



PROJECT MUSE®

Latining America

Claudia Milian


Published by University of Georgia Press

Milian, Claudia.

Latining America: Black-Brown Passages and the Coloring of Latino/a Studies.

Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2013.

Project MUSE., <https://muse.jhu.edu/>.



➔ For additional information about this book

<https://muse.jhu.edu/book/26836>

NOTES

INTRODUCTION. The Copiousness of Latin

1. An explanation is in order for how the categories “U.S. African American” and “Latinos and Latinas” are being referenced in this enterprise. In summoning “U.S. African American,” I follow Ifeoma Nwankwo’s exercising of the term. She explains her use of this nomenclature: “U.S. African American here refers to people of African descent from the U.S. African American is a general term more appropriate for describing all people of African descent in the Americas. Black here is intended as a general term to index people of African descent more broadly” (2006: 597). Nwankwo also provides Pan-American parameters for analysis. “We need to rethink what we mean when we say ‘African American,’” she urges, “so that we include the other Black Americas there (in ‘Nuestra América’), as well as here (in the United States)” (2005: 17). My use of this category does not suggest an understanding of U.S. African American as a homogeneous classification and comprehensive experience. Recent scholarship such as Ira Berlin’s *The Making of African America: The Four Great Migrations* (2010) documents other groups that are broadening the U.S. meaning of “African America”: migrants from the Caribbean and Africa. Berlin notes that after the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965, which created a yearly limitation of three hundred thousand annual visas on a first-come, first-served basis, “Black America, like white America, was also becoming an immigrant society” (2010: 6). In light of its complex sociohistorical transformations, U.S. African Americanness is also a harbinger of new demographics, representational tensions, and different meanings: “African American migrants,” let us say, “have struggled with established residents over the very name ‘African American,’ as many newcomers — declaring themselves, for instance, Jamaican Americans or Nigerian Americans — shun that title, while other immigrants have denied native black Americans’ claim to the title ‘African American’ since they had never been to Africa” (7). The slavery-to-freedom narrative also diverges. Berlin points out that some of the new arrivals, “rather than being descended solely from those who were sold, [. . .] trace their ancestry to the sellers of slaves” (10). Whereas others,

rather than “condemn[ing] their forced removal from Africa, [. . .] celebrate their arrival in America, in the words of Barack Obama’s father, as a ‘magical moment’” (11).

Throughout this work, I highlight the separate nature of U.S. Latinos *and* Latinas to concentrate on these two gendered categorizations and experiences. I employ Latino and Latina when referring to individuals and apply Latino/a when citing Latino/a studies as an academic field and its intellectual discourses and practices. This book’s epilogue elaborates my concern for the unpronounceable turns Latino and Latina groups are taking through the inclusion of the slash in Latino/a or the “@” sign in Latin@ to detail gender inclusion. As a final note, I use the U.S. Latino and Latina category not as a means to exclusively center and disassociate these U.S. identities from other relational elsewhere. I am also aware that Latinos and Latinas exist in Latin America, Europe, and other locations in the Global South as well as the Global North. I reference U.S. Latino and Latina to provide a context for the population being discussed. This is not to say that U.S. Latino and Latina and Latin American Latino and Latina equivalencies do not exist. Rather, the Latinidad thread I follow and question, as manifested in Latino/a studies, is a U.S. articulation.

2. For additional analyses on Latinidad, consult Beltrán (2010); Caminero-Santangelo (2007); Sugg (2004); J. Rodríguez (2003); Dávila (2001); Aparicio and Chávez-Silverman (1997a); Oboler (1995); Sommers (1991); and Padilla (1985).

3. Further elaborating on her evocation of double consciousness, Portman thoughtfully stated in her apology, “Du Bois writes about how black Americans often view the world simultaneously from other people’s point of view (from the outside in), as well as from their own points of view (from the inside out), because they are so aware of how they are scrutinized by other people and prejudices others may have against them. [. . .] I merely related to the overall framework of his idea—what it feels like to always see yourself from within and from without, knowing how other people view you and judge you and knowing how you view and judge yourself, at the same time. [. . .] I tried to explain my experience using a concept written by someone light-years more intelligent than I am, whose writing made me feel like someone else had been through a similar psychological experience to mine in some way. [. . .] I do believe, however, that it is in the small ways we relate to each other, even if we do so inaccurately, that we build our relationships with each other and realize our common humanity” (2004: 32).

4. This is not to say that Du Boisian double consciousness has not been likened to other U.S. contexts as well within U.S. African American studies. Robin D. G. Kelley, for example, tells us to “think of early New World Euro-Americans as possessing what Du Bois called ‘double-consciousness’: say, English and American, with whiteness as a means of negotiating this double consciousness.” These incisive moments of equiva-

lency also have corollaries with other bodies and geohistories, having the potential, as Kelley also sees it, to deepen “our understanding of race, nationality, and culture” (2002: 129).

5. Arlene Dávila has examined how a “commercial Latinidad” (2001: xiv) — as constructed by Hispanic marketing agencies in the United States — promotes the use of Spanish by Latinos and Latinas “to be symbolically moved and touched” through “their language” (71). The value of Spanish “is built as the paramount basis of U.S. Latinidad” (4). As a consequence, the Hispanic marketing industry — or, simply, the Latin market — re-creates “essentialist equations of Latinos” through the continuous reinforcement of Spanish in the advertising world (71). Soetoro-Ng’s real-world illustration conveys the different ways that the U.S. category “Latino or Latina” is being inhabited, highlighting other supplemental fashionings of — and constitutions for — the makings and unmakings of a “Spanish people” who are not limited to the Spanish-language world of the Latin market.

6. These migrations to black-brown ways of being can be situated within María Lugones’s “‘world’-travelling.” The working characteristics of this concept “serve to distinguish between a ‘world,’ a utopia, a possible world in the philosophical sense, and a world-view. By a ‘world’ I do not mean a utopia at all. A utopia does not count as a world in my sense. The ‘worlds’ that I am talking about are possible. But a possible world is not what I mean by a ‘world’ and I do not mean a world-view, though something like a world-view is involved here.” Lugones’s hermeneutic is outlined in this manner: “For something to be a ‘world’ in my sense it has to be inhabited at present by some flesh and blood people. That is why it cannot be a utopia. It may also be inhabited by some imaginary people. It may be inhabited by people who are dead or people that the inhabitants of this ‘world’ met in some other ‘world’ and now have in this ‘world’ in imagination. A ‘world’ in my sense may be an actual society given its dominant culture’s description and construction of life, including a construction of the relationships of production, of gender, race, etc. But a ‘world’ can also be such a society given a non-dominant construction, or it can be such a society or a society given an idiosyncratic construction. As we will see it is problematic to say that these are all constructions of the same society. But they are different ‘worlds.’ A ‘world’ need not be a construction of a whole society. It may be a construction of a tiny portion of a particular society. It may be inhabited by just a few people. Some ‘worlds’ are bigger than others” (1987: 8–9). Soetoro-Ng and Portman’s traveling can be regarded as an identifying act that may be *worked on* rather than dismissed for its lack of brown or black “authenticity.” Through Lugones’s words, we could then “understand *what it is to be them and what it is to be ourselves in their eyes*. Only when we have travelled to each other’s ‘worlds’ are we fully subjects to each other” (17).

7. I do not wish to be misunderstood here: I do not assert that Latinos and Latinas are the only “brown people” in the United States. Rather, I question why brownness has been exclusively designative of U.S. Latino and Latina lives through the dominant framework advancing Latino/a studies — namely, *Latinidad*. Attempting to find and fully delineate moments of passing among the multitudes of U.S. brown populations would deflect from the groups that I am critically focusing on: Latinos, Latinas, and African Americans. For analyses on the capacious brown canvas, the reader may consult, for example, Vijay Prashad’s *The Karma of Brown Folk* (2001).

8. Chapter 3 explores a brown–dark brown symbology and how it is put into use by both U.S. African Americans as well as U.S. Latinos and Latinas.

9. There are changing definitions and transnational dimensions to the nation at hand — in this instance, the United States. In this sense, this monograph concurs with the aims of Nancy Raquel Mirabal and Agustín Laó-Montes’s edited volume, *Technofuturos: Critical Interventions in Latina/o Studies*, in which they aim “to provide an intellectual and creative space for destabilizing and reassessing our understanding of *Latinidades* during a period of accelerated globalization, transnationalism, transmodernity, and reconfigurations of empire,” thereby “complicating how we narrate, conceive, and reconstruct the workings of *Latinidad* and the field of *Latina/o* studies in the twenty-first century” (Mirabal, 2007: 1). Here, states of U.S. Latinoness and Latinaness are punctuated by “exile, imposed citizenship, ‘undocumented’ immigrations, colonialism, diaspora, ‘legal’ residency, cultural citizenship, or historical absorption as a result of the United States–Mexican War of 1846 and the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo of 1848, land and landlessness, whether imagined and/or real, are all fundamental delineators of what constitutes being *Latina/o*” (8).

10. In employing minoritized or minoritization as particular modes, I echo Michael Dear and Gustavo Leclerc’s useful lens for this concept, which refers to “the process by which no racial or ethnic category becomes large enough to command a majority in public dialogue, elections, etc.” (2003: xi–xii).

11. Although W. E. B. Du Bois used the term “color line” in the singular, he did not strictly mean *one* arrangement of a line. Lewis Gordon has observed, “The color line is also a metaphor that exceeds its own concrete formulation. It is the race line as well as the gender line, the class line, the sexual orientation line, the religious line — in short, the line between ‘normal’ and ‘abnormal’ identities” (2000: 63). I invoke it in the plural, as color lines, to underline the multiple passages that transport us to what Aimee Carrillo Rowe calls the “lines of contact we build with others” (2008: 2).

12. Gavin Jones proposes that “Du Bois’s famous aphorism, ‘the problem of the Twentieth Century is the problem of the color-line,’ can be read as a remotivation of the phrase ‘the Negro Problem’ itself, a remotivation that identifies the ‘problem’

as the paradoxical politics of segregation rather than simply that of racial presence.” Jones puts forth that “by locating the true color-line not between black and white society, but at the interface of blackness and a Southern culture that had assimilated that blackness, Du Bois was able to force upon his reader a recognition of a racially hyphenated nation. Du Bois’s rhetorical task was to transform the paradoxical America of the color-line.” Seen as such, Du Bois’s hyphenated structuring of a “color-line” nests, as he wrote in *The Souls of Black Folk*, as a “point of transference where the thoughts and feelings of one race can come into direct contact and sympathy with thoughts and feelings of the other” (Gavin Jones, 1997: 30–31; Du Bois quoted on 31).

13. The *OED* defines a line as signifying “a row of written or printed words” and “the words of an actor’s part,” thus applying to the world of thespians. Actors perform different characters, adding the features, traits, and peculiarities that they understand to form the individual nature of a person, circumstance, or thing. I make note of actors’ lines as these apply to the world of plays, motion pictures, and television broadcasts, among other possibilities, to consider the staging of Latinness, which often surpasses the representation of an “authentic” Latino or Latina subject. As John Leguizamo points out in the context of cinematic passing lines, Latinness moves in various directions. Leguizamo’s Colombian and Puerto Rican Latinness were once converted into Italianness. Discussing his role in the 1999 crime drama directed by Spike Lee, *Summer of Sam*, Leguizamo added this autobiographical remark: “I got deep into my character Vinny the hairdresser. Pretty ironic. The story’s by an Italian guy [screenwriter Victor Colicchio] who played Puerto Ricans in movies. Now I’m a Puerto Rican playing an Italian in his movie. Holy shit, I crossed over! I figure I was on the Al Pacino exchange program. If he can play Latin twice, I get to be Italian once” (2006: 205).

14. In relation to the exceptionalist tradition of American studies, Brian T. Edwards and Dilip Parameshwar Gaonkar make an assertion that holds relevancy here as well. “We are all studying dying formations,” they argue, “with their archives simultaneously ossifying and fragmenting. We are struggling to decipher the new formations as they emerge from the debris of eroding traditions and worlds” (2010: 6).

15. One reason that *Latinidad*, as a unification strategy, has not adequately focused on “other” forms of Latinness that exceed the consolidation of panethnic subjects may have to do with its “forthcoming” temporality. Antonio Viego submits that “the interpretive contortions necessary to think that Latinos in the United States can constitute a nation in the first place are not only a testament to the ways in which the idea of ‘nation’ is significantly up for grabs these days. They are also a sign of the more general interpretive contortions that mark the contemporary discourse on *Latinidad*. Theorists of all stripes discuss *Latinidad* in relation to the future, the tense that ap-

pears to naturally elect itself for these discussions. [. . . T]he broadcasting of the Latino future is intimately dependent upon what will have already been claimed back as evidence of a Hispanic past” (2007: 108). Put another way: the Latinidad “hereafter” also bespeaks of the coming of a “new era” that returns to coherent dispositions of Latinidad.

16. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak references such grammatical constructions as “to lexicalize.” She puts across, “To *lexicalize* is to separate a linguistic item from its appropriate grammatical system into the conventions of another grammar. Thus a new economic and cultural lexicalization [. . .] demands a delexicalization as well” (2004: 118).

17. The colorings of Latinoness and Latinaness illustrate that they are always on the move. As sociologist Clara E. Rodríguez has written, “[A]lthough some Latinos are consistently seen as having the same color or ‘race,’ many Latinos are assigned a multiplicity of ‘racial’ classifications, sometimes in one day.” She continues, “In addition to being classified by others (without their consent), some Latinos shift their own self-classification during their lifetime. I have known Latinos who became ‘black,’ then ‘white,’ then ‘human beings,’ finally again ‘Latino’ — all in a relatively short time. [. . .] I have come to understand that this shifting, context-dependent experience is at the core of many Latinos’ life in the United States. Even in the nuclear family, parents, children, and siblings often have a wide range of physical types. For many Latinos, race is primarily cultural; multiple identities are a normal state of affairs; and ‘racial mixture’ is subject to many different, sometimes fluctuating, definitions.” In light of these multiple locations, my interest is not so much about finding a subject’s definitive ethnoracial identity. It is, instead, about finding relational meaning when a subject taps into another’s color line. The idea of Latinoness and Latinaness as provisional states dialogues with Rodríguez’s premise: “[F]or many Latinos, ‘racial’ classification is immediate, *provisional*, contextually dependent, and sometimes contested” (2000: 4–6; emphasis added).

18. An argument can be made that Richard Rodriguez was also searching for, in his third autobiographical project, a verb that would impart expressions of existence by brown actors who defy traditional ways of living and thereby remake, in this process, the United States. Calling himself a Hispanic, “a middle-aged noun” (2002: 105), Rodriguez holds a predilection for this term over “Latino,” because it admits “a relationship to Latin America in English” (110). In attempting to find a language for himself, the self-defined “Hispanic memoirist” (111) fluctuates between nouns and adjectives (cf. 103–23). Rodriguez concludes that both Hispanic and Latino honor “linguistic obeisance to Spain” and returns to the Latin location of these categories (109). He asks, “For what, after all, does ‘Latin’ refer to, if not the imperial root sys-

tem?" Rodriguez narratively progresses by "Latinizing" his categorical preference and discloses, "*Hispanicus sui*." This browned Latin Hispanicity comes out in the United States, for in his estimation, "Only America could create Hispanics, Asians, African Americans" (119). Sociopolitical actors with tangible ethnoracial and national particularities invariably perform Rodriguez's brownness and Hispanization, even though the transgressive future of brown is uncertain in terms of deeds and doers. Latinities anticipate moving actors and geographies beyond Latina, Latino, and Hispanic lives.

19. As Juan Flores claims, "personally and collectively, Puerto Ricans, Mexicans, Cubans, Dominicans, and each of the other groups project their own respective national backgrounds as a first and primary line of identity and on that basis, fully mindful of differences, distances, and particularities, negotiate their relation to some more embracing 'Latino' or 'Hispanic' composite" (1997: 187).

20. Latin body politics have broader implications that go beyond normative American, Latino, and Latina perceptions of the fixed U.S. Latino and Latina subject. Lázaro Lima's deft study provides a lens on "the conditions under which it becomes necessary to create a specific Latino subject of American cultural and literary history." His book, *The Latino Body: Crisis Identities in American Literary and Cultural Memory*, "tells the story of the U.S. Latino body politic and its relation to the state: how the state configures Latino subjects and how Latino subjects have in turn altered the state's appellative assertions of difference (the contemporary emphasis on 'Latino' instead of 'Hispanic,' for example) to their own ends in the public sphere" (2007: 6).

21. U.S. scholarship on "the full range of important historical, political, and cultural connections between Asian Americans and African Americans" is critically unfolding, as evidenced with publications such as Ho and Mullen (2008: 2). Consult also Lee (2011). Asian-Indian connections in Mexico prove equally relevant as well, for "Asians brought to Mexico in slavery on the Manila-to-Acapulco galleons [. . .] were labeled 'African' because the Spanish wanted more slaves, and by law only Africans could be slaves" (Vincent, 2001: 1).

22. Richard Rodriguez's excerpt reads, "My brown is a reminder of conflict. And of reconciliation" (2002: xii).

23. For studies on the African presence in Mexico, consult Gates (2011: 59–90); Vinson and Restall (2009); Bennett (2009); Irwin (2008); Hernández Cuevas (2004); Vinson and Vaughn (2004); and Jiménez Román (n.d.). For analyses on the African diaspora in Central America, refer to Feracho, Mosby, and Nwankwo (forthcoming); Gudmundson and Wolfe (2010); Mosby (2003); E. Gordon (1998); and Minority Rights Group (1996).

24. A model for brownness and "brown pride" transpired during the 1960s Chicano movement, when the Brown Berets also materialized. Ian F. Haney López relays that

the political and community organization “adopted the following pledge: ‘I wear the Brown Beret because it signifies my dignity and pride in the color of my skin and race’” (2003: 18–19). The Chicano movement — *el movimiento*, or the Chicano civil rights movement — served as “an insurgent uprising among a new political generation of Mexican-Americans” that “channeled their collective energies into a militant civil rights and ethnic nationalist movement in the late 1960s and 1970s” (A. García, 1997: 1–2). Alma M. García adds that the movement was surrounded by a radical national climate that included “the Black power movement, the anti-Vietnam War movement and the second wave of the women’s movement [. . . and] focused on social, political, and economic self-determination and autonomy for Mexican-American communities throughout the United States” (2). Lee Bebout expands on the meanings of *el movimiento*, noting that it can be described “more accurately [. . .] as a complex, diverse collection of struggles. During the 1960s and 1970s, Chicanos fought for political representation, labor rights, social programs, and access to education. These struggles were undertaken by disparate Chicano communities. Indeed, land grant activists, farm workers, students, and barrio organizers found the movement in their own localized struggles, marking a tension between Chicano diversity and the desire to imagine a national, unified front” (2011: 3–4). In addition, refer to Montejano (2010); C. Jackson (2009); Gonzalez, Fox, and Noriega (2008); Muñoz (2007); Treviño (2001); Saldívar-Hull (2000); and Gaspar de Alba (1998).

25. Cf. R. T. Rodriguez (2010); Flores and Rosaldo (2007); Cabán (2003); Poblete (2003); de la Torre and Pesquera (1993); and Rosaldo (1985).

26. Paul Cuadros suggests another *Latinidad* that surfaces in connection to the world of high school sports, which we can reference as “*Soccer Latinidad*.” He contrasts this *Soccer Latinidad* with the “all American” football town of Siler City, North Carolina. Cuadros’s delineation of an athletic *Latinidad* is premised on how the team he coaches, “Los Jets,” successfully integrates the three differentiated groups in Siler City’s Jordan-Matthews High School (JM): newcomers, immigrant “kids,” and “Chicanos.” He describes these group’s differentiations: “[T]hose feelings of alienation translated into many kids feeling lost, lost in themselves and lost in their communities. You could see that clearly in the halls of JM among the Latino students. There were generally three groups of Latinos at school. There were the ‘newcomers,’ kids fresh from the border who didn’t speak a word of English and were placed in the English As a Second Language classes. Then there were the ‘immigrant’ kids, like Fish and Indio, who’d come to the United States when they were younger and could speak English. And finally there were the ‘Chicanos,’ kids like Enrique and Edi who’d been born here and could often speak languages fluently. A newcomer had little in common with a Chicano who perhaps couldn’t speak Spanish as well. We had all three groups

on the team — one of the few places at the school where they could come together for something that they all loved” (2006: 155).

This inclusion is significant, as Cuadros expresses his desire for his players to think of themselves as a “Latino” family (2006: 163). His mediated efforts at creating a sense of family, together with a championship team, warrant a Latinidad context, which is organized here around English language proficiency, time of U.S. arrival and/or legal status, and Americanization. This Soccer Latinidad, while not entirely dependent on the Spanish language alone, is framed as a coalitional effort that guides, all the same, the road to American access and success. Cuadros admits as much: “I wanted to make the guys winners — to insulate them from the prejudice, their residency status, and allow them to overcome the barriers erected by the close-minded” (226). Despite Cuadros’s best intentions, the highly ethnoracialized features of his players remain untransferable within this coach’s Peruvian American gaze and, one must punctuate, within America at large. Cuadros feels inclined to provide not just his players’ nationalities but their ethnoracial markers as well. As the soccer players are all referenced through nicknames, the following descriptions follow Cuadros’s narrative style. The most light-skinned of the players, “Guero” (spelled without the diaeresis on the “u”), is depicted as having “light brown eyes, beneath the straight, honey-brown hair. [. . .] There was a reason why all the kids called him Guero — he looked white. You’d never know that Guero was a Latino kid until he opened his mouth. He was handsome, strong, a bit dangerous, and naturally all the girls were wild about him” (217). Ironically, in this hierarchical construction of whiteness, the other handsome white figure, distinguished as such, is David Duke, a former Louisiana U.S. Senate candidate and former Grand Wizard of the Knights of the Ku Klux Klan, who attended an anti-immigration rally at Siler City. In one instance, Cuadros writes that Duke possesses “Hollywood good looks” (52). In another, Duke stands out as “the tallest, the best-dressed, and best-looking” in the crowd (55). To return to Cuadros’s racialized portrayals of his Latino players: “Oso,” from Honduras, is defined as “coffee-bean black” (72). “Lechero” is indigenized: “He had dark-chocolate-colored skin with a triangular-shaped face, large eyes, and a broad nose. You could see the indigenous features in him” (76). Cuadros, on the other hand, appears as the bearer of a Latinidad marked through brownness. He is “short, brown, with dark hair” (113).

27. Expanding the scope of Julia Alvarez’s exploration of U.S. Latina *quinceañera* extravaganzas, it can be claimed that an exception to the presumably cogent, Spanish-speaking background that detonates Latinidad is what I am suggesting here as a “Quinceañera Latinidad.” This conceptual category refers to the conventional requirements promoted — or to use Alvarez’s phraseology, “touted” — by U.S. marketing sectors in the construction of a Latin “traditional” event. To be sure, a Quinceañera

Latinidad depends on the idea of a Latin tradition to explicitly target Latina youth and their parents in what Alvarez identifies as “our Pan-Hispanic United States” (2007: 75). These Latin assemblages are a marker of “an ethnicity with a label that reads *MADE IN THE USA* (or ‘Remade in the USA,’ if you will)” since there is socio-cultural “pressure to honor a tradition whose content and origins remains vague” (116; 110). The same vagueness is applicable to the subjects and origins subsumed by the U.S. Latino or Latina category. But unlike other kinds of Latinidad, the Spanish language is not a vital part for the manufacturing of a Quinceañera Latinidad. As Will Cain, the president and founder of *Quince Girl* magazine, tells Alvarez, “The Hispanic community is this very fractured community. You have your Mexican Americans and your Puerto Ricans and your Cuban Americans. And the only thing that ties all these separate nationalities together — no, it’s not Spanish. [. . .] What ties them together, the one single tie that binds all these cultures . . . is the tradition celebrated across the whole diverse group: the quinceañera. I mean, it is big” (2007: 68–69).

Additional corporate recognition of a Quinceañera Latinidad — mindful of what Alvarez christens as a “flamboyant new kind of American, the Latina American” — includes Kern’s Nectar sponsorship of its annual Dulce Quinceañera Sweepstakes and Maggi’s Put-Flavor-in-Your-Quinceañera Sweepstakes (2007: 121; 71; 118). The Latinidad that sets the stage for a Quinceañera Latinidad composed of diverse “cultural borrowings” is synthesized as follows: “So that now, Cuban quinceañeras in Miami are hiring Mexican mariachis to sing the traditional ‘Las Mañanitas.’ The full court of fourteen damas and chambelanes, ‘each couple representing a year of the quinceañera’s life,’ a mostly Mexican practice, is now a traditional must. As is the changing of the shoes to heels, which seems to originally have been a Puerto Rican embellishment. From the Puerto Ricans as well, though some say from the Mexicans, came the tradition of *la última muñeca*, a ‘last doll’ dressed exactly like the quinceañera” (78, 75). As is the case with other Latinidades, there are separations and exclusions within the dominant trends mapping U.S. quinceañera festivities and practices. According to Alvarez, the price tag for this festive occasion can range “anywhere from a hundred bucks for a cookout in the backyard and a stereo booming music for the young lady and her friends to fifty grand and up in a hall with a party planner, a limo, dinner for a hundred or more” (64–65). Central Americans — with their frugal cookout quinceañeras — are a group that stands at the lowest socioeconomic echelons of a Quinceañera Latinidad. As Alvarez explains it, “I have to conclude that the cookout quinceañeras are becoming the exception. In the past, perhaps they were the rule. In the old countries, of course. In small homogeneous pockets — a border town in Texas, a barrio composed solely of Central Americans; in other words, a group still largely out of the mainstream loop, perhaps” (65).

A Quinceañera Latinidad, then, emerges among the most visible Latinos and Latinas in terms of buying power, although Alvarez's example of a Latin cultural hodgepodge for quinceañeras largely depends on the "traditional" groups that encompass the U.S. Latino and Latina triad. Those on the margins of a Quinceañera Latinidad—that is, those hosting cookout quinceañeras—fall under the demographic radar because, as Alvarez reports, they are "taking place in segregated, often undocumented populations" (2007: 78). The most conspicuous "Quinceañera Latinos" participating in what Alvarez designates as an American "celluloid dream" are decidedly more marketable, desirable, and memorable in the formation of this Quinceañera Latinidad as well as in Latino and Latina cultural identity-making processes (121).

28. Tronto's ethic of care implicates these four phases: (1) caring about, (2) caring for, (3) caregiving, and (4) care receiving. Caring about implies an awareness of the need to genuinely care in the first place. This "requires listening to the articulated needs, recognizing unspoken needs, distinguishing among and deciding which needs to care about." Caring for entails a "responsibility to meet a need that has been identified." Here "someone has to assume responsibility for organizing [. . .] The moral dimension of caring for is to assume, and to take seriously, responsibility." Caregiving is a phase in which "individuals and organizations perform the necessary caring tasks. It involves a knowledge about how to care." Care receiving "involves the response of the thing, person, or group that received the caregiving. [It] requires the complex moral element of responsiveness" (1998: 16–17). Tronto's ubiquitous ethic of care is linked to Latinities, because it insists on the significance of analyzing human activities and interactions that, in a way, dismantle "the myth of our own invulnerable autonomy" (19). Tronto's ethic also brings with it gendered and class components that can be attached to ethnoracial factors: "caring is greatly undervalued in our culture—in the assumption that caring is 'women's work,' in perceptions of caring occupations, in the wages and salaries paid to workers in provision of care, in the assumption that care is menial" (16). Consult also Tronto (1993).

29. Regina M. Marchi suggests that the U.S. observance of the Day of the Dead—"a fusion of Indigenous and Roman Catholic rituals for honoring the deceased" in places like Mexico, Guatemala, El Salvador, Bolivia, Peru, and Ecuador (2009: 10–11)—is not limited to U.S. Latinos and Latinas. She remarks that this annual holiday, held on 1 or 2 November, merits greater examination. Marchi insists, "[S]tudies of Latinidad should not be confined to analyses of how Latinos create and fortify cultural ties in response to the dominant U.S. society. They should also examine how phenomena considered Latino enter different cultural spaces and change the dominant culture" (97). One can argue that the U.S. Day of the Dead, as a general manifestation of an ethic of care, has led to the "Latinization" of U.S. culture" where forms of public mourning

can take place, since “the basic object of the celebration — collectively remembering the dead — is universal enough” (101). Marchi also adds that the Day of the Dead in the United States has been popularized because of a new openness to non-Western spiritualities.

30. With this in mind, I am following a set of paramount questions raised by José Esteban Muñoz: “‘Latino’ does not subscribe to a common racial, class, gender, religious, or national category, and if a Latino can be from any country in Latin America, a member of any race, religion, class, or gender/sex orientation, who then is she? What, if any, nodes of commonality do Latinas/os share? How is it possible to know *latinidad*?” (2000: 67).

31. A clarification is required for the ways that these Latinidades are manifested in De Genova and Ramos-Zayas’s research on the racialized distinctions between Mexicans and Puerto Ricans in Chicago, “one of very few sites where [these two groups] have both settled over several decades” (2003: 1). *Latinidad* as the “American” abjection of the U.S.-born constitutes the ways that Mexicans and Puerto Ricans perceive this “*Latinidad* as an identity that fundamentally pertained to many ‘second-generation’ youth as the effect of a kind of racially subordinate ‘Americanization.’ This type of ‘American’ abjection was generally considered to be a degeneration of the ‘good’ or ‘proper’ values that migrants prized, and was readily conflated with ‘laziness’ and welfare system dependency” (179). This *Latinidad* also demonstrates how migrants view second-generation Latinos and Latinas as “mere ‘minorities’ who did not speak any language ‘properly’ [and] embodied values or behaviors more stereotypically associated with African Americans” (180).

The second of these — a *Latinidad* framed through migrant illegality as well as a *Latinidad* without Puerto Ricans — emerges through Mexican recognition of other groups, such as Guatemalans, who cross multiple borders to get to the United States. De Genova and Ramos-Zayas further tweak this *Latinidad* by calling it an “empathetic *Latinidad*,” which is a uniting force with Central American migrants’ plight due to the “compounding of nation-state borders” (2003: 184). A *Latinidad* in opposition to African Americans distrusts and fears African Americans. This *Latinidad* can also be deemed as “a strategy for the avoidance of blackness” (189). Here, blacks are perceived as too slow, lazy, and with “unfair advantages” at the U.S. workplace. De Genova and Ramos-Zayas elaborate, “It was abundantly evident in these comments that the equation of African Americans with laziness [. . .] became conjoined with the denigration of racial Blackness, and that this conjuncture became one kind of condition of possibility for the sense of the shared (racialized) identity — as ‘Latinos’ — to be mutually invoked by Mexican migrants and Puerto Ricans” (188). A *Latinidad* as an articulation of working-class solidarity is produced “in racialized opposition to white-

ness and Blackness [. . .] an unequivocal sameness or equivalence between Mexicans and Puerto Ricans (and also Central Americans) [. . .] in a class-inflected opposition, above else to specifically Latino bosses [. . .] demonstrating their greater loyalty and devotion to whites and Blacks” (195).

A *Latinidad* as a strategy of middle-class formation relates to “the process of becoming ‘middle-class’ [as] consonant with ‘becoming Latino.’” This way of being both “middle-class” and “Latino” is “rooted in an affirmative sense of ‘giving back’ or ‘serving the community,’ and ‘remembering where you came from’ without ‘selling out’” (De Genova and Ramos-Zayas, 2003: 198). Finally, a fractured *Latinidad* through institutional contexts, whiteness, and power was deployed “in overt relation to whiteness” at institutional settings “traditionally associated with ideas of ‘mobility,’ ‘assimilation,’ and ‘mainstreaming’ (i.e., college).” This *Latinidad* “became a form of racial identification that held the promises of coalition and solidarity for the sake of contesting the dominant racializations of ‘Mexicans’ and ‘Puerto Ricans’ that both groups had to confront” (205).

32. Robin D. G. Kelley sets forth a useful definition of *Africana* diasporas, explaining that “its contemporary usage emerges clearly in the 1950s and 1960s. It served in scholarly debates as both a political term emphasizing the unifying experiences of African peoples dispersed by the slave trade and an analytical term that enabled scholars to talk about black communities across national boundaries. Much of this scholarship examines the dispersal of people of African descent, their role in the transformation and creation of new cultures, institutions, and ideas outside of Africa, and the problems of building Pan-African movements across the globe. A critical component of this work, as well as all diaspora studies, is the construction and reproduction of a diaspora consciousness. The main elements of such a consciousness (to varying degrees, of course) include a collective memory of dispersal from a homeland, a vision of that homeland, feelings of alienation, desire for return, and a continuing relationship and identity with the homeland” (2002: 126). Frank Andre Guridy cogitates on this diaspora “as both the dispersal of Africans through the slave trade and their ongoing social, political, cultural interactions across various boundaries after emancipation. As a concept that illuminates the creation of cross-border communities, diaspora is a useful way to interpret cross-national, Afro-descended interaction that is not reducible to politicized forms of ‘black internationalism’ or ‘racial solidarity’” (2010: 4–5).

33. Oscar is “a hardcore sci-fi and fantasy man” who cannot surpass his nerd status (Díaz, 2007: 6). Initially, however, “in those blessed days of his youth,” Oscar was one “of those preschool loverboys who was always trying to kiss the girls, always coming up behind them during a merengue and giving them the pelvic pump, the first nigger to learn the perrito and the one who danced it any chance he got.” Díaz adds, “Because

in those days he was (still) a ‘normal’ Dominican boy raised in a ‘typical’ Dominican family, his nascent pimp-ness was encouraged by blood and friends alike” (11). Even though Oscar grows out of his “innate” Dominican dancing skills, the expected and “natural” rhythm of the Latin subject constantly follows him, one can say, through the name association with Oscar D’León. Oscar Emilio León Somoza, otherwise known as Oscar D’León, was born in Caracas in 1943. Reaching musical success in the 1980s, D’León is nicknamed “El Sonero del Mundo” (The Son Singer of the World). He has collaborated with such stars as Celia Cruz, Tito Puente, Arturo Sandoval, and Luís Enrique.

34. Gabriel García Márquez’s fictional village of Macondo informs Díaz’s moving literary world, which is also in line with its updated, hyperurban space, conceived in the mid-1990s, “McOndo” (Díaz, 2007: 7). The latter refers to a Latin American literary movement taking its root from Macintoshes, McDonald’s, and condos (cf. Fuguet and Gómez, 1996). Not to be overlooked is Díaz’s gesture to the Anglo- and Francophone Caribbean. Derek Walcott’s poem from 1979, “The Schooner ‘Flight,’” which speaks to the rich cultural mixtures of the Caribbean and takes the reader to the narrator’s brief history of his life, serves as the epigraph to Díaz’s book. He also references Martinican intellectual Édouard Glissant, whose theorization of cultural interrelationships in the Caribbean through processes of creolization and conceptual terms like “relation” have served as important landmarks for diasporic studies and the relational links between the Caribbean and the Atlantic world (Díaz, 2007: 92).

35. The complex bridging of high and low popular culture mediums is best raised by Díaz himself, who clues readers on the novel’s narration. He told the *New Yorker* that to understand the “narration enigma,” readers “have to know a little bit about the comic book series *The Fantastic Four*. Each of the family members is explicitly linked to one of the Four — Oscar is the Thing, Abelard is Mr. Fantastic, Belicia is the Invisible Woman, and Lola is the Human Torch — something I stole from Rick Moody’s incomparable novel *The Ice Storm*” (2010).

36. Paula M. L. Moya and Ramón Saldívar, among other literary theorists, have evaluated the shifting articulations of American national identities and literatures through the optic of the “trans-American imaginary” and have called for the need “to see American literature as heterogeneous and multiple.” Such a mode requires an alteration of the American corpus, since its influences exceed “nations other than England and idioms that do not originate in the English language have been unevenly and inadequately incorporated into the larger narrative of American literary historiography.” Moya and Saldívar provide the hemispheric vantage point — “the interpretive framework that yokes together North and South America instead of New England and England” — of the “transnational imaginary” (2). This literary form of geopolitical

kinship “make[s] visible the centrality of Latinidad to the fictional discourses that continue to shape the American national imaginary” (5). Its theoretical contribution is a “chronotope, a contact zone that is both historical and geographical and that is populated by transnational persons whose lives from an experiential region within which singularly delineated notions of political, social, and cultural identity do not suffice” (2).

This renewed vision of American literature is both opportune and valuable, as Moya and Saldívar seek to extricate the recurring “Americanness” in normative domains that restrict a “national” American corpus. I use a “Latined literature” as a literary resource, rather than the aforementioned terms. Although my perspectives dialogue with Moya and Saldívar, the idea of a Latined literature—or a Latined literary space—diverges insofar as I am interested in the function of U.S. Latino and Latina literature outside the confines of the American geographic, national, cultural, and ethnoracial context that also locates these groups and “their” productions as “Latino” and “Latina.” Despite its “trans-Americanness,” Latino and Latina writing appears to become standardized within and channeled through the United States, dwelling in literary Americanness. Latino and Latina narrative productions become “naturalized” to the U.S. literary map, as critics seek to find and insist on the centrality of their space in U.S. American literature. But what of such texts as they speak to and restore Caribbean, Central American, and Latin American regional struggles and thinking? I am advancing, then, a rereading—while going beyond the boundaries—of Latinoness, Latinaness, and Latinidad and their insular relation to ideological Americanness. An “American” novel (in the U.S. sense) may herald a Latined perspective, and it may or may not necessarily be written by “Latinos” and “Latinas.” Such a text, for instance, could just as well reconstitute a “new” American self—in the continental sense—in the Americas. But it also fashions a new form of writing and engages with hermeneutic turns that integrate and disrupt literary conventions in Latin America *and* the United States. Latin American cultural practices are now gesturing toward Latinos and Latinas, placing their oeuvres in a new regional and historical context, with a literary temporality that is also navigating mass migrations, transnational communities, cultural alterations, and millennial transitions.

Take note of how Junot Díaz and Daniel Alarcón, a Peruvian American writer, are being imported southward. They recently had the distinction of being the only two U.S. Latinos who were named as two of the most renowned thirty-nine authors under thirty-nine (or as pitched in Spanish, *treinta y nueve escritores menores de treinta y nueve*) by the 2007 Bogota World Book Capital. The literary measure of U.S. Latinos and Latinas changes perspective and becomes regional “Latin American.” The rest of the “thirty-nine under thirty-nine” authors, selected by a jury composed

of Colombian novelists Piedad Bonnett, Hector Abad Faciolince, and Oscar Callazos, write primarily in Spanish and come from Latin America. Díaz's and Alarcón's works are two concrete cases in point of U.S. Latino/a publications that are translated into Spanish. One might ask, where does their "trans-ness" reside, in "trans-America" or "trans-Latin America"? In what ways do their literary forms unsettle both U.S.-based Americanness and Latin Americanness? We must bear in mind the different continental understandings of their endeavors, as the American nation and the American hemisphere mark them. In effect, they bear the geo- and biographical distancing from these spaces, lending themselves to my premise: that the symbolic acts and geographies with which we are grappling constitute Latinings. Such works are not purely (North or Latin) American but an elective representation of a subject with multiple thresholds and continuous denationalizations. What might this mean for hemispherist Latino and Latina creative workers with many detours? What of their translated writings, circulating in more and more globalized settings and linked to other "foreign" aesthetics and literary practices?

37. By separating "re" and "cognition," I am building from the standard meaning of "recognition." The *OED* defines this noun as "the action or process of recognizing or being recognized, in particular" and the "identification of a thing or person from previous encounters or knowledge." But I am also expressing the process of redoing something, like the act of cognition, whose *OED* meaning entails "the mental action or process of acquiring knowledge and understanding through thought, experience, and the senses" and "a perception, sensation, idea, or intuition resulting from this."

38. But this Latining certainly operates in "Latin" America. Just as I explore the itinerant meanings of U.S. Latinoness and Latinaness within an expansive vista of the color line and U.S. borders, Néstor García Canclini's work *Latinoamericanos buscando lugar en este siglo* (2002) seeks to decipher the locations of Latin Americans and Latin Americanness in this century. García Canclini's point of departure includes the following concerns: "What does it mean to be Latin American?" (12); "Where are Latin American accounts located now?" (17); and "Who wants to be Latin American?" (23). The context for the first query reads as follows: "What does it mean to be Latin America? I sought to elaborate an essay about the way in which the question is changing and the new answers that are being constructed. There are still historical voices in this debate, but different ones are being added, and sometimes with new arguments. The scale also has expanded: the present condition of Latin America exceeds its territory. Those who left their countries and are now extending their cultures beyond the region demonstrate the painful dislocation of Latin Americans and the opportunities offered by global exchanges" (12; my translation).

39. Latining also motions toward the critical inclusion of U.S. Latino and Latina cultural and intellectual production in Latin American studies. It is frequently obvious to me how U.S. Latinos and Latinas discursively integrate Latin American history, culture, and politics in their works (e.g., Julia Alvarez, Ana Castillo, Sandra Cisneros, Junot Díaz, Martín Espada, Cristina García, Francisco Goldman, and Héctor Tobar, among many others). This linking, however, is not so apparent when it comes to Latin American literary production and intellectual thought and their examination of—or even interrelation with—U.S. Latinos and Latinas.

40. As geo- and biographical migratory passages, these movements create, as Ira Berlin has elucidated in the context of the transformations underpinning U.S. African American life, “a glimpse of the future, for the new history has not one story line but many and has not one direction but several” (2010: 9). He adds that exploring the complex struggles of the ever-widening African American experience “does not create a single culture, produce an established political goal, or culminate in a pre-established outcome. Rather it raises questions about the character of the master narrative of African American history” (10).

41. At the same time, of course, such subjects may not accept the construction as an accounting of themselves. It is productive to once again turn to Lugones’s sagacious observations on “world’-travelling.” She indicates, “In a ‘world’ some of the inhabitants may not understand or hold the particular construction of them that constructs them in that ‘world.’ So, there may be ‘worlds’ that construct me in ways that I do not even understand. Or it may be that I understand the construction, but do not hold it of myself. I may not accept it as an account of myself, a construction of myself. And yet, I may be animating such a construction.” The recurring, but differing exercise of “Latin” throughout should be apprehended as a conjectural approach that simultaneously seizes and excoriates stereotypes of the temperamental “Latin.” Lugones brilliantly speaks to the meanings behind this construction: “One can be at the same time in a ‘world’ that constructs one as stereotypically latin, for example, and in a ‘world’ that constructs one as latin. Being stereotypically latin and being simply latin are different simultaneous constructions of persons that are part of different ‘worlds.’ One animates one or the other or both at the same time without necessarily confusing them, though simultaneous enactment can be confusing if one is not on one’s guard” (Lugones, 1987: 10). Lugones adds, “Given that latins are constructed in Anglo ‘worlds’ as stereotypically intense—intensity being a central characteristic of at least one of the anglo stereotypes of latins—and given that many latins, myself included, are genuinely intense, I can say to myself ‘I am intense’ and take a hold of the double meaning. And furthermore, I can be stereotypically intense or be the real thing and, if you are Anglo, you do not know when I am which because I am Latin-

American. As Latin-American I am an ambiguous being, a two-imagined self: I can see that gringos see me as stereotypically intense because I am, as a Latin-American, constructed that way but I may or may not intentionally animate the stereotype or the real thing knowing that you may not see it in anything other than in the stereotypical construction. This ambiguity is funny and is not just funny, it is survival-rich" (13).

42. I interrogate the relevance of double consciousness in light of José Luis Falconi and José Antonio Mazzotti's identification of it as an "old notion" in their edited volume *The Other Latinos: Central and South Americans in the United States*. They ask, "Is the old notion of a 'double consciousness' still useful in depicting these new collective subjectivities?" (2007: 3).

43. I discuss, in chapter 4, José Luis Falconi and José Antonio Mazzotti's "Other Latino" designation in greater length.

44. Cary D. Wintz notes that "taken together," the Harlem Renaissance, the New Negro Movement, and the Negro Renaissance "provide a succinct and remarkably accurate glimpse of the diverse and diffuse currents that surfaced in the mid-1920s and gave rise to a surge of black creativity." But this literary and intellectual movement also poses some definitive chronological limitations. "Generally," Wintz states, "the consensus among scholars has been that the Harlem Renaissance was an event of the 1920s, bounded on one side by the war and the race riots of 1919 and on the other side by the 1929 stock market crash" (1988: 1). Jeffrey B. Perry adds that the Harlem Renaissance "is a much-debated concept — its very existence and name are challenged by some. In general, 'the Harlem Renaissance' refers to the literary outpourings, mostly by Black writers working on Black subject matter with a new sense of confidence and achievement, that reached much wider audiences in the period of the 1920s, particularly the second half of the decade. (Some would date the 'Renaissance' from 1917 through about 1935.) The location of the 'Renaissance' is also contested — some emphasize its national or international character, while most locate it in New York City, particularly Harlem. Much-discussed aspects of the 'Renaissance' concern the authors, their audiences, their themes and subject matter, the quality of their work, and the disproportionate role played by white publishers and white patrons in shaping their artistic works" (2001: 351).

45. Influential literary and cultural vehicles were established during the 1910s and 1920s for these aims, which included the *Crisis*, founded by W. E. B. Du Bois as the official publication of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), and the Urban League's *Opportunity*, edited by sociologist Charles S. Johnson (1893–1956).

46. And yet ironically *Down These Mean Streets*, a text hailed for its palpable blackness, exposes an anxiety of brownness-cum-blackness. Conversations between

mother and son reveal a concurrent brownness and blackness. In one instance, she reassures him, almost soothingly, “You are not black, you’re brown, a nice color, a pretty color” (P. Thomas, 1997: 135). A few pages later, it is the term “*Negrito*” that turns into the problematic loving diminutive, as the mother asks Thomas, “Why does it hurt you to be *un Negrito*?” (148).

47. Thomas misspells *trigueño* and *trigueña* as *tregeño* and *tregeña* in his glossary. The *Diccionario de la Real Academia Española* identifies *trigueño* and *trigueña* as “wheat-colored; between dark-skinned and blonde” (my translation). The Spanish definition reads, “de color del trigo; entre moreno y rubio.”

48. Although I am borrowing Juan Gonzalez’s (2000) apt description and book title in connection to U.S. Latinos and Latinas, I would slightly rearrange it to “harvest of empires,” attempting to underscore that interest in Latin America has historically varied and has not been limited just to the United States. For instance, despite the 1823 Monroe Doctrine, which stipulated U.S. protection over the Western Hemisphere, Britain “largely filled the vacuum left by Spain in Central America” (Stiles, 2009: 183). T. J. Stiles recounts, “Leapfrogging from the colonies of Jamaica and British Honduras (later Belize), English merchants had come to dominate the region’s trade. In 1841, the British had extended their sway by proclaiming a protectorate over the ‘kingdom’ of the Miskito (corrupted to ‘Mosquito’ by the British) Indians on Nicaragua’s sparsely populated Atlantic Coast. The Nicaraguans regarded it as an insult to their sovereignty—an insult the British had compounded in 1848, when they had occupied San Juan del Norte and renamed it Greytown to block any canal or transit route” (2009: 183). Another lingering intercontinental example of European and American entrepreneurial and imperial coupling is the initial excavation of the Panama Canal by the French and its subsequent successful construction by the United States in 1914. It illustrates U.S. and European attention for “the fever of the Great Idea” that became the Central American waterway, thereby stressing “the poetry of capitalism” for France and a “strategic and economic crossroads of the Americas” for U.S. military power (Parker, 2009: 86, 238). Matthew Parker writes that Frenchmen were “prepared to die for the Great Idea of the canal,” especially because the Central American tropics represented a space in which French planners “were going to engage in the great scientific battle” (90–91). For Americans in the United States, Panama served as an important route that facilitated a link between the East and West Coasts during the Gold Rush, becoming “an American protectorate”—an appendage to U.S. Western expansion and nation formation (36). Parker contends that “between 1861 and 1865, the U.S. was, of course, fighting its own civil war, and the Panama route was used several times for moving troops, materials, and bullion from coast to coast” (37).

49. This absence also lends itself to other levels of nonpresence indicating outsiderhood — or even “alienized signification” — within normative mappings of U.S. Latinness and Latinaness. As Héctor Tobar points out in *The Tattooed Soldier*, this state of unmappable (Central American) “otherworldliness,” a Latinity that is not accounted for in Latino/a studies because of its Guatemalan ties, operates as a perpetual U.S. oddity. Central American subjects, under Tobar’s literary representation, look “like walking question marks” (1998: 41). Discrepant and irreconcilable, perhaps, but thrusting one to speculate if these question marks, as paradoxically marked invisible beings, require an answer or clarification, since they are beyond the grasp of the American and Latino and Latina social pattern.

50. Nwankwo directs our attention to the proclivity by U.S. “Americanist scholars to think of work by or about U.S. African Americans as falling neatly into one of the two categories — as part of the ‘new’ hemispherist American studies or as holding firm to academic versions of the national political commitments that undergirded the creation of African-American studies in the first place” (2006: 582).

51. John Hope Franklin also advanced a resonant observation. He had this to say about U.S. African American internationalism and their reactions to Italy’s 1935 invasion of Ethiopia: “Almost overnight even the most provincial among the Negroes became international-minded” (quoted in Taketani, 2010: 146).

CHAPTER ONE. Southern Latinities

1. Different scholars attempting to discuss the phenomenon of the Nuevo or New South have employed similar terminology. The designation “Nuevo New South” is traced to Raymond A. Mohl (2005). “New South” was used after the Reconstruction Era (1865–77). Its coinage is generally attributed to Henry Woodfin Grady (1850–89), editor of the *Atlanta Constitution*, who delivered a classic speech before the New England Society in 1886, titled “The New South.” Grady’s dynamic New South promoted southern industrial growth and northern investment.

2. This tracing of the South’s other routes resounds with V. S. Naipaul’s preoccupation more than two decades ago in *A Turn in the South*. Naipaul conveyed a nexus with contemporary frameworks that impel further inquiry into what is now framed as the Global South. While acknowledging that his familiarity with the United States was limited to New York and New England, his interest derived from a southern link that binds Naipaul to his homeland, Trinidad (1989: 23). “And for the first time,” he writes, “it occurred to me that Trinidad, a former British colony (from 1797), and an agricultural slave colony (until 1833, when slavery was abolished in the British Empire), would have had more in common with the old slave states of the Southeast

than with New England or the newer European-immigrant states of the North.” Yet Naipaul’s connection was postponed for decades. This personal oversight is induced by the psychological impact that the South’s racialized dynamics have had not just in domestic U.S. settings but at an international scale too. This South-South link is so manifest that it “should have occurred to me a long time before, but it hadn’t,” he concedes (24). “What I had heard as a child about the racial demeanor of the South had been too shocking. It had tainted the United States, and had made me close my mind to the South.” But Naipaul’s mind, also tainted by U.S. segregationist practices, does not entirely bar the South as a correlational terrain of inquiry. His southern discussion is preoccupied with historical continuity and discontinuity in a landscape — or a “country place” — “where little changed and little happened” (3).

While the landscape may be static in this view, the people of the South are not. Naipaul’s prologue bears witness to the region’s variegated colorings and developing socioeconomic relations, although the stifling weight of the black-white racial paradigm is skillfully illustrated through the guided tour he received from a North Carolina woman. Calling her remarks “a chant,” he describes the comments she furnished him with through two particular repetitions. One of them is: “Black people there, black people there, white people there. Black people, black people, white people, black people. All this side black people, all this side white people. White people, white people, black people, white people” (1989: 10). The other reiteration, more economical with words, is still an echo of the former: “All this side white people, all that side black people. Black people, black people, white people, black people. Black people, white people” (17). Despite this black-white reiterative synonymy, we meet “Indians from India” who are “buying the motels from the South from white people” (6). An older Nuevo South is surfacing also, and it did not escape Naipaul’s eye. “The Mexicans did the fruit-picking,” he reports, making them an ethnoracial site that provoked a “pro-American attitude [in the South that] extended to foreign affairs” among certain black community members (16–17). Naipaul’s undertaking surfaces from his interest in U.S. black responses to “immigrants of a new sort”: Latin Americans and Asians (29).

3. While interrogating such boundaries, I attempt to cross and recross these scholarly undertakings, as John Muthyala (2001) has prompted.

4. As a cursory outline on the differences between Hispanics and Latinos, William Luis puts forth a useful, though certainly not definitive, distinction between these categories. I draw on Luis’s working definition, because it explains these categories through “writerly” perspectives and traditions: “Hispanics are those who are born or raised and educated in their native country, which they leave for political or economic reasons to reside in the U.S.A. Latinos are those who are born or raised and educated in the U.S.A., and have been subjected to the demands of U.S. society and

culture. Hispanics have closer ties to the language and culture of their country of origin; Latinos recognize their parents' ancestry, but they feel closer to U.S. culture. Hispanic writers tend to write in Spanish; Latino writers tend to write in English, and they contribute to a Latino literature. While I propose a definition for Hispanic and Latino, I also recognize that a Hispanic can identify himself as a Latino and vice versa" (2003: 122).

5. Bernadette Marie Calafell, a Mexican American from Arizona, proposes some interesting insights on what she calls "the new Latina/o South." Calafell begins by telling readers that she followed her Chicana path until she enrolled at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill for a doctorate in communication studies. Her self-identification was "forced, for the first time, really to identify myself as a Latina — a Latina in a space that negated Chicana identities." She elucidates, "Latina was a term I had not previously used to describe myself because of its generality. [. . .] Thus, in coming to North Carolina, a land whose population was unknown to me, I chose Latina because of the possibility of identification across ethnic groups" (2007: 14). It is the U.S. Southeast — the new Latina/o South — that opens up Calafell's Chicana consciousness to the emergent possibilities of Latina being. She proffers some considerations for Chicanos and Chicanas in the twenty-first century: "Questions regarding the possibility of Chicana/o as a political and cultural identification for the future suddenly became more and more apparent to me as I forced myself in a world in which very few people knew what Chicana/o meant or identified in that way. What I found instead was a vibrant and growing community of Mexican, Central American, Latina/o, and Arab immigrants who were remaking the face of North Carolina and with it my assumptions about the face of the South. What would Chicana/o come to mean to those children born Mexican American in the South — the next generation? What would Aztlán, our physical and symbolic nation, mean to those who had never visited it or had no concept of it? Would Chicana/o as a term of identification survive once Mexican Americans had moved beyond the Southwest? Or, because of the multiple connections being made in contact zones such as North Carolina would Chicana/o become something else, allowing a new political identification to emerge?" (16).

These conjectural concerns can surface in the Southwest, given that the demographics Calafell references also exist there, with the exception that this area has been historically defined as Aztlán, a Chicano- and Chicana-specific space. Calafell's questions become more tangible for her in light of the black history of the Southeast. She concedes as much, stating that the Southeast imparted a "sense of homelessness that seemed to guide many of our experiences as the weight of the history of the South bore down on our daily lives" (2007: 48). While Calafell's impressions have great

promise, they neatly — “authentically” — form a Chicano and Chicana Southwest/African American Southeast impenetrable dyad. Under this structuring, a “Latina/o” emergence cannot transpire in the “new Latina/o South” because the “I” at hand is invariably — and must be told as — “Chicana/o.” What analytically attracts me, nevertheless, are mobile subjects and their impulses toward Latined beginnings and articulations in the U.S. Southeast as well as the Southwest.

6. For Houston A. Baker Jr. “‘tight places’ are constituted by the necessity to articulate a position that combines the specters of abjection (slavery), multiple subjects and signifiers ([Jim] Trueblood’s narrative [in Ralph Ellison’s *Invisible Man*] is produced for a rich, northern, white philanthropist), representational obligations of race in America (to speak ‘Negro’), and patent sex and gender implications (the role of the Law as the Phallus)” (2001: 15).

7. Lawrence A. Herzog’s qualifier of a new borderland urbanism is a locus of a new border city as a tangible living space that crosses national political boundaries, confronting “the conditions under which the global economy collides with social space in a bicultural, first-world–third-world, high density, rapidly urbanizing international boundary region” (2003: 120). In mentioning the black-white plantation South, I am aware that this space is by no means static and monolithic, as Lacy K. Ford and George Brown Tindall, among others, have demonstrated. Ford’s examination of the slavery question, which is not one query but a set of interrelated troubling concerns for the upper and lower South during the founding era, “contends that there was not one antebellum South but many, not one southern white mind-set but several” (2009: 4). The following questions reflect Ford’s preoccupations, methodologically explored between 1787 and 1840: “Could slavery coexist with the nation’s republican ideals? Did the economic benefits of slavery outweigh the costs? Did slavery expand or limit economic and social opportunities for whites? Was there any other way to generate as much wealth in the South as slavery created? Would the wealth held in slaves survive an effort to change systems? Would the spread of evangelical Christianity challenge the dominant slaveholding ethos?” (3). Tindall’s *Natives and Newcomers* likens U.S. southerners to migrants: “It had suddenly dawned on me that southerners, white and black, were outsiders in much the same way as were recent immigrants. Southerners differed from immigrants, however, in being home-grown outsiders in the nation” (1995: 23).

8. There are, to be sure, black Latinos and Latinas who migrate to and settle in the U.S. Southeast. As my primary focus is the semiotics of blackness through brownness and dark brownness — and how blackened bodies are constructed and positioned — I defer to future studies on this topic of the politics of space and place for “Afro-Latin@s” in the “New South.”

9. This black prominence certainly stands out. Intellectual history discussions verify the importance of a dynamic Durham for U.S. African Americans. Du Bois lauded this urban center in 1912 as an important community that “characterizes the progress of the Negro American” (quoted in Brown, 2008: 12). E. Franklin Frazier denominated it in 1925 as the “Capital of the Black Middle Class” (14). But during the city’s “upbuilding,” as historian Leslie Brown has shown, “almost everyone who lived in Durham came from someplace else” (16). Brown applies the Du Boisian term of upbuilding in her study to depict the socioeconomic development “of black communities after slavery, upbuilding was the literal and figurative construction of structures African Americans used to climb out of slavery” (10).

10. Texas, as Neil Foley argues, oversteps the U.S. boundaries that mark the South and West. It “fits comfortably within the cultural and historiographical boundaries of the South, with its history of slavery, cotton, and postemancipation society.” But Texas also has “cultural elements of the South, the West, and Mexico [that] form a unique borderlands culture” (1997: 2). Mexicans forged new identities in the region by “rupturing the black-white polarity of southern race relations.” The cotton culture of central Texas, brought together “by blacks and whites in the South, and Mexicans and Anglos in the Southwest,” created a “hybrid southwestern culture” (4–5). That being so, this geography is not “racially static or bipartite but a site of multiple and heterogeneous borders where different languages, experiences, histories, and voices intermingled amid diverse relations of power and privilege. Partly for these reasons, the categories of Anglo, black, and Mexican are wholly inadequate — and even misleading — in describing the highly miscegenated culture of central Texas” (7).

11. The city’s shifting entrepreneurial governance in the late 1990s, Thaddeus Countway Guldbrandsen specifies, has been reorganized around a way where “Durham’s trajectory resembles most closely that of those cities in the American South whose economic competitive advantage was built partly on the lasting legacy of some aspects of their Southernness, including low property values and low labor costs, as well as on massive public investment in universities, roads, telecommunications, and other infrastructure” (2005: 83). The region’s transfigurations can also be accounted for in terms of the burgeoning Spanish-language press, as newspapers like *La Voz de Carolina* (formerly *La Voz del Pueblo*, 1993, Chapel Hill), *La Conexión* (1995, Raleigh), and *La Noticia* (1997, Charlotte) attest. For an analysis of interethnic relations among African Americans, Latinos, Latinas, and Afro-Latinos, as represented in the Spanish-language media, see Jackson et al. (2008).

12. The *Herald-Sun*, a local newspaper, recently summarized that “the black community decreased” from 2000 to 2006 and estimated a 68 percent growth in Durham among Latinos and Latinas. The Hispanic “population swell,” as this venue dubbed

it, is “changing the face” of the medium-sized city and the “contiguous counties” of Durham, Chatham, Orange, Granville, and Person. The boom is attributed to Latino and Latina wage work in agricultural plants and construction jobs, giving way to the *Herald-Sun*’s description of a “flooding of the region” that is “readily apparent by the number of Hispanic *tiendas*, restaurants, laborers, and families” (West and Hoyle, 2007: B1). Adding to this journalistic representation from the celebratory culinary perspective, the now-defunct *Gourmet*, “The Magazine of Good Living,” devoted its September 2007 issue to “Carolina Cocina.” *Gourmet* illustrated how Durham — and by extension, much of the U.S. South — is becoming “Latin” in its culinary preference. But the food discussion soon turned sociological, noting that approximately “570,000 [Hispanic] people are scattered around the state, many of them living in the so-called Triangle defined by the cities of Raleigh, Durham, and Chapel Hill” (C. Andrews, 2007: 34). There was also a tone of caution as much as a sense of gastronomic discovery in the feature article. Revealing the shared, sustaining sameness between nation and narrator, *Gourmet* observed that in these eateries “you might not hear a word of English spoken for hours at a time” (36).

This uncovering of Durham’s surprisingly profitable enterprises — brown and dark brown follies, one might say, in twenty-first-century capitalism — calls for an abridged deliberation of what makes the spice world of a Latino menu so novel in the South? Far from trivial, this concentration on Latino cooking and food choices alludes to how “the South gets defined, by whom, at what time, and why it matters.” In a southern meal, Elizabeth S. D. Engelhardt communicates, “you see visible expressions of our background regional identity” (2011: 4). Engelhardt puts forward that “scholars, media, advertisers, and artists not only excavate food practices, we actively shape them as well. Our definitions of ‘true’ southern foods change and evolve constantly, as some foods are lifted and celebrated while other equally common ones stay in the background waiting for their day” (6–7).

Gourmet’s exposure of Latino fare accentuates its estranged, non-black-white southernness at the regional level, while nationwide colloquial truisms take note of how many people in the United States prefer salsa to ketchup. Such propensity for salsa indicates that there is familiarity with Latin ingredients around the American table. Dating further back than the consumption of salsa as an edible phenomenon — and aptly complementary to our lens of the Global South — however, is another demonstrable preference for Latinness and tropicality through the more substantial plant, herb, and grass known as the banana. The fruit, as is widely known, is harvested in Central America, Caribbean posts including Jamaica and Cuba, as well as Colombia and Ecuador. This crop has become the most popular item on supermarket shelves, and “the only other products beating the banana on to our shopping lists” are

gasoline and lottery tickets (Chapman, 2007: 17). And yet as a recent pop culture study about the “remarkable culinary evolution” that has “exploded” in the United States points out, “it is a great time to be an eater” in this nation. The researcher adds that “food is an area of American life where things just continue to improve,” insofar as “Americans are increasingly sophisticated about what they eat and expansive in their tastes” (Kamp, 2006: xi–xiv). Even though *Gourmet* informed, at the time, middle- or upper-class American subjects about Latino cookery — this type of panethnic food, unlike the more upscale haute cuisine genre of “Nuevo Latino” — is more affordable and crosses into a pan-Latino domain despite its Mexican *taquería* specificity.

13. Latino and Latina national incipency seems to germinate and become more visible through southern passages and myriad exchanges from the Southwest to the Southeast. According to the *Los Angeles Times* journalist and novelist Héctor Tobar, California is now “sending off its more ambitious and restless” Latino and Latina “sons and daughters to settle in newer places.” Tobar records how local gossip about North Carolina stresses that there is “so much work carving up chickens you could save up enough to buy up your own little *rancho*” (2005: 28). Sonia Nazario, also a *Los Angeles Times* reporter, expands on these Southwestern-Southeastern migrations and networks facilitating such geographic exchanges. Her coverage of Lourdes, a Honduran migrant, notes that she moved from the Golden State to the Tar Heel State because “California is too hard.” Lourdes’s trajectory is retold in this fashion: “She has followed a female friend to North Carolina and started over again. She sold everything in California — her old Ford, a chest of drawers, a television, the bed she shares with her daughter. It netted \$800 for the move” (2007: 27). Although Lourdes and her daughter end up moving farther South to Florida, Nazario writes that Lourdes came to love North Carolina. Her daughter, who was born in California, learned to quickly speak English there, “something she hadn’t done surrounded by Spanish speakers in California” (186).

Perhaps what is so striking is that North Carolina is providing a more feasible (if not expedient) version of the “American Dream” — or quicker cultural assimilatory evidence — than California. Even so, these questions remain: Why is it so astonishing that Latinos and Latinas are moving out of the Southwest? Is it because they are exceeding the bounds of where they “belong”? How is their incessant movement, as history has shown, continually shifting the geography of “ethnoracial reason” in the U.S. map? I am, of course, echoing the objectives of the Caribbean Philosophical Association (CPA) when I raise this concern. Since its first international conference in 2004, the CPA has organized around the theme of “Shifting the Geography of Reason” in such countries as Barbados (2004), Puerto Rico (2005), Canada (2006), Jamaica (2007), Guadeloupe (2008), Colombia (2010), and Trinidad (2012). The intent

behind this analytic geography of reason is to focus “on the broad impact of the rise of Africana and other ‘third world’ philosophies from geographical notions, metaphors, and assumptions that have long been associated with modern concepts of philosophical reason.” The CPA thus “look[s] closely at the variety of intellectual movements that have shaped the development of ideas, especially in the Caribbean, that have contributed to, and continue to have an impact (positive or negative) on, the geography of reason” (Caribbean Philosophical Association, n.d.).

14. Du Bois cautioned on the economic challenges in the South more than a century ago, when he spoke not only of the struggles of the black body but also of the integration of “that” black being into U.S. socioeconomic and nationalist projects. “To be a poor man is hard,” Du Bois observed, “but to be a poor race in the land of dollars is the very bottom of hardships” (2003: 12). C. Vann Woodward wrote about the “great changes that are altering the cultural landscape of the South almost beyond recognition.” Among those changes, particularly those of the 1940s, is urbanization. To this end, Woodward drew on the symbol of the bulldozer as “the advance agent of the metropolis” to point to the growth of what he terms the “Bulldozer Revolution” (1960: 5–6). The Bulldozer Revolution plowed “under cherished old values of individualism, localism, family, clan, and rural folk culture” in the South, bringing about “industrialism, urbanism, unionism, and big government [that] confirmed or promised too many coveted benefits” (10). By the 1950s a “considerable portion of these Southerners moved from country to suburb,” forming a “rurbanization” that “skipped the phase of urbanization entirely” (6–7). The 1950s also signified that “the voice of the South [during this period] had become the voice of the chamber of commerce, and Southerners appeared to be about as much absorbed in the acquirement of creature comforts and adult playthings as any other Americans” (9).

Regarding the Nuevo (“alien”) South, Stack’s research interposes these public perceptions and interjections, noting that “even after a generation or more of prattle about a new new new South, there still were no jobs to speak of” for the young African Americans of North and South Carolina (1996: 5). And yet does U.S. African American relocation signify erasure from an entire regional and national landscape? Stack’s work on U.S. African American migrations to the rural, eastern parts of North and South Carolina presses for the exploration and reflection of the structures that bind individuals to a sense of place and social identities. She notes that figures released by the U.S. Census Bureau as far back as 1975 document the first numbers of a black American exodus from the industrious North to the rural South. Since then, a “small counterstream of perhaps 15,000 people a year [moved] against the overwhelming northward tide that had been flowing throughout the twentieth century” (xiii). So much so that by 1990, “the South had gained more than half a million black Americans

who were leaving the North — or more precisely the South had *regained* from the cities of the North the half-million black citizens it had lost to northward migration during the 1960s” (xiv). Stack’s multilayered ethnographies concerning what she calls an evolving Great Return Migration to southern “homeplaces” stress a reversal of push-and-pull factors anticipating other social dynamics, as internal transformations are bound to take place, and not entirely because of Latinos and Latinas (7). Those returning to the South, Stack insists, “are changed in all the usual mortal ways [. . .] and they are also changed in particular and profound and historical ways, their consciousness shaped by their experience of America at a certain time, in certain American places” (xv). Returning migrants are, in this regard, “more like strangers than homefolk; [. . .] they are very much like migrants moving someplace new,” as they seek to develop “a place in which their lives and strivings will make a difference — a place in which to *create a home*” (199).

15. Fink’s central focus is Morganton’s labor force transformation through Guatemalan and Mexican migrant poultry workers. He inserts scary quotes around the “Hispanic” category under which these groups fall in Morganton, an industrial center whose previous settlers were whites, blacks, and Hmong refugees. Further inquiry into these communities and their demographic shifts demonstrates that the Guatemalans are, in fact, “nearly all” Highland Maya (2003: 2). They are a Q’anjob’al-speaking population “from the mountain villages of the northwestern province of Huehuetenango” that also includes “Awakatekos and Chalchitekos from the commercial agricultural valley of Aguacatán” (4). Fink examines the “cultural adjustment among the new migrant workers,” asking, “with what capacity and vision but also at what cost did the Guatemalan Maya transplant themselves to a new North American setting” (2–3)? For the purposes of this study, I am also interested in how these indigenous groups are mutually “Hispanized” or “Latinized” in the United States, particularly through public discourses on “new” migrations and processes of “alienization.” As Fink states, “the arriving Guatemala Maya presented a puzzle and a challenge to the established citizenry of Morganton even as this North Carolina town equally presented its own mysteries to the new arrivals. [. . .] [T]he problem was, and remains, more severe — a horde of aliens would ravage the landscape, threatening the very foundation of the community, and deprive others of their chance for the good life” (32). Mayas also pose a form of “Latin” abstraction in the U.S. imaginary. “In this small southern town,” Fink writes, “the questions of who is an American, who will do the work, and under what conditions echoed with renewed insistence” (33).

16. I recognize of course the presence of Native Americans in the U.S. South. Although southeastern and southwestern Native populations are not analyzed in a similarly in-depth manner as Africana and Latino and Latina populations in this

book, I am aware that they have navigated geographic and national tensions concerning the U.S. South and Jim Crow laws, notions of U.S. and hemispheric Americanness, and their construction as a “race.” Malinda Maynor Lowery’s study, *Lumbee Indians in the Jim Crow South: Race, Identity, and the Making of a Nation*, frames the subject formation of North Carolina’s Lumbee Indians — also known as Tuscarora, Croatan, Cherokee, and Siouan — through a trifold subject formation that brings in Lumbee identity as well as their southernness and Americanness. Lowery explains that the Lumbee Tribe of Robeson County, North Carolina, has “crafted an identity as a People, a race, a tribe and a nation. They have done so not only as Indians but also as Southerners and Americans. And they have done so against the backdrop of some of the central issues in American history: race, class, politics, and citizenship.” Lumbees formed “their own sense of nationhood, [. . .] adopting (and adapting to) racial segregation and creating political and social institutions that protected their distinct identity” (2010: xii).

17. Cuadros characterizes this Latino and Latina silent migration in the rural South to poultry-processing work available in Siler City, North Carolina. This industry is unlike other agricultural enterprises: the meatpacking and poultry-processing plants have a “year-round, six days a week, three shifts” schedule (2006: 12). Cuadros chronicles the ethnoracial and linguistic tensions between white and African American Siler City residents and Latinos and Latinas. He accounts for the latter group’s facing of prejudice and fear in that town’s public schools. Siler City citizens “needed the Latino workers to man the chicken plants and keep their economy going, but they didn’t necessarily want the people or their children to live with them or share their resources” (41). Cuadros perceives that Siler City’s townspeople cope with the Latino and Latina presence through “stages similar to the five stages of grief.” The steps for such a process brings about “denial, where communities ignore the presence of Latino workers in their town. The next stage is anger. The third stage is bargaining, and sometimes people would say that as soon as the economy took a downturn the Latinos would leave. The fourth is depression. [. . .] The last stage, of course, is acceptance, and in 1999, Siler City was nowhere near accepting the Latino population. Siler City was angry” (42). Most striking is Cuadros’s recount of a 2000 KKK rally in Siler City featuring David Duke, “the former grand dragon of the KKK in Louisiana and U.S. Senate candidate” (47). The mass gathering objected to the “unburdenable strain on the indigenous residents here, our traditions, our institutions, and our infrastructure.” Whiteness is indigenized in this instance, preceding any “other” group. Siler City’s African Americans, however, denounced the protest: “They reasoned that if it were still possible for Klan supporters to hold an open rally after all the previous suffering, there was no guarantee they were any safer than before” (46–47).

18. For Edwards, *décalage* — “one of the many French words that resists translation into English” but that can nonetheless be thought of as “‘gap,’ ‘discrepancy,’ ‘time-lag,’ or ‘interval’” — furnishes a model for Africana groups through “the very weave of culture” that paradoxically brings up “a haunting gap or discrepancy that allows the African diaspora to ‘step’ and ‘move’ in various articulations” (2003: 13–15).

19. Conventionally, passing has typified, as historian Martha A. Sandweiss denotes it, a practice that “generally involves adopting a particular identity to move toward greater legal and social privilege. It might mean taking on a different gender, or ethnic or national identity, but it most often involves the assumption of a different racial identity. And since, in the United States, social privilege has been associated with lighter-colored skin, passing usually entails concealing one’s African American heritage to assume a white identity. The entire practice hinges on a peculiar idea” (2009: 7). Mary Bucholtz also elaborates on the academic fields that dissect this “peculiar idea,” making it known that “whereas gender theorists celebrate passing as an achievement, a transcendence of sexual difference, in ethnic studies the phenomenon is generally considered an evasion of racism, an escape that is available only to individuals who can successfully represent themselves as white” (1995: 352). But whiteness is not a linear end for all subjects. There is an overlapping instability within blackness, brownness, dark brownness, and whiteness. These colorings pass and tinge one another in the creation of new biographical moments that attempt to forge a language of selfhood, nation, and ethnicity. Bucholtz is mindful of these possibilities, writing, “passing is not a one-time event but a never-completed process of achieving a position in a recognized category” (354).

20. Charles W. Chesnutt seemed to have this point in mind with his depiction of U.S. African Americans and the alternative routes some took to access the benefits conferred on whiteness within the color line. One of his protagonists in *The House behind the Cedars* (1900) implores that he and his sister must be taken for themselves alone, maintaining “we are a new people” (1993: 57). This newness concentrates on access and self-invention rather than on the exceptionalist idea of being a “rare” — or even a “unique” — American of mixed race.

21. Sonia Saldívar-Hull also applies notions of a “larger political family” (2007: 3) — as evinced in Anzaldúa’s *Borderlands/La Frontera* — and a “Familia de Mujeres” in *Feminism on the Border* (2000: 56–57).

22. These equivalencies between what Cohn identifies as the South and Spanish America engender “a fundamental paradigm structuring social organization and relations, as well as leaving a legacy of strict social hierarchization and a deeply rooted aversion to miscegenation” (1999: 6).

23. Though I express and attempt to open a new interpretive window into new

subjectivities, migrants, and migrations, I wish to stress Alfred J. López's productive prompt: "Of course the places and peoples that make up today's Global South are not exactly new; it is rather their commingling and alignment under the banner of globalization and its aftermath, among other things, that distinguishes today's Global South from yesterday's Third World and other such terms" (2007b: v).

24. On this point about African–New World studies, consult Davies et al. (2003).

25. Adams and Phillips Casteel admit that they "are not the first to argue for a connection between Canada and the Americas" (2005: 7). This admission does not diminish their contribution to Canadian, American, and Latin American studies. They offer an intersecting schema between Canadian and broader continental frameworks. Their corollaries for "critical conversations about a hemispheric American Studies" include the following four points: "(1) Canada's place in the history of slavery and the black diaspora; (2) Canada's official policies of bilingualism and multiculturalism and its struggles with linguistic and cultural diversity; (3) The U.S.–Canadian border provides an opportunity to expand the borderlands paradigm from encounters between Mexican and Anglo cultures to a comparative view of contact zones across the Americas; and (4) Canadian discourses of racial hybridity may be seen as counterparts to the more well-known theories of Latin American proponents of *mestizaje* such as Simón Bolívar, José Martí, José Vasconcelos, and Roberto Fernández Retamar" (8–11).

26. Juan Flores defines cultural remittances as "the ensemble of ideas, values, and expressive forms introduced into societies of origin by remigrants [returning migrant nationals] and their families as they return 'home,' sometimes for the first time, for temporary visits or permanent re-settlement, and is transmitted through the increasingly pervasive means of telecommunications" (2009: 4). Cultural remittances are nonmonetary and "may bear even greater consequences than the 'cash transfers.'" We need to "understand the potential deeper significance of all 'transfers' emanating from diasporas," he adds, as "our notion of culture needs to embrace collective, ideological, as well as artistic meanings of the term" (9).

27. One could also take into account Harlem, the urban center of Alain Locke's "New Negro." This neighborhood is represented as a space whose diasporic blackness is not only wedded to the U.S. South. As a "race capital," Harlem "has attracted the African, the West Indian, and the Negro American" (1997: 963). But the characteristics of what can be read as a Global South apply to the "New Negro," as evidenced in the production of linguistically mixed Harlem publications. Locke notes that "Negro" newspapers "carry news material in English, French, and Spanish, gathered from all quarters of America, the West Indies, and Africa has maintained itself in Harlem for over five years" (968).

28. As Sandweiss references in *Passing Strange*, the biography of Clarence King, “an explorer of the American West, a geologist, an accomplished writer and storyteller” (2009: 3), the Southwest — namely, the territory between the Rocky Mountains and the Sierra Nevada — began to be formally surveyed and mapped in 1867 by civilian scientists under the influence of the Northeast’s intellectual and political establishments. These men were employed by King, who was appointed and funded by the federal government as U.S. geologist in charge of the U.S. Geological Exploration of the Fortieth Parallel, a Southwest military operation that included graduates from Yale and Harvard Universities (48). Sandweiss writes that King’s expedition “represented American ambitions for the West writ at large. And King’s efficient field organization, emphasis on the practical uses of basic science, and new, more rigorous methods of topographic mapping provided a model and standard for the rest. The data he and his fellow survey leaders gathered aided economic development in the post-Civil War West, and the scientific reports, maps, popular literature, and stunning photographic views that flowed forth year after year built broad public support for western exploration as a valuable national enterprise” (50). Despite U.S. expansion, King was skeptic about whether “a vibrant American culture could thrive in the West.” Unlike Americans in the East, King found that “California people are not living in a tranquil, healthy, social *régime*” (60).

Ana Castillo’s query consequently bears pertinence, considering that the U.S. Southwest and West — as they come to be historically recorded — exist from the governmental and institutional circuits of the North. Equally salient is Castillo’s point of geographic interest, as it moves out of a U.S. North/U.S. South historical deadlock in terms of nation formation. Herewith, one cannot fail to mention, as well, Saldívar-Hull’s fierce remembrance of southern marginality on the U.S.-Mexico borderlands: “Living in Brownsville, Texas, meant living at the southernmost tip of the United States. When I was a child, the knowledge that we were at the bottom of the U.S. map made sense to me” (2000: 12).

29. Hill Collins proceeds to reference the exclusion of educator and activist Septima Clark, who remarked, “I found all over the South that whatever the man said had to be right. They had the whole say. A woman couldn’t say a thing” (1990: 8).

30. Palumbo-Liu argues that the “Asia Pacific paradigm is a crucial task for Asian American studies, one that might be facilitated by alternative modernities in South Asia, especially as the momentum toward the Pacific has been modified by the recent instabilities of Asian economies and new waves of South Asian populations have refigured America in critical ways.” The modernizing of America excluded certain groups but accommodated others. It framed “the appearance and function of Asian America [. . .] [as] deeply rooted in the histories of both willed and forced migrations, of both

national and global economic change, of wars of colonization, decolonization, and global strife" (1999: 6). U.S. practices of exclusion and accommodation led to a "crisis management," where "American development as a global power sets in motion a complex history of strategizing the precise nature of that [Asian and Asian American] incorporation, and of reading the effects of increased contact upon the national body" (8). Palumbo-Liu asks, "how to understand Asians if not to plumb the psychic content of the body, to see the possible affinities and points of alienation" (7)?

31. It has been assessed that the South's Jim Crow segregation has now become "Juan Crow" due to strict anti-immigration laws and attitudes. The name has been linked to Alabama's anti-immigration measure, HB 56, which directs law enforcement officers to "act as de facto immigration agents during routine traffic stops and requiring school systems to document the citizenship status of new students." Juan Crow is "a play on Jim Crow, the moniker for segregation in the pre-civil rights South—because of the likelihood that Hispanics will be subjected to racial profiling and dubious detentions" (Person, 2011). Roberto Lovato has likened Juan Crow to anti-immigration politics in Georgia. Juan Crow, as a regime, is "the matrix of laws, social customs, economic institutions and symbolic systems enabling the physical and psychic isolation needed to control and exploit undocumented immigrants" (2008).

32. Du Bois described Atlanta's geography as "South of the North, yet North of the South" (1996b: 63). Rubén Martínez synthesized the power dynamics informing the hierarchical normativity of the North/South he encountered—in Los Angeles, Mexico City, and San Salvador—in this manner: "[W]herever I am now, I must be more than two. I must be North and South in the North and in the South" (1993: 5). Martínez's social locations, positionings, and meanings call for linkages that disharmonize the fixity of each location, or in Jon Smith's estimation, "postplantation economies in the New World, and, with appropriate qualification, throughout much of the Third World or Global South" (2004: 144).

33. Robert McKee Irwin, Claudia Sadowski-Smith, and Sophia A. McClennen articulate three notable breaks in the study of the U.S.-Mexico border (Irwin), the Canada-U.S. frontier (Sadowski-Smith), and inter-American studies (McClennen). Irwin upholds that U.S.-Mexico border studies needs to integrate Mexican perspectives into U.S.-based discussions of this southern boundary to challenge "implicit hierarchies that go beyond economics, technology, and military might" and enter "the realms of academics and publishing, the production of knowledges." More scholarly reciprocity is found from South to North, a case advanced by Irwin: "It is certainly more common, for example, for Mexican scholars of Mexican culture to be informed and conscious of what has been published on Mexican culture in English by scholars at U.S. universities than for U.S.-based scholars of American culture to know or care about what Mexicans

working at Mexican universities and publishing in Spanish may contribute to the field” (2001: 510). He adds, “While it is true that Mexican Americans are marginalized in racist U.S. society, in the borderlands themselves, hierarchies are more complex. Chicano culture is not synonymous with U.S.-Mexico border culture. Chicano culture very specifically reflects the lives of Mexican immigrants (first generation or otherwise) in the geopolitical terrain of the United States. The borderlands of Sonora or Nuevo León are not equivalent to those of New Mexico or Southern California” (517). Irwin sparks meaningful and convincing observations. While I understand that he explicitly focuses here on U.S.-Mexico border studies, U.S. border studies and its emergent knowledges should not be limited to the U.S.-Mexico or Mexico-U.S. dyad. Mexico also shares a 750-mile southern border with Belize and Guatemala, and an understanding of U.S.-Canadian border politics necessitates epistemic terms as well.

Sadowski-Smith, for instance, has drawn on Canadian border narratives to consider how this cultural production symbolizes “Canadian internal diversity and its difference from ethnic frameworks in the USA.” She marks Canada’s “declining economic, political, and cultural autonomy, while also signifying the country’s growing relationship to other parts of the hemisphere.” In general, Canada’s five-thousand-mile border with the United States has indexed a division demonstrating that country’s “political and cultural autonomy from the USA, as a marginal space that signifies Canada’s marginal position in the world, and as a sanctuary for U.S. Americans, including indigenous peoples and slaves during the nineteenth century and Vietnam War resisters, draft evaders and other political dissenters during the twentieth century” (2005: 65–66).

McClennen calls for the displacement of U.S. culture in inter-American studies to move to other comparative models, as U.S. reference points have served as the predominant “central signifier” to investigate the region. She writes, “If Inter-American Studies are to effectively dislocate the United States from the center of the hemisphere’s academic purview, then comparisons of works from within Latin America should also form part of the work of Inter-American Studies.” McClennen’s illustration of corresponding research includes “a comparison of the feminist theories of Clarice Lispector, Luisa Valenzuela, Diamela Eltit, and Cristina Peri Rossi, or the political aesthetic of the Bolivian Grupo Ukumau and the Peruvian Grupo Chaski” (2005: 393–94). These examples and possible approaches are indisputably important. Yet we should also recall that this proposal suggests a distinctive Inter-South American dialogue that for the most part overlooks Mexico, Central America, and the Caribbean.

34. Jovita González and Eve Raleigh’s *Caballero: A Historical Novel* takes us to the slavery that existed in the U.S. South’s plantation system. They link it to the lowest

class of workers in Texas as well as in the unfolding U.S. Southwest in 1846. González and Raleigh's fragment on life in the Virginia plantation and its parallel with occupied Texas reads: "Black slaves! [. . .] 'A man should be a slave only if he wishes it. Slavery as such does not exist here [in Texas], but we have peonage which is almost as bad. If your [American] nation is so progressive, why does it not free its slaves? Only freedom of the individual is progress'" (2008: 45).

35. The Great Migration, for example, elicited dreams about America and freedom through the North/South divide and African American odysseys to the North. Hazel Rowley sums it up in *Richard Wright: The Life and Times*: "In the North, wages for blacks could be as much as four times higher than wages in the South. [. . .] You would not be lynched for running a successful business. You could vote. You could live in a brick house and send your children to school for the whole of the school year and you could sit anywhere you liked on public transport and not be bothered. You did not have to step off the sidewalk if a white came along, or raise your hat, or say 'yes-sir,' or wait until all whites were served first before you could buy your newspaper" (2001: 52). Rowley's portrayal of the Ohio River during these migrations evokes a North/South borderland. It functioned as "the border between slavery and freedom. Southern blacks still see it as a gateway to freedom" (50).

36. But we also find a disjunction: while some scholars insist on the academic "openness" of Latino/a studies, such multiple entrances are not extended to the Latino or Latina subject, who is always presumably bound by a discernible way of being "Latino." Angie Chabram-Dernerseian's words hold relevance in terms of the other fields with which Latino/a studies dialogues. At the same time, I am pushing for the study of Latino and Latina theories and bodies through comparative approaches that also focus on the commonplaces and acts through which Latinities speak. Chabram-Dernerseian comments, "With regard to the ways Latina/o studies get articulated in the academy, I would agree with those who propose that what is required is 'numerous entrances, exits,' and 'escape routes' as well as 'collaboration versus subsumption.' Already the trend of Latina/o studies is toward the dispersal of the lines of affiliation, not the promised self-contained overarching umbrella. (The study of Latinas/os can be found in a number of diverse departments including women's studies, law schools, feminist studies, ethnic studies, Native American studies, Black studies, cultural studies, gay and lesbian studies, border studies, and community studies)" (2003: 116).

37. To the notion of "Transamerica," a "Transafrica" can also be appended, as the TransAfrica Forum attests. The TransAfrica Forum is "the oldest and largest African American human rights and social justice advocacy organization promoting diversity and equity in the foreign policy arena and justice for the African World" (2011). Consult also Early (2003).

38. These epistemic terms also have resonances with Mignolo's theory of "border gnosis," where he aspires to "open up the notion of 'knowledge' beyond cultures of scholarships" (2000: 9).

39. For recent contributions to the widening field of inter-American studies, consult Fox (2005).

40. Though not grounding her theoretical contributions through the optic of the Global South, Jody Berland also articulates a double consciousness when it comes to her interrogation of Canadian studies in relation — and contrast — to U.S.-centered Americanisms that slight Canadian discourses. Berland contends in *North of Empire* that Canadians experience "a form of a double consciousness similar to yet profoundly different from the 'doubling' of black consciousness described by race theorists such as W. E. B. Du Bois, Frantz Fanon, and Paul Gilroy. In this writing, the black person sees himself from the vantage point of both the other and himself, and experiences an irresolvable schism between the two perceptions. Rather than remaining invisible behind the veil of the raced body, the Canadian hides behind verisimilitude, 'passing' as the other while recognizing the other not as oneself. This vantage point is double-reflected through a one-way mirror in which 'America' does not see Canada at all. The nonknowing of the other is part of what the Canadian knows, and it shapes her scholarship and art" (2009: 3). Canada's northern subalternity conflicts with the hegemonic neighbor that geographically stands south of its borders.

Taking us to the geopolitics of Panama and the West Indies, Sonja Stephenson Watson implements and problematizes a Du Boisian double consciousness in conjunction with the "'duality' of being both Panamanian and Caribbean" (2009: 231). As she gauges it, specific contemporary Panamanian writers — Carlos Wilson, Gerardo Maloney, and Carlos Russell — negotiate their "Anglophone Caribbean heritage with their Hispanic heritage that is often viewed in conflict with the [nonblack] nation-state" (232). Anglophone West Indians, who are also "bilingual speakers of Spanish and English and navigate culturally and linguistically between Panama, Africa, the Caribbean, and the United States" (231), do not correspond "with the national imaginary, which promoted homogeneity over racial differences" (235). Their oeuvre disputes "national anti-West Indian sentiment and make[s] an effort to integrate the Anglophone Caribbean into the national discourse of *panameñidad*," thus contributing to "debates on race, language, and identity in their 20th-century and 21st-century texts" (237–38).

41. Connell calls attention to the fact that Du Bois "connected race issues in the metropole with movements in the colonial world and, increasingly, with the structure of global capitalism" (2007: 20). Du Bois's double consciousness was undeniably fashioned from an Africana framework that incorporated his genealogical story of

New England, the U.S. South, and the Afro-Caribbean. David Levering Lewis has recounted that class and social interactions were at work also. He writes that Du Bois's "sense of identity or belonging was spun out between the poles of two distinct racial groups — black and white — and two dissimilar social classes — lower and upper — to form that double consciousness of being he would famously describe at age thirty-five" (1993: 12).

42. And yet as Caroline F. Levander has pointed out, Du Bois's Pan-Africanism is hardly linked to other spheres in the Americas like Cuba. "Less familiar" is Du Bois's "interest in Cuba's struggle for independence from Spain. [. . .] Most scholars have tended to overlook the significance of Cuba for Du Bois's thinking, focusing instead on his attention to Haiti and its influence on his commitment to Pan-African nationalism. Yet Du Bois remained interested in Cuba throughout his career, making many trips to Cuba, [and] engaging in extensive correspondence with Cuban political leaders such as Fernando Ortiz" (2006: 158–59). Du Bois's Pan-Africanism can be examined and supplemented through more heterogeneous geographies and knowledges.

43. Carby has noted, Du Bois's "theory of double-consciousness has been so widely adopted to explain the nature of the African American soul." *The Souls of Black Folk*, she adds, "is so frequently taken to be representative of black intellectual, psychological, and existential reality" (1998: 2).

44. Connell further clarifies on this general theory and its possible effects: "Overwhelmingly, general theory is produced in the metropole. Does this matter? The sociology of knowledge would suggest that it does. On the other hand, the very generality of general theory, the aspiration to general relevance, implies that this genre could escape from local determinations" (2007: 28). When I mention general theory and the Global South, I am also inferring its possibility as a shifting intellectual undertaking that labors through ideas and frameworks from "the periphery that have to be considered as part of the dialogue of theory" (46).

45. Provocatively, African American writer Gayl Jones provides a margin-to-margin discussion of the asymmetrical location of Africana and Chicano books. In her novel *Mosquito*, Jones records a Chicana character, Delgadina, as saying, "I figure when they figure out how to commercialize Chicano literature and put us into the category of Entertainment, we'll get some popularity. Well, there are some publishers who are publishing some Chicano-oriented books and books in Spanish, but that's mostly because of the numbers of Chicano readers. We aren't as popular as African-American writers with white readers, though. And mostly we're published by little publishers, like E. D. Santos" (1999: 95).

46. As of this writing, three autobiographical narratives by and about notable men who were born in the United States during the 1910s have been restored and pub-

lished in the first decade of the twenty-first century. These works include Grillo's *Black Cuban, Black American*; John Hope Franklin's *Mirror to America: The Autobiography of John Hope Franklin* (2005); and Ben Vinson III's account, *Flight: The True Story of Virgil Richardson, a Tuskegee Airman in Mexico* (2004). Both Franklin and Grillo wrote their respective stories later on in life as accomplished individuals, whereas Richardson's autobiography, while told in the first person, is registered through Vinson's meticulous historian filter and the questions he solicited from his subject. Richardson's oral reflections were narrated to Vinson. It is striking that Richardson's text is not conceived in ways that parallel testimonial literature and the latter's incorporation of socioeconomic, ethnic, and political marginalities and struggles. I do not seek transparent literary categories for Vinson's characterization of Richardson's life. But as these life narratives are being literarily and historically recuperated, it is important to reflect on these works' solidity. It is not only the autobiographical subject who "is radically in question," as Robert Folkenflik has written, but also the "different vantage points" that publicly shape these modes of self-conception (1993: 12).

In the context of Grillo's memoir, it is worth coupling his life story with a contemporary, such as African American historian John Hope Franklin (1915–2009). Read together, Grillo and Franklin highlight the public representation of a biographical continuity—even literary beginnings—touching not only on the self's reconstruction but also on the importance of restoring particular Jim Crow histories. These projects are attentive to a "collective" (racial) narrative—vis-à-vis individual success—of American achievement. Franklin's autobiography, *Mirror to America*, admits that "Unfortunately, I kept no records of my life until I was a tenured professor and chair of the department at Brooklyn College" (2005: ix). We find a conscientious chronicler who regulates the course of his autobiography through what can be verifiably recorded and granted archival permanence. Grillo's and Franklin's life stories are written after they gained social and political realization, a notable feat since they overcame what Nell Irvin Painter calls the invisible/hypervisible color line at a time prior to the institutionalization of affirmative action (2008: 36).

Ben Vinson's *Flight* has resonances with Grillo insofar as we find correlative Latinities. *Flight* is a historical portrayal of Virgil Richardson (1916–2004), an Arkansas-born African American who was "part of a sub-current of the black diaspora, a member of a small clique of black military servicemen who retired in Mexico" (2004: 2). Arriving in 1950, Richardson lived in Mexico for forty-seven years, returning to Texas in 1997. Virgil's story is notable because he was a former Tuskegee airman, a cluster of elite fliers who inhabit "a special place in the mythology of America." As Richardson recalled his accomplishment, "Learning to fly at Tuskegee was a marvelous and unique opportunity. Most whites in America didn't believe that blacks

had the reflexes or intelligence to fly planes” (39). Tuskegee airmen “were among the ‘talented tenth’ of their generation, whose pedigree among blacks was unquestioned, and whose patriotic service to their country would eventually earn wide respect and praise” (3). Richardson’s Mexican migration was part of larger pursuits, as Vinson records it, by African American GIs who “began branching out internationally after World War II, with many taking advantage of the GI bill to improve their education.” Mexico provided a “cheap alternative to crowded U.S. schools. In the 1960s and 1970s, black vets from the Korean and Vietnam wars added to the mix. Even wounded soldiers found a new lease on life south of the border, settling, marrying, and thriving in the wonderful Mexican climate” (3).

47. “A common racial identity did not bridge the gulf that existed between the two groups,” Grillo mentions. “Black Americans spoke English and followed Protestant religions. Black Cubans spoke Spanish and practiced Catholicism” (2000: 11). These black distinctions differ through Cuban and American nationalities.

48. Gary R. Mormino and George E. Pozzetta record that Ybor City became “a new industrial enterprise” in 1886, the year that “workers put the finishing touches on the magnificent Statue of Liberty” (1987: 63). This industrial boom expanded from 1886 to 1900, a formative period that marked “the rapid and uninterrupted growth of an industry” (68). Curiously, this Latin boom—largely indebted to the recruitment of skilled labor from Spain and Cuba—is characterized through food. Mormino and Pozzetta note that “along with their tote bags, Cubans and Spaniards brought a cultural vitality that helped create an ethnic *paella* unique for the South” (70). Ybor City’s Latinness was growing through Sicilian migrants to Florida and New Orleans (81). Italians in Florida “labored in the phosphate mines of Tampa and on construction crews at the magnificent Tampa Bay Hotel” and even went on to establish a “Little Italy” in the mid-1890s (82). For Mormino and Pozzetta, this signifies “the building of a community” in Ybor City that “centered around Seventh Avenue and Eighteenth Street, which remained the settlement’s core for the next seventy-five years” (86).

49. Román de la Campa finds that Arte Público Press’s RUSHLH’s texts are a “major effort” that launch a U.S. Latino and Latina literary boom with beginnings “from each of [the] historically established groups in the United States.” This literary heritage is “analogous on a minor scale to the Latin American literary ferment of the past thirty years [that] has provided an interesting retrospective framework, through which the long history of the U.S. Hispanic heritage is now being discovered and rediscovered. Its meaning, as with any other complex historical object-subject, will be open to debate, but it promises to challenge any simple desire to affirm or deny a pan-ethnic Latino identity. It also promises to complicate how these groups and their cultural production are viewed by scholars and critics, though both the Anglo and

Latin American literary establishments—but especially the latter—have resisted acknowledging this considerable corpus” (1994: 63). What interests me about *Black Cuban*, *Black American* is precisely its embodiment of another literary tension. Grillo’s new mode of self-articulation is an immersion into a (Latined) American blackness that is also part of the African American canon.

50. This literary struggle also has implications for how we read Grillo’s function as an autobiographer. What are his inquiries into the self, as he develops an epistemology of his existence’s coetaneous dimensions? Put another way, what is the larger self-transformation at the level of black and Latin epistemologies? Profoundly embedded to “his” selfhood are the “evidentiary” components of his categorical blackness and Cubanness as well as their textual negation of each other. Grillo’s lines of thought as a being-in-the-world are narratively skewed. An autobiographer, William Gass bids, is also “a shaping self: it is the consciousness of oneself as a consciousness among all these other minds, an awareness born out much later than the self it studies, and a self whose existence was fitful, intermittent, for a long time, before it was able to throw a full beam upon the life already lived and see there a pattern, as a plowed field seen from a plane reveals the geometry of the tractor’s path” (1994: 51). An autobiographer’s new consciousness requires an inner self that also distantiates itself from the representativeness of the narratively constructed self. Such distance—or “othering” of Grillo’s Cubanness and blackness—demands that we ask, how does he “rewrite” each black and Cuban situation and their turning points?

51. Wald’s take on official stories reads, “I use the term ‘official’ because of the authority they command, articulated, as they are, in relation to the rights and privileges of individuals. They determine the status of an individual in the community. Neither static nor monolithic, they change in response to competing narratives of the nation that must be engaged, absorbed, and retold: the fashioning and endless refashioning of ‘a people’” (1995: 2).

52. Grillo’s entry into the “American way of life” is not white Americanness but a black Latined Americanness that also registers—to make use of Anna Julia Cooper’s efforts in *A Voice from the South*—dissatisfaction with the American present. This discontentment builds on what Cooper, a North Carolinian, called a “satisfaction in American institutions [that] rests not on the fruition we now enjoy, but [that] springs rather from the possibilities and promise that are inherent in the system, though as yet, perhaps, far in the future” (1998: 54). If the promise of a satisfactory American future is unknowable and unimaginable, so is the arrival of the Latin subject to America. What do we make of such a typically omitted subject—and in changeable manifestations of Latinness? How do we insert it as a possibility and a promise that inher-

ently spring in the American processes and institutions that un-Americanize it? Like Cooper's insistence that the projected voice of the South fails to consider the standpoints of "the expectant Black woman" as an "important witness" to social thought emanating from the South, Grillo's book brings to the fore what Cooper called "one silent strain in the Silent South" (51). Latinity, in this instance, refers to the Cuban cultural practices that Grillo addresses, customs and meanings that do not necessarily impart Cuban but Latin. Despite being told from a racialized man's perspective overlooking Latina voices from the South, Grillo's other layer of the Latino Silent South makes known that Latino and Latina stories are still in the making and have yet to be fully recorded.

53. Jennifer DeVere Brody cogitates on punctuation marks and their proliferation as "visual (re)marks" (2008: 2). She posits, "Punctuation is not a proper object: it is neither speech nor writing; art nor craft; sound nor silence. It may be neither here nor there and yet somehow it is everywhere" (3). Punctuation is marked by "ambiguous movements." Depending on the editorial setting, they "function as shadow figures that both compose and haunt writing's substance" (5). Grillo appears to underscore a robust comma as a subject of punctuation as well as a deferred selfhood that cannot intrude on the present jagged mapping of the past through Arte Público Press's steps to recover the U.S. Hispanic Literary Heritage.

54. We could recollect James Weldon Johnson's discussion in *Along This Way* of the kinds of families he encounters when teaching in rural Hampton, Georgia. During one stop, Johnson meets a homeowner caught between the crevices of being "white" and "colored." The homeowner is described as "an intelligent, light-complexioned man, who had a job with a railroad; the wife was a comely light-brown woman; and there was a pretty little girl named Alma." Johnson does not discount the rich spectrum of the color line as well as the nuances behind the girl's name. He immediately follows with this contention: "I wondered how her parents came to choose the name, a word that in Spanish means soul" (2000: 106). Alma, it should also be noted, means "soul" in Latin. This seeming itinerant moment in Johnson's autobiography pushes the reader to think about black-brown exchanges — lexical doppelgängers — through this family's southern Latinities. One indeed wonders how they — and their names — came to be and how they passed into the racial, historical, and geographic realm of indigent U.S. African American rural life. And yet there is also something obstinately unmoving in this customary mode of passing. The name Alma eclipses, not so subtly, another deviation of *lo negro*. Though Johnson does not expand on other forms of blackness in this rustic part of Georgia (to retain his phrasing), one could interpret such a rupturing moment of the black-white color divide as substantial enough in that it stands out in Johnson's memory as well as text (113).

Karla F. C. Holloway has written about Johnson's representative mode of remembrance in *Along This Way*, alluding to the "fragility of the recollections," in the context of mother-son readerly and artistic formation. Johnson intentionally filled his narrative "spaces with ellipses as if to indicate that even though these are 'intensely vivid' memories, they are vignettes, and they have for him as much visual memory as they do power of recall. He allows his reader to fill in the spaces" (2006: 107). This "Alma vignette" can be framed through a similar literary and interpretive milieu. Johnson's sentence omissions become critical ellipses whose elliptical blanks are filled differently by different readers. What proves extraordinarily elucidating at auditory, linguistic, and visual levels is the possibility that this Alma moment presents: the continuous remix of blackness and brownness as "a sampling machine where any sound can be you" (P. Miller, 2008: 5). This general "you" lends itself to Africana, Latino, and Latina spectrums. This point does not suggest that I am unencumbered by historical accuracy, as assigned to Johnson's period. Rather, I want to access and incorporate another interpretive reentry for evaluating general constructions of U.S. "ethnics." To not be receptive to or deny other readings of a Latin Alma is to endeavor in a literalist analytic take and "translation" of what amounts to, for me, a turning point in perceptions about U.S. African American authenticity in the South. This noteworthy moment can also serve as commentary for readers to extrapolate whether they can hear and tell the difference between an Alma that is U.S. African American or Latina. Since Alma is being narratively represented in a Latined fashion, the question that arises is, what do we care to hear (or not hear) when "something" works against what may be too easily definable?

55. Irving Lewis Allen delineates in *The Language of Ethnic Conflict* that the term *wop* appeared in American slang by the mid-1890s, "near the peak of Italian immigration to the United States," as "a derogatory epithet for Italians." He annotates how "the offensive nickname for an Italian probably derives from the Neapolitan dialect's *guappo*, a dandy (literally a handsome man), later used as a Neapolitan greeting and by other Italians to refer to a Neapolitan" (1983: 118). Allen expounds that "a popular but probably wrong story has it that *wop* derives from the acronym for the phrase With Out Papers (or sometimes Passport). [. . .] The With-Out-Papers story for *wop* is seductive because it is consistent with the fact that later nicknames for other groups did emerge from the bureaucratic insensitivities of the host society" (119). He adds that *wop* has also signified Work-On-Pavement, "probably inspired by the occupational stereotype of Italians as concentrated in the masonry, construction, and road-building industries" (120).

56. Mormino and Pozzetta note that the Afro-Cuban presence in Ybor City constituted "13 percent of the Cuban population" in 1900. They observe that "Black Cubans,

like white Cubans, were extremely mobile geographically, shuttling frequently between Tampa and the island" (1987: 79).

57. Earl Lewis and Heidi Ardizzone focus on the media uproar resulting from the 1924 interracial marriage between Alice Jones, a black woman, and Leonard Rhinelander, a white trust-fund heir. Their relationship and the court case to annul their marriage "prompted outraged editorials regarding interracial mixing, racial definitions, white manhood, upper-class morals, working class respectability, and the place of racial and class hierarchies in a democratic society" (2001: xiii). The national sensationalism and impact of "The Rhinelander Case," as it has come to be known, was also referenced in Nella Larsen's novel, *Passing* (1929), a connection that has been widely studied (cf. Larsen, 2007; Madigan, 1990). Rhinelander was hailed as a successor to a "well-heeled family" listed in the *Social Register*. The Rhinelanders "descended from several of New York's founding families." They were "an American version of aristocracy" (Lewis and Ardizzone, 2001: xi), making their fortune "as provision merchants, shipping agricultural goods to the West Indies" (9). By contrast, Jones was the daughter of a colored man, and as newspapers of the time described this family's "disparate class standing," a "cabby" (11).

What interests me from Lewis and Ardizzone's discussion is the Latin linkage that surfaces for both Jones and Grillo. In that coloring of blackness, Jones and Grillo point to the roundabout paths that blackness takes, as opposed to steering only toward the "main road": the one-drop rule of black racial identity. Analyzing Jones's media coverage, Lewis and Ardizzone write, "Again and again papers tried to describe Alice, an endeavor that actually painted a range of images of her appearance: She was 'dark'; 'she was 'of light complexion'; she was 'dusky'; she was a 'pretty girl of the Spanish type'; she was 'of medium height, dark and of a Spanish or Latin type of features. Her straight black hair is worn in a long bob'; she was 'a comely young woman with bobbed black hair and a complexion of Spanish tint.'" These statements seem to work through the rich semiotics of blackness and Latinness, an operating Latinities of sorts. Though the remarks seem to invariably translate into blackness, they also paradoxically undermine "the most straightforward definition of blackness [. . .] that someone is black who looks black" (2001: 24).

58. At this point of our discussion, Julie M. Weise's research on the race and class dimensions of the "Mexican generation" and the "Mexican American generation" in New Orleans and the Mississippi Delta demands special note to broaden our Latina and Latina compass of the U.S. South. The former pertains to "Mexican immigrants of the 1910s and 1920s who created homeward-looking cultures as bulwarks against a society that had begun to exclude and racialize them"; the latter speaks to those whose "service in World War II was an integral component of a new political strategy,

and in some cases identity shift, emphasizing U.S. citizenship” (2009: 247). Weise’s work, dating from 1908 to 1939, adds an interesting configuration to the corpus of the U.S. South: her analysis revolves around the sociocultural acquisition of whiteness by Mexicans and Mexican Americans, which came into being from abroad. Mexican government representatives, in confronting “the black-white eugenic binary of U.S. white supremacy” (250), exercised a “banner of Mexican nationalism” that granted migrants a social status affiliated with U.S. whiteness (269). Weise contends that “the leadership of Mexico’s New Orleans consulate and of its Mexican Honorary Commission in Gunnison, Mississippi [. . .] [engaged in] distinctly Mexican strategies which Mexicans of all social classes pursued in their quest to attain and retain white status in the U.S. South” (249–50). These commissions “promoted Mexican culture, organized politically, and offered communal support” (258), under a type of Mexicanness — a cultural whitening — that emphasized North-South “cordial relations” (269). This is not to imply, however, that Mexicans and Mexican Americans were not racialized in the South. This point is not amiss in Weise’s calculations. “Certainly,” she claims, “Mexicans arriving in the South at the close of the Mexican Revolution faced the possibility of becoming racialized not as white nor black, but ‘Mexican’” (255). Particularly striking is that although “by 1920 the federal census listed 1,242 Mexican-born whites in New Orleans,” it is possible that “an additional ten percent lived there as well, classified as negro or mulatto” (252). All to say, then, that Grillo’s coloring has Mesoamerican counterparts, as *negro* and *mulato* are inhabited by Latinos and Latinas. Negro and mulatto do not just stem from U.S. blackness.

59. Still, Grillo expresses disappointment with an institution that did not trust him “in asserting my individuality outside the campus on my own.” His individual and institutional differences are framed through political and religious ideologies that are not in line with Xavier University. Since he was considered a “renegade” on campus with “Communist leanings,” Grillo intimates that such political differences may have been what led to the university not granting him the highest honors. “Graduation seemed like a bad dream,” he bemoans, “with my classmates inquiring, ‘What happened?’ Visibly embarrassed and upset, I had not learned to be cool under fire.” But Grillo, the author with finessed political experience, returns to this moment of disappointment. He seems to want to reconcile these differences by writing, “In the perspective of the years, however, it is not appropriate or necessary to focus on the negative aspects of my largely pleasant years at Xavier. Xavier took me in, one of many penniless if deserving young people of college age.” His racial uplift story is obliged to admit that Xavier “provided me with a superb education, which I have used advantageously for my own growth in life, for my family’s benefit and, I hope, for the benefit of the many communities that I have served” (2000: 89–90).

60. The organization's website notes, "The Unity Council (officially known as the Spanish Speaking Unity Council) was founded in 1964, incorporated in 1967, and received 501(c)(3) tax-exempt status in 1968. The Unity Council is a non-profit community development corporation committed to enriching the quality of life of families primarily in the Fruitvale District of Oakland. Its mission is to help families and individuals build wealth and assets through comprehensive programs of sustainable economic, social and neighborhood development."

61. With Amparo's exception, members of her household appear as castrated figures, including Grillo's stepfather, Luis, a "classic passive observer." He was "thoroughly defeated and humorless" but played "an indirect role" in Grillo's quest for sex education. Grillo credits Luis with "a few helpful, exciting lessons." Taking "a peep through the keyhole in the bedroom," Grillo saw his mother and stepfather "carry out amazing gyrations under the blanket." They made "intriguing noises, poorly contained by the thin walls" (2000: 25). The mother's repression seems to be released in the bedroom, but it bears mentioning that two humorless individuals perform this undoing. Grillo's undercover investigation made him "wild with excitement" but "afraid of being caught, and guilty, because I knew I was doing something wrong." While illustrating adolescent inadequacies and anxieties around sexual matters, Grillo's representation also intimates a search for who may be symbolically big enough to dominate Amparo. That figure may as well be Grillo, a beneficiary of his mother's "wisdom and strength" (24). Soon after describing his mother's sexual desires, Grillo assigns political respectability to Amparo. He relates that she legally married the passive and seldom employed Luis, thereby recording how his stepfather established "his right to be in the house and to sleep with her" (26).

62. As Gina M. Pérez, Frank A. Guridy, and Adrian Burgos Jr. put across in their edited volume, *Beyond El Barrio: Everyday Life in Latina/o America* (2010), scholars have examined Latinoness and Latinaness as a problem and threat to America. But what also warrants more analytic attention is how Latinos and Latinas become a *problem* with concomitant black problems. Du Bois's problem, let us recall, is about the meaning of blackness. The question remains how Latino and Latina — as an amalgam of many things — pose a particular brown or dark brown problem akin to the meaning of blackness. To borrow from Lawrence D. Bobo (2010), how might we articulate, as a counterpart to blackness, Latino and Latina (brown/dark brown) "human strivings"? By translating the problem as Latino and Latina, Du Bois's formation of the problem stays in its inert blackness, as though the problem of blackness has not migrated to other U.S. ethnoracial domains. The Latino and Latina problem, by contrast, holds a prominent place through the ethnoracially ambiguous Latino/Latina label, not through a dehumanizing symbology of being blackened. I suggest that Latino and

Latina ambiguity, and its appended, monolithized brownness, are part of the contemporary American problem. U.S. Latinoness and Latinaness must be dissected not just through its perceived inherent brownness but also through the overlooked body politics of a problematic, caricatured blackness, brownness, and dark brownness that inform and move through U.S. African Americanness, Latinoness, and Latinaness.

63. Du Bois's peerless excerpt reads, "After the Egyptian and Indian, the Greek and Roman, the Teuton and Mongolian, the Negro is a sort of seventh son, born with a veil, and gifted with second-sight in this American world, — a world which yields him no true self-consciousness, but only lets him see himself through the revelation of the other world. It is a peculiar sensation this double-consciousness, this sense of always looking at one's self through the eyes of others, of measuring one's soul by the tape of a world that looks on in amused contempt and pity. One ever feels his two-ness, — an American, a Negro; two souls, two thoughts, two unreconciled strivings; two warring ideals in one dark body, whose dogged strength alone keeps it from being torn asunder" (2003: 9). For an analysis of the sources from which Du Bois drew his own articulation of double consciousness — that is, European romanticism and American transcendentalism as well as the field of psychology — see Bruce (1992) and Gates and Oliver (1999).

64. My reference to epistemic lines of thinking draws from Mignolo's appraisal that if the problem of the twentieth century was measured through the color line, dilemmas for the twenty-first will fall along what he has identified as the "epistemic line" (2010).

65. This ingression into double consciousness also invites a reinterpretation of how Du Bois's framework has been articulated. For instance, Toi Derricotte could account for such an open double consciousness through the various self-vehicles that are always "there," open for dialogue, and receptive to meanings unmasking the things that estrange us from the world. In her creative nonfiction project, *The Black Notebooks*, Derricotte writes about the many people, subjectivities, and translocations she embodies. Notice the following declaration: "I was watching the world as if I were looking through the eyes of the most vicious racist, but I was also looking through the eyes of white literary critics, black literary critics, of light-skinned black women and dark-skinned black women, of middle class and poor. I was looking through the eyes of my mother, cousins, and aunts. I had to find a way, not only to go around competing and repressive voices, but to address them, to listen and record, to disarm them and to bring them to another perspective, to resolve conflicting aims. Voice becomes, not a synthesis of opposing voices, but rather a path of energy that is allowed by all sides, one that gains egress past restrictions by bowing to them at the same time they are disobeyed, by bargaining and earning" (1997: 20). Derricotte's excerpt zooms

into “the world”: the cacophony of conflicting voices that overcrowds and divides her macrocosm. As a manifestation of an unsettled articulation of double consciousness, Derricotte’s feelings and thoughts are being opened to a plenitude of social worlds. Derricotte admits another point for deliberation: “Whiteness has to be examined, addressed, not taken as ‘normal.’ White people have to develop a double consciousness, too, a part in which they see themselves as ‘other.’ We are all wounded by racism, but for some of us those wounds are anesthetized. When we begin to feel it, we’re awake” (125). She promotes the need, for all those wounded by racism, to open up and feel “it” as a problem but not necessarily to be one. On a fictional level, James Weldon Johnson’s anonymous narrator in *The Autobiography of an Ex-Coloured Man* articulates a double consciousness embodied through the protagonist’s black-and-white biraciality. But since the character’s biracial body can signify various readings (and, indeed, misreadings), he moves, I insist, toward an open double consciousness. His namelessness intensifies this “openness.” The fact that he is unnamed leads to shifting forms of self-reflection that continually allow him to name — and rename — himself. As he transitions from one world into another, he “looked out through other eyes, my thoughts were coloured, my words dictated, my actions limited by one-dominating, all pervading idea which constantly increased in force and weight until I finally realized in it a great, tangible fact” (1989: 21).

66. For Luis Eduardo Guarnizo, Alejandro Portes, and William Haller “cross-border political relationships” by contemporary U.S. migrants — which in concise form have the tendency to be framed under “transnationalism” — signify “the rise of a new class of immigrants, economic entrepreneurs or political activists who conduct cross-border activities on a *regular* basis” (2003: 1213). The authors opt for a more accurate qualifier, “political transnationalism,” to differentiate those actors from migrants who participate in “the simple act of sending remittances to families or traveling home occasionally” (1212). For additional studies on American citizenship, disparate American interests, dual nationalities, and the crafting of “transnational life,” consult Oboler (2006); R. Smith (2006); and Duany (2011).

67. Open double consciousness turns the specific double consciousness that Richard Wright postulated in Paris — through the illimitable examination of his handwritten declaration, “I am an American but . . .” — into other Latined realms informed by the conjunction “but” (Wright, n.d.). Wright’s “but” can be part of a speculative Latined *décalage*. It has the potential to modify the meanings and actors behind Americanness through the rotating inhabitants of that inevitable contrarian state enunciated with “but.”

68. Perhaps a Mexican American and Chicano and Chicana equivalent to this Du Boisian “other world” could be González and Raleigh’s italicized use of the U.S. nation-

ality *Americanos* in their novel, *Caballero*. More than merely applicable to white, U.S. citizens, the idea of *Americanos*, in Spanish, refers to the unfolding Americanness that awaits the occupied Texan world of González and Raleigh — otherizing not the Mexicanness of what became the U.S. Southwest but the ideological processes that transplant and enforce U.S. Americanness. One of *Caballero*'s characters tries to grasp the meaning of his sudden Americanness by observing, “[C]an’t you laugh? Is it not something to laugh at? We are *Americanos*!” (2008: 9). This newly granted and astonishing Americanness is as foreign as the one being brought by the “other world.”

69. Richard Wright’s quote reads, “There is not a black problem in the United States, but a white problem. The blacks now know what they want. . . . The whites don’t” (quoted in Rowley, 2001: 332).

70. Writing a book review in 1968, the year in which *The Autobiography of W. E. B. Du Bois: A Soliloquy on Viewing My Life from the Last Decade of Its First Century* was published, historian Hugh Davis Graham concurred with Du Bois’s own assessment. Graham referred to Du Bois’s third and fullest autobiography as a “thoughtful recollection of a high order” (641). Du Bois’s extract on a theory of a life reads, “Eager as I am to put down the truth, there are difficulties; memory fails especially in small details, so that it becomes finally but a theory of my life, with much forgotten and misconceived, with valuable testimony but often less than absolutely true, despite my intention to be frank and fair” (1997: 12).

71. Feeling alone cannot fully account for a sustained investigation of Du Bois’s centenarian problem. Frantz Fanon’s *Black Skin, White Masks*, another seminal text in Africana thought, stresses that his book “should have been written” three years prior to its initial publication in 1952. Echoing Du Bois, where to pen *The Souls of Black Folk* he had to “reduce the boiling to a simmer,” Fanon brings to view the fact that “at the time [1949] the truths made our blood boil. Today the fever has dropped and truths can be said without having them hurled into people’s faces” (2008: xiii). Fanon also writes, “if I utter a great shout, it won’t be black” (13). Du Bois urged us to think about how “problematic peoples” conceal, disclose, or play with their responses. Feeling *like* a — and not as *the* — problem allows the problematic subject to alter codes of behavior that differ from double consciousness inasmuch as this awareness must make meaning of the problem. Double consciousness is the impetus for making sense of “the problem of the color-line” (Du Bois, 1996b: 5).

CHAPTER TWO. Passing Latinities

1. In addition, Samira Kawash provides these definitional parameters for passing: “Common sense dictates that passing plays only with appearance and that the true identities underlying the deceptive appearances remain untouched. This has

been the accepted understanding of passing, both on the part of social scientists who attempted to study the phenomenon and literary critics who sought to understand the significance of literary representations of passing” (1997: 126). My approach deals with the moving possibilities — passages — from black and Latin to white and vice versa.

2. Two outstanding works on the African diaspora and Latin America include Nwankwo (2005) and Guridy (2010).

3. This assessment is also evidenced in Rampersad’s first volume of Hughes’s life, whose time in Mexico is described, rather oxymoronically, as a “dull horror” (2002: 32). There may have been dull instants in Hughes’s trip, but as I argue, his journeys to that nation unveil an actively working Latinity.

4. As announced in a supplementary page to this same book, “The best biographical material on James Weldon Johnson is his own autobiography, *Along This Way*” (2000: xix).

5. Suzanne Bost’s definition of *mestizaje* provides a good scope of this concept’s working directions: “*Mestizaje* is the Latin American term for the racial and cultural mixture that was produced by the conquest of the so-called ‘New World,’ in which European colonizers mixed with the darker-skinned colonized subjects. Originally the term was used to describe the Spanish and native heritage, but *mestizaje* has incorporated additional racial elements. Chicana/o theorists in the United States have drawn attention to the Anglo-American additions to their racial and cultural mixture, but they often elide the African lineage in *mestizaje*” (2000: 187).

In the context of Nicaragua’s *mestizaje*, Jeffrey Gould explains that the “myth of *Nicaragua mestiza*” depends on “the common sense notion that Nicaragua had long been an ethnically homogeneous society is one of the elite’s most enduring hegemonic achievements. The creation of this nationalistic discourse in Nicaragua depended upon the increasing disarticulation of the *Comunidades Indigenas*. This was realized in the highlands departments of Matagalpa, Jinotega, and Boaco through *ladino* pressures on indigenous labor and land, which contributed to the weakening of the *Comunidades*. The incessant questioning of indigenous authenticity that coincided with the *ladino* advance, contributed both to the consolidation of *ladino* power and to the erosion of indigenous communal identity. Moreover, that delegitimization of indigenous authenticity, in turn, was related to the development of a democratic discourse of equal rights and citizenship that effectively suppressed specific indigenous rights to communal land and political autonomy” (2003: 365).

6. Johnson remarked, “occasionally race prejudice bumped into me.” Such was the case when a white South Carolinian male was baffled upon encountering the black consul in Nicaragua. “There were several other cases of individuals,” Johnson wrote, who were “caught unawares and psychologically unprepared to meet the situation. I

found it best to let them work out their own recovery from the shock and embarrassment” (2000: 258–59).

7. Julie Greene reminds us that empire was a concept that was jettisoned in the United States during Theodore Roosevelt’s presidency. The twenty-sixth commander in chief “eschewed the term ‘empire’ in describing the United States. Instead, he talked about national greatness and the virtues and responsibilities of the Anglo-Saxon race” (2009: 18). As such, Roosevelt needed to win the nation’s “citizenry over to a new identity as an imperial power” (35).

8. As a *New York Times* headline on 1 August 1912 announced, “Another Nicaragua Revolt: Mena May Bombard Managua — We Send a Ship to Corinto.” The article, a “special to the *New York Times*,” informed, “The feud between President [Adolfo] Diaz of Nicaragua and his former War Minister Gen. [Luis] Mena, has developed into a revolution, and to protect American interests the 500-ton gunboat Annapolis has been ordered to proceed from San Juan del Sur to Corinto. There the gunboat will restore communication with American Minister [George T.] Weitzel, who has not been heard from since the rebels cut off Managua from the outside world.”

9. On 28 January 1930 Sandino published an opinion piece in the *New York World*, where he declared, “We have understood that the greatest aim of the United States of North America in Nicaragua is to appropriate Central American territory where possibilities exist for the opening of an interoceanic canal route, in addition to the Gulf of Fonseca as a naval base. And that is why our army, together with all the uncorrupted and uncontaminated Nicaraguan people, has determined that the interoceanic canal as much as the naval base in question must be considered within the sovereignty of Latin American nationality for its progress and self-defense” (1988: 305–6; my translation).

10. Robert E. Fleming informs us that literary reception to *The Autobiography of an Ex-Coloured Man* “attracted relatively little attention when it was published in 1912, [but] it remained in print until 1918 as indicated by advertisements in the *Crisis* ‘Book Mart’ advertisements. However, the 1927 Knopf edition, coming as it did at the height of the Harlem Renaissance and at a time when Johnson was perhaps the best-known member of the older generation of black writers, was considerably more influential. Handsomely printed and well distributed, this edition of the novel was reviewed widely not only in America but in England also. Critics from the 1930s to the present have always considered it one of the most important novels of the early part of the century, and in 1965 it was reprinted, along with Booker T. Washington’s *Up From Slavery* and W. E. B. Du Bois’s *The Souls of Black Folk*, as *Three Negro Classics*, edited by John Hope Franklin” (1987: 41).

11. The most palpable act of anonymity commonly attributed to Johnson’s novel is the leading character’s namelessness and the (black) ethnoracial ambiguity that

facilitates his admission, unidirectionally, into whiteness. Overall, however, it can be said that *The Autobiography of an Ex-Coloured Man* interpretively proposes anonymities, since obscurity is attributed to the world that the “ex-coloured man” encounters. Those inhabiting such a world are never formally named, and so the reader, too, goes by the quiddity attributed to the inhabitants of that literary microcosm. This essence has been largely interpreted in black-white terms. Roxanna Pisiak contends, for example, that in the text “[m]uch ambiguity resides in the very personality of the narrator. While he is always careful to describe the exact color of the black people he meets, the reader is never told of the narrator’s exact racial status, or of his mother’s. This lack of specific racial identity reflects the inanity of the arbitrary racial assumption in American society that any amount of black blood designates an individual as ‘black.’ Furthermore, because we don’t know how ‘white’ or ‘black’ the narrator is (biologically), we can only judge him according to his actions and reactions, and not as a ‘black man’ or a ‘white man’” (1993: 86). The simultaneity of both ambiguity and anonymity can be contextualized through Lewis Gordon’s theorizing on anonymity and antiblackness. Gordon’s premise is that “[o]rdinary existence is an immersion in the bosom of anonymity. Anonymity literally means to be nameless. The context of anonymity with which I am here concerned is an antiblack society. The result in such a society is a violent namelessness committed against blacks whose familiarity is so familiar that it transforms the protective dynamics of anonymity itself. Yet anonymity itself is not the cause of this violence. Anonymity by itself doesn’t *cause* anything. In a humane world, anonymity is a blessing that offers human possibility and understanding” (1997: 13–14). Johnson’s narrator seems to transcend race through his passing. But his *Latined* blackness (and deviations thereof) are localized within the dynamics of — and Johnson’s focus on — an antiblack society.

12. Although Johnson’s protagonist travels to Europe, this visit becomes a test for how his ethereal blackness moves through different spectrums outside the United States. Given that a millionaire patron sponsors his trip, it is as though the character becomes a graduate of a European “crash-course” on the Western subject. The narrator mentions that, through this tour of the old world, the white benefactor had made him “a polished man of the world” (1989: 143). The patron concurs, telling him, “my boy, you are by blood, by appearance, by education, and by tastes a white man” (144). Notice that the whiteness proffered is immediately taken back — tinted by the blackness of the light-skinned storyteller through the use of “my boy” as a purported term of endearment.

13. In the case of Hughes’s political proclivities, Lawrence P. Jackson has written that “the boy wonder” of the Harlem Renaissance “was vulnerable in the mainstream and on the Left. [. . .] In payment for his commitment to social justice, Hughes spent much of the 1940s and 1950s having to extricate himself from his most radical works

and looking for succor from welcoming black audiences. Despite this sometimes-exhausting trek, Hughes possessed a genuine courage and intellectual flexibility. These qualities enabled him to cultivate the next cadre of artists whose work would project them successfully beyond the confines of racial segregation in the arts. A viable network of writers in Harlem remained, and Hughes, whose regular address shifted only once, from 634 St. Nicholas Avenue to a house at 20 West 127th Street in 1948, often stood at the center” (2011: 19).

14. Latin-America, as “cross-border, transnational zone,” symbolizes what Guridy conceives as the “U.S.-Caribbean world.” This region “first emerged out of the trade networks of the eighteenth century and came to full fruition after the War of 1898. In the four decades before the outbreak of the Second World War, Caribbean and Central American economies and societies became more integrated into U.S.-controlled cross-border linkages. The boundaries of this supranational configuration stretched from the eastern seaboard of the United States southward along the Atlantic coast to the islands of the Caribbean basin, the shores of the Gulf of Mexico, the nations of Central America, and even the northern reaches of South America” (2010: 7).

15. V. S. Naipaul’s insights, as attributed in Patrick French’s *The World Is What It Is*, bear significance here. Naipaul speaks of an author’s life as a rightful subject of study. His comment reads, “The lives of writers are a legitimate subject of inquiry; and the truth should not be skimmed. It may well be, in fact, that a full account of a writer’s life might in the end be more a work of literature and more illuminating — of a cultural or historical moment — than the writer’s books” (2008: xi). Glimpses of Johnson’s and Hughes’s lived anecdotal interludes take us to other cultural and historical oversights: the erasure of their fluctuating Latinities.

16. Writing on American Consular Service letterhead, Johnson told his wife, “Everywhere I go, the people, market women, children, everybody ask[s] me about la niña Graciela, and when she is coming” (1912a: 4 Apr.). A little more than a month later, Johnson repeated a similar sentiment, attributing her absence to the heat: “Everybody keeps asking about you. They all seem to miss you very much — but it is as you say, very hot down here” (18 May). It is common, in some Central American nations, to use the term *niña*, which literally means girl, to respectfully refer to an adult woman, regardless of her age and social class. Salvadoran novelist Jacinta Escudos elaborates on these conventional titles for different stages of “womanhood.” She has written in her blog that the vagueness of *niña* or even the employment, in Guatemala, of the term *seño* (as an abbreviation for *señora* [woman/Mrs.] or *señorita* [young lady/Miss]) is more welcoming than *doña* (lady, Madame, Mrs., or Ms.). The latter, Escudos has observed, “makes me feel like a decrepit being, and, above all, like a deteriorated 115-year-old [. . .]. Far from being an expression of re-

spect, as it is usually justified, it seems like it has a disparaging connotation. It has always appeared like a guarded way to call me *vieja* [an old woman] to my face” (2008; my translation).

17. Johnson immortalized Manhattan’s allure in *The Autobiography of an Ex-Coloured Man*, wherein the protagonist asserts, “New York City is the most fatally fascinating thing in America. [. . .] [A]s I walked about that evening, I began to feel the dread power of the city; the crowds, the lights, the excitement, the gaiety, and all its subtler stimulating influences began to take effect upon me” (1989: 89–90). Stecopoulos has discussed a distinctive “metropolitan superiority” etched in the minds of the period’s race men. They had a “sense of ‘northernness’ and a concomitant feeling of civilized belonging” (2007: 37). Johnson impregnates *Along This Way* with a resonating metropolitanism, as he narratively takes the reader to the summer when he taught “in the backwoods of Georgia.” “This was going to be a new experience for me,” Johnson confessed. “True, I was born in a very small city, but it was one, nevertheless, that had quite a metropolitan air; and I knew nothing at all of rural life” (2000: 105). Johnson proceeded to equate the inconveniences of his rural life, such as the lack of light, with the kinds of struggles confronted by “the philosophers and poets of Greece in her age of highest culture” (109).

18. Johnson’s main character, though, never claims while visiting France that he speaks French better than that nation’s citizens. His passage into Latinity is marked through the Spanish language. His French, by contrast, appears a tad rudimentary. He gets by with a vocabulary of “three hundred necessary words” — ergo suggesting that his entrance into Western discourses is unpassable, if not deadlocked (1989: 132–33).

19. The English word that grabs the narrator’s attention — it almost shocks him — is the verb “ramify” (Johnson, 1989: 71).

20. Although an argument can be made that Speedy Gonzalez is bound to a Mexican and Mexican American iconography, his symbolic representation codifies a larger Latin population. Carlos Eire’s *Waiting for Snow in Havana: Confessions of a Cuban Boy* affords a viewpoint of the representational lineage under which U.S. Latinos and Latinas have fallen vis-à-vis this caricature. Suggesting an afterlife doom for Mel Blanc (1908–89) — the voice of Speedy Gonzalez among a myriad of canonical Warner Brothers and Hanna-Barbera television productions cartoons like Bugs Bunny, Daffy Duck, Porky Pig, and Barney Rubble — Eire utters, “may you burn in hell forever. As one of your God-damned Hispanic Warner Brothers cartoon characters might have said: ‘*Sí, señor, firrst I go to zee fiesta and zen I tayk-a siesta, beeforrre I go to anozzer fiesta again. Ole! Andale, ándale! Arriba, arriba!*’ I take it back, Mel. Sorry, I got carried away. Hell might be too harsh a punishment for your sins. You must have been clueless, truly. Maybe a better place for you would be heaven, where you might

be surrounded by lazy, napping, partying spics who talk funny” (2003: 69). Eire also calls Blanc a “spicmeister” and “colonialist doofus” (81).

21. Train rides prove critically invaluable when canvassing the unsteady linguistic and semiotic divisions that Latined subjects pass through in the U.S. landscape, as we see here with Johnson. Hughes’s story “Puerto Ricans” in *The Best of Simple* (1961) also sheds light on how a foreign-sounding Spanish language, as uttered in the United States, deracializes other colored folk. In this piece, Jesse B. Simple boards a New York City subway at 125th and Lenox, hoping to read a recently purchased comic book. During the ride, however, Simple discovers that the book is written in “*Español!*” (1990: 216). Unable to understand—to which Simple merely remarks “*no entiendo*”—he offers the comic to a Puerto Rican passenger, caustically noting, “*Español!* Now that is a language which, if you speak it, will take *some* of the black off of you if you are colored. Just say, *Sí*, and folks will think you are a foreigner, instead of only a plain old ordinary American Negro” (217). Of gleaming significance is Simple’s emphasis that español discards “*some* of the black off of you.” The Spanish language is not a direct passage into whiteness, but a dissembling utterance of incomprehension on both sides. On the one hand, the white side does not speak Spanish. One could say that since it would take too long for this side to intelligibly and reasonably explain the logic and order of Jim Crow, a temporary passing access is granted to Spanish speakers in this U.S. racial order. On the other hand, we find Latins who claim not to understand the black and white of it and thus provide, like Hughes’s character, a simple “*no entiendo*.” In this Hughesian sense, this presumed lack of understanding transcends a black-and-white impasse, taking us to the useful purpose of the comic book’s narrative value. Toward the story’s end, Simple decides he would like to start a series of comics titled *Jess Simple’s Jim Crow Jive*. These books would be published in “English and Spanish so Puerto Ricans could laugh, too.” *Jess Simple’s Jim Crow Jive* would provoke Puerto Rican laughter “because it must tickle them to see what *a little foreignness* will do” (218; emphasis added). Blackness and whiteness cease to be so inchoate and straightforward. The transparency of the color line requires what Hughes called, in this same volume, “*genial* souls”—and I italicize *genial* here since it is a word both in Spanish and English and thus shares passing Latinities—that tap into other colorings of the U.S. panorama (viii).

22. In relation to U.S. West Indian migrations in the early twentieth century, Martha A. Sandweiss interprets this same incident in Johnson’s text, concurring with Stecopoulos’s analysis. To quote Sandweiss, this was a period where blacks born outside the United States “hung on to their foreign citizenship to assert their social superiority over American-born blacks and shield themselves from some of the most virulent forms of racial discrimination” (2009: 218–19). In connection to Johnson,

we must also consider that Rodríguez Ponce is not so much a bridge to whiteness, but a witness to how varieties of blackness walk in and out of both U.S. blackness and whiteness. It is not that Latinos and Latinas, as we now come to know them, are excluded from the black-white binary. Indeed, their racialization processes have been different. This Johnson–Rodríguez Ponce literary episode suggests that U.S. blackness is inclusive of that type of foreign-born blackness. Consider Sandweiss’s observation: “the directions to the census takers suggest, the hardening edge of American racial thought at the end of the century had effectively erased the possibility of a category of mixed-race ‘mulattoes’ with an intermediate status between black and white. If such people had once held a special status that set them apart from ‘blacks,’ new state laws obliterated the distinction between peoples with different degrees of African heritage” (217). Clearly the black mulatto and the Latino mulato/mestizo, “with different degrees of African heritage,” have not been completely removed from the national racial order. Rodríguez Ponce is gaining an instruction on how his Cubanness and Latinoness stand, move, or deadlock in U.S. renditions of unalloyed blackness and whiteness.

23. My uses of Latin@ness/Latin-at-ness are explained in this book’s epilogue.

24. A Latinity, of course, can also be unpassable, as it has been evidenced for Latinos, Latinas, and Latin Americans. Gabriel García Márquez’s biographer, Gerald Martin, chronicles an incident in this writer’s journey to the U.S. South — “Faulkner country” — where Latins cannot even pass as culturally white Mexicans. One evening in 1961, García Márquez and his wife “missed a night [in Montgomery, Alabama] because no one would rent ‘dirty Mexicans’ a room” (2009: 260).

25. Johnson also noted, “Before leaving New York, I had made myself known to Richard Watson Gilder, the editor of the *Century Magazine*, and to William Hayes Ward, the editor of the *Independent*. I began mailing manuscripts to them, and my poems began appearing in the two publications” (2000: 237).

26. The letter was sent to Victor M. Shapiro of the Fox Film Corporation. Shapiro responded on the following day with a tactful and noncommittal note: “My dear Mr. Johnson: I deeply appreciate the autographed copy of your book. I will read it with a great deal of interest as I have heard so much about it. If anything develops when I get to Hollywood, I will communicate directly with you. Best wishes and sincerest regards to yourself and Mrs. Johnson. Sincerely, Victor M. Shapiro” (quoted in Johnson, 1931b).

27. Bok mentions that his Dutch family was able “to make an experiment of Americanization” (1927: x). He interpolated American ideology, noting in his third-person written account, “the American spirit of initiative had entered deep into the soul of Edward Bok” (15).

28. Johnson wrote this poem to honor the fiftieth anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation, which officially outlawed slavery in 1865.

29. It is worth citing here the 1915 summary of *Fifty Years and Other Poems* provided by the Cornhill Company. The publicity noted, “This volume includes the poem ‘Fifty Years’ so widely quoted and admired when it was published in *The New York Times* four years ago. Mr. Johnson sings of a variety of themes with the same unerring touch as in the titular poem. There is a group devoted to Latin-American life called ‘Down by the Carib Sea,’ and a group of ‘Folk Runes,’ pieces in dialect of the pathetic and humorous aspect of Negro life.” Other luminaries who blurbed this book include Elihu Root and Elbridge L. Adams (Johnson, 1915). Root (1845–1937), a lawyer and a recipient of the 1912 Nobel Peace Prize, served as President William McKinley’s secretary of war from 1899 to 1904 and as President Theodore Roosevelt’s secretary of state in 1905. Adams (1866–1934) was an attorney with literary ties to Joseph Conrad. He served as chair of the Correspondence Committee of the Civil Service Reform Association in 1919 and cofounded the New York–based Fountain Press in 1929.

30. Curtis Márez calls attention to the characteristic employment of “Pancho” for Chicanos. Building on Américo Paredes, Márez asserts, “Pancho suggests the bandit stereotype, the Mexican with the long mustaches and the cartridge belts crossed over his chest.’ In other words, the name calls to mind a stereotyped image of the brown border combatant” (1996: 112).

31. Johnson’s monolingual association with American English is worthy of further consideration, as the Spanish language cannot pass. Given Johnson’s aptness with various languages, his distinctive bonding at this precise moment with American monolingualism could be fashioned through what Ingrid M. Reneau has called, in the context of “broad’ Belizean Creole (bBC),” a process of “lightening-up one’s tongue” (2006: 95). This concept refers to a monolithic tongue that does not migrate or intone “a variety of new U.S. landscapes.” In Johnson’s Nicaraguan instance, it can be grounded to an un-Americanized race of color that speaks only Spanish (Reneau, 2006: 95). As Reneau writes, “Internal barriers of personal and historical memories and our perceptions of our selves, linguistically and otherwise, can enable as well as disable our abilities to see our commonalities, our wholeness, not only as Belizeans, but as Caribbean and Central American people and people of the world” (2006: 97). Johnson’s separation from Spanish, as spoken and embodied in Nicaragua, prompts a disabling of any Latin linkages — punctuating, in this process, a foreignness tinged by his own rendition of a U.S.-based Americanness abroad.

32. Johnson’s wife was also learning French, perhaps thinking, like her husband, that they would be going to France in the next consular appointment. Johnson wrote, “Don’t get discouraged with your French. You can only master it by *constant* repeti-

tion. You know it was the same with your Spanish, how after hours of repetition, then suddenly you found out that you could speak Spanish and that you knew more than you had any idea that you knew" (1912a: 18 May).

33. The consul's preoccupation with Nicaragua's heat and its tropical nature has resonances with twentieth-century notions on how "the white man 'can never be acclimated in the tropics'" (Greene, 2009: 27). Greene puts forward that "the 'tropics' loomed as a great source of anxiety to many in the early twentieth century. Tropical climates were particularly associated with the absence of civilization" (28).

34. Johnson outlined in one letter the types of transactions for which he was responsible as consul. He confided, "I'm still a bit worried over the responsibility of the Sheridan Estate. In León I collected over \$2,000.00 in gold that was due, and \$26,000.00 in bills. Mr. L. and I were a whole day counting the bills over. There is still about \$6,000.00 in gold to be collected. Besides, his property will amount to about \$60,000.00 gold. This is the first big case of the kind I have handled, and, of course, I want every penny to turn just right. My little safe is over loaded with money" (1912a: 5 June).

35. Historian Gerald Horne makes known that Mexico "as a beacon of hope for Negroes was not new. During the antebellum era thousands of enslaved Africans fled to freedom across the border, as Mexico had abolished slavery long before the United States" (2005: 6). Drawing on Hughes's father, Horne explains African American migration to Mexico as follows: "After the death of Reconstruction some African Americans organized to migrate en masse to Mexico. There were also countless individual migrations, as evidenced by the father of Langston Hughes, the writer. Shortly after he was born, his parents separated because his father wanted to escape the United States and go 'where a colored man could get ahead and make money quicker, and my mother did not want to go. My father went to Cuba, and then to Mexico, where there wasn't any color line, or any Jim Crow.' That Langston Hughes's father was not alone in wanting to go to Mexico is indicated by the experience of the Alabama Negro colony in Mexico in the 1890s. Fleeing pell mell from Jim Crow, lynchings, and the rest, Negroes were leaving for Liberia, Central America, and elsewhere. There were 'ten large colonies' in Mexico. A Mexican official had assured the migrants that his nation 'will be their Canaan, the land of hope and promise, where they could find relief from the persecution of southern whites'" (21). Other literary forays into Mexico include Richard Wright's 1940 visit to Cuernavaca. Hazel Rowley, his biographer, reports, "For a black man, Mexico was a welcome heaven" (2001: 197). Wright's observations of that nation are referenced as follows: "'People of all races and colors live in harmony and without racial prejudices or theories of racial superiority.' He added that he only ever experienced racism when he came into contact with

American tourists or businessmen.” Wright admitted, “Mexico was beautiful but backward. ‘I wanted to go to Europe,’ Wright pointed out. [. . .] ‘I’m not yet one of those people who can get excited over primitive people. Maybe the reason is that I’m too primitive myself, I don’t know’” (2001: 197). By 1954 Mexico was still “populated with expatriates from abroad” (De Veaux, 2004: 50). Audre Lorde, who traveled to Mexico that year, “described it as ‘a haven for political and spiritual refugees’” (quoted in De Veaux, 2004: 50).

36. Yet Hughes’s mother, who remained in the United States, never quite crossed the Mexican color line. Although she had lived with her former husband, James N. Hughes, in Mexico, she returned to the United States with the “five- or six-year-old” Langston. Hughes recounted their move in this manner: “But no sooner had my mother, my grandmother, and I got to Mexico City than there was a big earthquake, and people ran out from their houses into the Alameda, and the big National Opera House they were building sank down into the ground, and tarantulas came out of the walls—and my mother said she wanted to go back home at once to Kansas, where people spoke English or something she could understand and there were no earthquakes. So we went” (1993: 15–16). Hughes’s mother worked as a stenographer for a “colored” lawyer in Topeka, a cook in Chicago, and a waitress in Cleveland. It is hard to miss the classed and gendered dynamics of these racial and geographic passings (or lack thereof). They seem to facilitate, at a larger and perhaps more generous level, processes of reinvention for some of the race men of the period. Charles W. Chesnut imbued his novel *The House behind the Cedars* (1900) with the limits of racial passing. But it is his heroine, Rena Walden (who uses the moniker Rowena Warwick while passing through the other world) who does not pass, unlike John, her brother. Her concluding comments in the novel underscore this gendered constraint when she tells her intended, a white aristocratic male, “You are white, and you have given me to understand that I am black. I accept the classification, however unfair, and the consequences, however unjust, one of which is that we cannot meet in the same parlor, in the same church, at the same table, or anywhere, in social intercourse; upon a steamboat we would not sit at the same table; we could not walk together on the street, or meet publicly anywhere and converse, without unkind remark. As a white man, this might not mean a great deal to you; as a woman, shut out already by my color from much that is desirable, my good name remains my most valuable possession” (1993: 172–73).

37. By the 1930s Hughes’s “revolutionary quality had been recognized before in occasional translations published in Mexico, but the new articles had a more immediate effect. From the mainly apolitical *Contemporáneos* group to the League of Revolutionary Artists and Writers, he was welcomed by the most accomplished

Mexican writers and painters. Among the latter, he met the melancholy Orozco, the mountainous, dark-skinned Diego Rivera (a Negro grandmother, Rivera claimed proudly), Siquieros, Izquierdo, Tamayo, and Montenegro, and was taken up by the flamboyant Lupe Marin, Rivera's estranged wife and his favorite model" (Rampersad, 2002: 303).

38. This key incident is discussed in Rampersad's first volume of *The Life of Langston Hughes*, but it is not assembled within the context of black-brown passing lines that undo the black-white binary or as a border crossing—in effect, a passing—in diasporic blackness (2002: 40). The only time in which Hughes's passing as a Mexican is mentioned in this biography is when Hughes returns, as the biographer puts it, "home" to the United States. Traveling from San Antonio to Cleveland, a clerk in a Saint Louis soda fountain turned the color line into the national line, asking Hughes "bluntly whether he was Mexican or American" (35).

39. Hughes's story is, of course, from the perspective of an everyday black man transitioning into generic white Americanness. Sandweiss's biography of Clarence King, a renowned geologist who passed part-time from distinguished whiteness to anonymous blackness vis-à-vis his common-law marriage to a black woman (née Ada Copeland/Ada Todd) reveals that his written communication with his wife, who had no idea of King's distinguished record of chronicling U.S. Western expansion, was to be destroyed (2009: 144). Sandweiss quotes King's final instructions to his spouse, conveyed in this exclamatory, one-sentence supplement: "P.S. Carefully burn my letters!" (222). Although some letters survived—and even if they all had been completely destroyed—the story of King's part-time passing lingered. As Sandweiss claims, "James Todd' was his [King's] greatest fictional work of all" (234).

40. In this way, undocumented migrants can be deported within Mexico or one of its contiguous nations. This passing for a particular nationality facilitates the journey for migrants attempting to cross the Mexico-U.S. border. But in these "brown" Mexico–Central American passages, one seldom hears of Belize and Belizeans, especially when considering Mexico's southern frontier with Guatemala and Belize.

41. Let us briefly recall restrictive 1920s immigration laws such as the Emergency Quota Act (aka the Emergency Immigration Act of 1921) and the Immigration Act of 1924 (also called the Johnson-Reed Act and the National Origins Act). The former was "designed to ensure access for immigrants from northwestern Europe while restricting those from south/central/eastern Europe." The latter remained in effect until 1952, yielding "an annual limit of 150,000 Europeans, a total ban on Japanese" and, among other stipulations, "the creation of quotas based on the contribution of each nationality to the overall U.S. population, rather than on the foreign-born population" (LeMay, 2006: 23).

42. The reader also sees passing Latinities that become “paperless” through the sidestepping of the official documentation required at the crossing of geopolitical borders. This maneuver, as Hughes shows, alludes to a general “education in passing” on national (Mexican or “American”) and ethnoracial grounds (“colored,” “Latin,” or “Mexican”). As these subjects acquire a “mastery of moving back and forth,” they authenticate the fact that they can pass, and “no one will ask [them] for [their] papers” (Brady, 2002: 92, 86).

43. These Mexican manifestations of everyday speech reflect Hughes’s coruscating attraction with life stories and cultural expressions and their representation in his oeuvre. Certainly his literary construction of the Virginia-born protagonist, Jesse B. Simple, is the typification of someone, who according to the writer, speculates and laughs off “the numerous problems of white folks, colored folks, and just folks—including himself” (1990: viii).

44. The critical literature on this Fanonian moment is copious. Some of the important works include Gooding-Williams (2005b); N. Gibson (2003); Wynter (2001); Alessandrini (1999); Gordon, Sharpley-Whiting, and White (1996); L. Gordon (1995b); and Bhabha (1994).

45. Switching now from sweets to savory food, Eire spills the beans on his white Cuban constitution. He reveals his avoidance of eating the rice and beans that Nilda, his black nanny, would offer him when growing up in Havana. Nilda’s invitation to the meal was conveyed through the linguistic nudge, “Here, have some more [rice and beans], you’ll grow up to be just like me.” Eire fears his “skin would turn black,” just like his caregiver’s. He states, “I knew even then that there was something awful about being black in Cuba. African Cubans weren’t too lucky, from what I could see. They seemed to do all the hard work, and to have inferior bathrooms” (2003: 152). This fear of blackness, which moves synonymously from *Negro* and African to brown and dark, continued “for a very, very long time.” Eire adds, “I wouldn’t eat any food that was black or brown. Nothing dark. Not even chocolate” (153). He sums his fear along these lines: “Whatever work needed to be done in the house was done by African women. And whatever hard work needed to be done in the world, that is, my world, always fell to African Cubans, men and women alike. [. . .] So when Nilda asked me to join her in being discriminated against, my immediate reaction was to panic. [. . .] I thought it was some kind of curse placed directly on me, and me alone. I was the only white person who would be turned black by dark foods” (159).

46. By 1935 Hughes had published the play *Mulatto* with a double “t,” locating the mixed-race matter in the Big House of a Georgia plantation.

47. Guridy’s scholarly exploration on the audience reception to Hughes’s work in Havana proves stimulating. Cuban disposition during this period toward Hughes and

U.S. black musicians, Guridy finds, “produced new hierarchal and relational understandings of Afro-diasporic cultures in both countries. Cubans celebrated Hughes as a representative of the most advanced sector of the global ‘colored race’” (2009: 116).

48. Gustavo Urrutia was a prominent black Cuban journalist and a columnist for the daily Havana newspaper, *Diario de la Marina*.

49. Ortiz is widely recognized as an anthropologist and public intellectual who focused on the study of Afro-Cuban popular traditions. Fernando Coronil’s introduction to *Cuban Counterpoint* posits that Ortiz’s work practiced the “the self-fashioning of these [Afro-Cuban] peripheries, the counterpoint through which people turn margins into centers and make fluidly coherent identities out of fragmented histories.” Coronil adds that this work “helps show the play of illusion and power in the making and unmaking of cultural formations” (1995: xiv). Herewith, Ortiz brought into circulation the notion of “transculturation” in *Cuban Counterpoint* as a means to better express “the different phases of the process of transition from one culture to another.” This concept “carries the idea of the consequent of new cultural phenomena” (1995: 102–3). Transculturation conveys “the highly varied phenomena that have come about in Cuba as a result of the extremely complex transmutations of culture that have taken place here, and without a knowledge of which it is impossible to understand the evolution of Cuban folk, either in the economic or in the institutional, legal, ethical, religious, artistic, linguistic, psychological, sexual, or other aspects of life” (98). Ortiz also founded and edited the magazines *Archivos del Folklore Cubano*, *Estudios Afrocubanos*, and *Surco*. He presided over various cultural institutions, including the Society of Cuban Folklore, the Society of Afro-Cuban Studies, and the National Association against Racial Discrimination (cf. M. González, 1946).

50. Ifeoma Nwankwo has put forth that Hughes’s “intra-racial translation” transformed Nicolás Guillén’s poetry into African American English. So doing, Hughes exercised a methodology of translation that undertook “intra-racial linguistic difference while also affirming racial connectedness” (1999–2001: 55). Nwankwo contends that Hughes’s efforts made Guillén’s translated poetry “feel familiar, like one of our own, in order to emphasize the fact that we are all part of one community, the Black community.” Nwankwo also submits a key conceptual framework, “transnational Black collectivism,” which denotes “a sense of community that prioritizes racial connection over national location. Terms such as ‘pan-Africanism’ have been used to connote similar notions of a lengthy history or histories that trace them through a fixed genealogy” (56). Transnational black collectivism, more specifically, touches on “the general issue of Black-to-Black translation, of the relationship between translation methodology and the desire for an international Blackness” (60).

51. Rampersad has noted that when Hughes lived in Mexico in 1935, he had become a member “of a tiny international advance guard that would eventually include Pablo Neruda of Chile, Jorge Luis Borges of Argentina, Léopold Sédar Senghor of Senegal, Jacques Romain of Haiti, Aimé Césaire of Martinique, and Nicolás Guillén of Cuba” (2002: 47).

52. As Jean Franco (2002) and Neil Larsen (1995), among others, have brought up, the 1959 Cuban Revolution and the Cold War provoked U.S. academic interest in Latin American literature.

CHAPTER THREE. Indigent Latinities

1. The *Diccionario de la Real Academia Española* enumerates *prieto* as (1) “said of a color: very dark and almost indistinguishable from black” (“Dicho de un color: Muy oscuro y que casi no se distingue del negro”); (2) as a Cuban term “Said of a person: of the black race” (“Cuba. Dicho de una persona: De raza negra”); and (3) as a Mexican label “Said of a person: of brown skin” (“Méx. Dicho de una persona: De piel morena”). *Negro* is “Said of a person: Whose skin is of a black color” (“Dicho de una persona: Cuya piel es de color negro”). (All English translations are mine.) I adopt brownish blackness and blackish brownness from W. D. Wright, who takes them up as descriptors in *Black History and Black Identity*. Wright informs us, “Skeptics of a Black ethnic group might point out that all people of that group are not black in color, and thus are not all black people. There is truth in this observation, but some falsity in it as well. What is false about it is the projection of the idea of a pure black race, which has never existed in the world, not even in Africa. In Africa there have always been shades of blackness, including brownish blackness or blackish brownness, or even shades of brownness. [. . .] The amalgamation of white and black people in the United States has not destroyed the black race as such, as that race is still overwhelmingly black, blackish brown, or brownish black, as it was before coming to the United States” (2002: 90).

2. This brownness speaks through a bodily taxonomy. For example, Oscar Hijuelos codifies and naturalizes this Latino brownness in relation to his brother, José-Pascual, whose hair (not skin) “of a brownish-red coloration bespoke somewhat more Latino origins” (2011: 8).

3. See, for example, Christina Sharpe’s superb study, *Monstrous Intimacies: Making Post-Slavery Subjects*, where she brings to light formulations of “the (New World) *black* subject” (2010: 3). These subjections— with their routine repetition of sexual violence on these particular bodies— organize the *blackening* of black subjects and how we come to “know” them as both black and blackened. Sharpe calls the routinization of this violence, as her monograph’s title elucidates, “monstrous intimacies.”

These “awful intimate and monstrous configurations” both in slavery and freedom, from her perspective, rely on “the uses of blackness over time” (14, 4). They link black and blackened diasporic “others” through “everyday mundane horrors that aren’t acknowledged to be horrors.” Sharpe defines her ongoing processes of subjectification as a “set of known and unknown performances and inhabited horrors, desires and positions produced, reproduced, circulated, and transmitted, that are breathed in like air and often unacknowledged to be monstrous.” These productions and reproductions of “fundamental familiar violence” are “the most readable and locatable still through the horrors enacted on the black body after slavery and the official periods of emancipation and through further colonialism, imperialism, and the relative freedoms of segregation, desegregation, and independence, whether the body is in the Caribbean, the Americas, England, or post-independence Africa” (2–3). A provocative question raised in Sharpe’s work holds great influence here too: “Do those black and blackened people who can’t or don’t claim that proximity to whiteness [. . .] as positive inheritance become the sole visible bearers of the trauma of the survival of slavery and racism, sole signifiers of an as yet unerased proximity to the blood-stained gate?” (22).

Please allow me, at this point, to better explain *Latining America’s* analytic quest. I do not make or envision Latino and Latina vocalizations of brownness akin to whiteness. I direct attention to the ways that brownness walks alongside dark brownness and blackness in Latino, Latina, and African American contexts—giving weight to how the blackened signifier moves not only through the demonstrably black and blackened body but also through a dark browned subject that has also been blackened. This is not to say that the black body remains locked in its “own” blackened signifiers. This chapter proposes that the blackened signifier is also “popping” up in this Latino and Latina economy of brown and dark brown indigent Latinities. The blackened signifier also migrates and is transmitted through other bodies and narratives. It turns to another doubling of how processes of blackening fracture at the level of meaning for strictly brown (Latino and Latina) and black (African American) signification. To adapt Lewis Gordon’s words, “The black, subject to interpretation, becomes a designation that could be held by different groups at different times and as such is both concrete and metaphorical” (2000: 63).

4. As Jennifer P. Mathews reminds us, the *sapodilla* or *chicozapote* tree from which chewing gum, *chicle*, is extracted has Mesoamerican origins. Aztec and Maya pre-Columbian cultures had multiple uses for the sapodilla that ranged from chewing the natural gum and eating the tree’s fruit (*sapote*) to using it to treat hemorrhoids and dysentery to exploiting the wood for firewood and building materials (2009: 1–18). The development of chicle as a commercial industry can be traced to the 1870s, when

key entrepreneurial enterprises by Thomas Adams Sr. and William Wrigley Jr. paved the way for “the great American invention” (38). On the other side of this American invention are the gum collectors or rubber tappers, known as *chicleros*, who face natural difficulties in the Mesoamerican jungles where chicle camps are located. The gum collectors largely comprise indigenous workers, who have been viewed rather negatively: “Local peoples generally feared the chicleros and considered them to be one of the dangers of the jungle, as many were rumored to be ex-convicts, Maya rebels, and criminals on the lam” (85). Mathews mentions, “in addition to their violent reputations, chicleros were criticized for being promiscuous vectors of venereal disease” (86). And yet chicleros are a “complex and misunderstood group [that] has played a significant role in a truly American industry” (92). I include this note to indicate the inseparable signifying space of the economically docile Indian: from commercial production and the selling of chicle to the embodiment of a “different” human subject.

5. Apolinar “hardly counted as a male because he did not count as a human being” (Martin, 2009: 37).

6. Castellanos Moya’s narrator “passed the time, enjoying the brilliant morning among these hundreds of Indians decked out in their Sunday dress of so many festive colors, among the most salient being that joyous cheerful red, as if red had nothing to do with blood and sorrow but was rather the emblem of happiness for these hundreds of domestic servants enjoying their day off in the large square. [. . .] I realized that not one of those women with slanted eyes and toasted brown skin awoke my sexual appetite or my prurient interests” (2008: 67–68).

7. Mayas are not off the radar in Cancún; they form a visible and significant presence and contribute to the area’s way of living. M. Bianet Castellanos’s *A Return to Servitude* calls attention to Cancún’s tourist industry and how it has fostered, at least since the 1970s, internal indigenous migrations from the Yucatán peninsula to Mexico’s most popular traveling destination. Maya workers make up more than one-third of Cancún’s population. They are also “the second largest indigenous group in Mexico” (2010: 83; xxxv). They were recruited for wage work “from the surrounding countryside to fill the vast labor supply needed to construct this tourist center” (xviii). The Maya worker “represents the ideal body,” since “within the tourist industry, the submissive, exotic, racialized body—which is feminized by the virtue of the work being performed, regardless of the fact that both men and women are employed within this industry—serves as the universal trope by which production is organized and worker subjectivities are constituted” (80).

Castellanos contends that Maya relocation from the countryside to Cancún transforms them “into modern citizens and urban workers,” engaged with “the ideological struggles generated by experiencing work and life within export-processing zones

dominated by the production of services” (2010: 78). Maya migrant workers employed in service work are transformed into “‘modern’ citizens.” Those previously hired as farm labor underwent corporate “disciplinary tactics” where they “learned to adhere to a time clock, acquired new skills, and adopted new behavior and attitudes (e.g., submissiveness and attentiveness). [. . .] They learned the intricacies of service: setting a table, greeting a client, adopting a hotel’s standards of cleanliness, and so forth” (92–93). All the same, Cancún’s tourist industry, like maquiladora manufacturing, is typified by “low wages, repetitive motion, attempts to control a worker’s sexuality, limited job promotion, a lack of economic security, and a reliance on racialized bodies” (xxx). Castellanos casts light on Mexican modernization projects that required indigenous assimilation into the nation-state. They were forced “by the state to adopt Western dress and stop speaking their language” and “exited the historical stage of national memory in the 1930s, only to be included once again when national discourse embraced multiculturalism in the 1970s” (xxii). Cancún’s narrative for the traveling class counts on Maya origins. Yet it is “marked by a growing disconnection with the region [. . .] and a pronounced articulation with a global economy” (81).

8. It remains to be said that not all degrees of black and brown invisibility within these discourses are tantamount to a homogeneously hypothesized black and brown collectivity. Brown critical engagement among U.S. Latinos and Latinas with Afro-Latino populations is, at best, embryonic. Even more, as Ernesto Sagás identifies in the *Latino Studies Journal*, “most Latino studies scholarship” has the tendency to principally concern “itself with the examination of the Chicano, Puerto Rican, and Cuban experiences in the United States” (1998: 5). Sagás conveys, in the context of U.S. Dominican populations, that hierarchical perceptibilities direct which Latino and Latina subgroup has more visibility and legitimate claims to being institutionalized within the field of Latino/a studies. This absence of black Latinos and Latinas and groups outside the aforementioned Latino/a trinity also echoes the types of sedentary African Americanness recognized in U.S. discourses on blackness. Mary Waters discusses, with regard to West Indian migrations to North America, that “the invisibility of the Caribbean immigrants as immigrants [alludes to] their visibility as blacks” (1997: 3). The lives of certain individuals from the Afro-Caribbean imply struggles with processes of negotiating migratory identities from the Americas, of altering such identifications to U.S.-centered notions of Americanness, and of specifically becoming *black* Americans.

9. Vicki L. Ruiz offers this note on Mexican, Mexican American, Chicano, and Chicana categories: “People of Mexican birth or descent refer to themselves by many names — Mexicana/o, Mexican American, and Chicana/o (to name just three). Self-identification speaks volumes about regional, generational, and even political orien-

tations. Mexicana/o typically refers to immigrants, while Mexican American signifies U.S. birth. Chicana/o reflects a political consciousness born of the Chicana/o Student Movement, often a generational marker for those of us coming of age during the 1960s and 1970s. Chicana/o also has been embraced by our elders and our children who share in the political ideals of the movement” (2004: 344).

10. The idea of a linear U.S. Latino and Latina brownness that omits other dark brown tints is particularly evocative post-9/11. Some U.S. Latino and Latina cultural workers are disentangling the meanings of Latino and Latina brownness — engulfed by issues of migration, incarceration, education, employment, political activism, and justice — through the U.S. quest for and a formation of a twenty-first-century brown genealogy. Consider the group the Chicano Messengers of Spoken Word, composed of artists Paul Flores, Amalia Ortiz, and Marc David Pinate. They titled their first play *Fear of a Brown Planet*, dialoguing with Public Enemy’s 1990 canonical hip-hop album, *Fear of a Black Planet*. The Chicano Messengers of Spoken Word’s piece, which premiered in 2005, was envisioned as a “new spoken word/hip hop theater play.” *Fear of a Brown Planet* describes how two Chicanos and a Chicana find themselves in “a psycho-spiritual journey into the dark prison of the mind in a quest for meaning to our collective Brown existence” (Mojica Arts, 2005). But this brownness reads like a referent locked in Latino and Latina specificities. Asked about what sparked the group’s enterprise by the *Houston Chronicle* in 2007, Flores touched on the political effects of brownness from a Chicano/Latino composition. He qualified the group’s production in this manner: “We invented a scenario commenting on the issue of ‘brownness.’ If, as projected, by 2050 the majority population will be either Latino or mixed heritage, what is the potential effect of that? We started with three archetypal characters we find in the community. I play a stubborn construction worker who barely graduated high school and was always told he wouldn’t amount to anything. Marc’s character is a radical labor-party lawyer who’s now defending drug dealers. Amalia plays a Hispanic socialite/trophy wife, who’s married to a judge. Having them find themselves in an internment camp lets us comment on post-9/11 America” (quoted in Evans, 2007).

11. Caramelo, as a descriptor brought up in the book, implies a “corn teeth smile” (Cisneros, 2002: 36), a brown skin color reminiscent of a peanut (11), a hue “bright as a copper *veinte centavos* color after you’ve sucked it” (34), a tone “more bright than chicharrón” (74), a shade that is “creamy” (103), and a texture “as dark as cajeta” (116). Even though the streaks of caramelo, “like all mestizos, [come] from everywhere” (96), a caramel state encompasses Indianness in light, intermediate, dark, and extra dark tones.

12. Piri Thomas’s phrase from chapter 11 of *Down These Mean Streets* comes to mind: “How to Be a *Negro* without Really Trying” (1997: 95–104). Thomas does not

italicize the word “Negro” in his book, since he uses it in an English-language context. I emphasize the word in this instance to mark its existence in Spanish as well as to bring out its “Latin” brownness.

13. But if blacks-browns have an intimate knowledge of their *negro* location in the U.S. labor force, such approximation also administers blackness as a distant site. This black distance from brownness, as it could play out in the service industry, underscores brown submissiveness and desexualization. Consider, for instance, “wise-cracks” about black coffee, or *café negro*. As Renán Almendárez Coello (aka “El Cucuy de la Mañana”) recounts it, “¿Usted sabe qué le dice la taza al café? [. . .] ¡Hay, qué negro tan caliente!” (2002: 11). Or, loosely translated, the idiom is, “Do you know what the cup tells its coffee? [. . .] Oh, what a hot *negro*!”

14. Cisneros spells out racial hierarchies through combinations of Indian, black (*negro*), and Spanish ancestry; see the chapter “Echando Palabras” (2002: 79–86). Cisneros’s inclusion of this social dictum resonates with another Latin-American aphorism: “trabajo como negro para vivir como blanco” (I work like a *negro*, to live like a white person).

15. In connection to Mexican migrations and Mexican American ethnoracial identity formation, Tomás R. Jiménez proffers the notion of “immigrant replenishment.” This concept refers to the ways in which ongoing Mexican migration “sustains both the cultural content of ethnic identity and the ethnic boundaries that distinguish both groups.” It is “the means by which Mexican Americans come to feel more positively attached to their ethnic roots.” But renewal and attachment also have their implications in U.S. society, as Mexican and Mexican American experiences invariably become “new” to the United States, barring “Mexican Americans from being fully regarded as part of the quilt of ethnic groups that make up the ‘nation of immigrants’” (2010: 5). Jiménez elaborates, “The consequences of replenishment depend in large part on the status that the replenishing immigrants occupy in U.S. society. If the immigrant group occupies a low status in the host context — as is the case with the largely poor, laboring, and unauthorized Mexican-immigrant population — then those who are members of the ethnic group being replenished may experience status degradation” (21–22).

16. In Richard T. Rodríguez’s words, “If there is a single issue almost always at stake in Chicano/a cultural politics since the Chicano movement of the 1960s and 1970s, it is the family in some shape, form, or fashion. Indeed, the family is a crucial symbol and organizing principle that by and large frames the history of Mexican Americans in the United States” (2009: 2). Rodríguez’s work, however, departs from “exclusionary kinship relations” that have provided “the foundation on which la familia become adopted as an organizing strategy for communitarian politics” wedded to masculinity, nationalism, and heteropatriarchy (7, 15). He takes on “the family trope as a double-

edged sword, a signifier with many meanings that both troubles *and* assists in the struggle for communitarian politics” (12).

17. See “Brown, Brownness, Brown Pride, Brownout” and “Brown Berets” (Allatson, 2007: 49–51).

18. I provided some working parameters for the Chicano movement in the notes to the introduction, but we can also profit from this straightforward delineation by sociologist Marta Lopez-Garza. She clarifies, “In the mid-1960s, militant Mexican-American nationalists introduced the word ‘Chicano’ to the North American vocabulary, and, through the Chicano movement, brought class and race consciousness to Mexican-American politics. The movement was an informal ideological umbrella for a number of Mexican-American (or primarily Mexican-American) organizations. Among the most influential of these were the United Farm Workers, the Federal Alliance of Land Grants in New Mexico, the Brown Berets, Crusade for Justice in Colorado, and Chicano student organizations, such as the Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano de Aztlán (MECHA) and the United Mexican American Students (UMAS). Identifying oneself as Chicano (someone born of Mexican ancestry, but living in the United States) or with ‘Chicanismo’ became a politically significant factor reflecting political mobilization and active participation in social change. (The leading explanation of the origin of the term ‘Chicano’ is that the Nahuatl or Aztec pronunciation of the word describing people living in Mexico is *Mechicano*. The term had evolved through various stages of meaning by the time the nationalists appropriated it as a political statement.) A Chicano was one who did not wish to be known as ‘American’ in the U.S. sense, but whose history and experience were somewhat different from those living in Mexico” (1992: 35).

19. *La raza* also translates as “the race.” I employ “the people” to speak to what Rivera identifies as the “stories of Mexican peoplehood,” which are “fundamental to understanding not only the contradictory logic of American democratic culture but also Mexican American cultural production and the ambivalent location of Mexicans as citizen-subjects in the United States.” Rivera communicates that “the people” operates as “the cultural framework for democracy, ‘the people’ have historically become a discursive site that fostered both egalitarianism and exclusion and inclusion. To this end, defining who counts as ‘the people’ reveals the contradictory logic of democratic nation-states and the ways in which rhetoric about the people facilitates democratic legitimacy and power for the majority population in the United States” (2006: 3–4). At the same time, I recognize the historical specificity and function of *la raza* as “the race.” Haney López submits that the “repeated use of *la raza*” in East Los Angeles during the arrests and indictments of the East LA Thirteen “began to translate more readily into ‘the race’ rather than ‘the people.’” For Haney López,

“Mexicans using that phrase [la raza] in East Los Angeles in the late 1960s were not deaf to its resonance when translated into English as ‘race.’ Increasingly, the U.S. sense of race informed the activist community’s invocation of la raza as they moved toward a non-white conception of themselves” (2003: 170). For a critique of la raza as a political movement and its patriarchal cultural nationalism, see Chabram-Dernersesian (1992).

20. I use Chicano in this instance, rather than “Chicano/a,” or “Chicano and Chicana,” concurring with Ramón A. Gutiérrez’s stance in relation to Chicano mobilization from the mid-1960s to the 1970s. He writes, “It is currently common to use the term Chicano/a instead of simply Chicano to indicate that the word includes females too. [. . .] I retain Chicano here for historically specific reasons, namely that Chicano as a political identity was initially claimed largely by men” (2004: 294).

21. Sheila Marie Contreras identifies the movement’s indigenous turn as “Chicana/o indigenism.” She remarks that “Chicanas and Chicanos are indigenous to the Americas” and “bear the weight of this history of social relations of power as they attempt to conceptualize relationships both to Mexico and to the United States” (2008: 1, 2). The movement’s appropriation of iconic signifiers was “[a]rticulated within a matrix of recovered Mesoamerican mythology.” Chicana/o indigenism therefore “mobilize[d] the story of the Aztec migration from the ancestral homeland of Aztlán, the cosmogonic narrative of *el Quinto Sol*/the Fifth Sun, and the cross-culturally significant figure of the plumed serpent, also known as the god-king Quetzalcoatl. Indigenism found outlets in fiction and poetry, in public mural art of the period, and in the drama productions of *El Teatro Campesino*” (71–72).

22. There were some political exceptions in terms of Chicano collaborations with U.S. African Americans, of course, and Haney does bring them to mind in his East Los Angeles discussion of the Chicano movement years. Tatcho Mindiola Jr., Yolanda Flores Niemann, and Nestor Rodriguez also make note that activists from the black and Chicano movements in the Houston area “supported each other ideologically and sometimes cooperated in political work.” Still, they underscore that “[l]ong after the Black and Chicano movements subsided, the perception of the need for intergroup political solidarity remained a value for many African Americans and Chicanos. However, stereotypes and competition for resources, among other factors, have mediated this solidarity” (2003: 11). These authors contend that “[s]everal of the terms describing Hispanics [by African American respondents in their research] deal with competition, for example, taking over jobs, [being] underpaid, [becoming a] growing population, [and acting as] opportunistic” (33). They also note that their “results indicate that in general African Americans have more positive views of Hispanics than vice versa” (35).

23. Santa Ana methodologically relies on the *Los Angeles Times*, because “it is the newspaper of greatest distribution in California. It is the local newspaper of California’s most populous city and home to the nation’s largest Latino population” (2002: 54).

24. “What did Nixon know?” Richard Rodriguez asks. “Did he really devise to rid himself of a bunch of spic agitators by officially designating them a minority, entitled to all rights?” (2002: 117). Nixon is also responsible for a Latino and Latina look southward: “As a result of Nixon’s noun, our relationship to Latin America became less remote” (121).

25. Considering Márez’s imaginative assembling of the “lowbrow(n)” qualifier, one also wonders if a “highbrow(n)” brown style can emerge. What would be the “highbrow(n)” influences? What would they look and sound like?

26. Cf. Kemo the Blaxican’s website (D. Thomas, n.d.).

27. Hazel Rowley explains in her Richard Wright biography that his maternal grandmother, Margaret Bolden, who is also depicted in *Black Boy*, “was so small and slight, with deep set brown eyes and long straight hair. She was so light-skinned that until she opened her mouth and spoke pure Southern Negro dialect, strangers thought she was white. Her grandson Richard Wright believed she was a mixture of Irish, Scottish, and French stock, ‘in which somewhere Negro blood had somewhere and somehow been infused’” (2001: 1–2). And “Wright’s paternal grandmother, Laura Calvin, was thought to be partly Choctaw Indian” (4).

Audre Lorde’s mother, Linda, passed for Spanish in New York (De Veaux, 2004: 11). Alexis De Veaux, Lorde’s biographer, writes that Lorde recognized “herself as the darkest child” and illustrates moments that speak to Anzaldúa’s struggles with coming to terms for being “la prieta,” her family’s dark one. De Veaux writes, “Not pretty, not light-skinned, she was the outsider in a family of outsiders” (18). Lorde’s 1954 trip to Mexico exhibited fluid states of brownness, blackness, and overlapping Latin-American nationalities. “At times,” De Veaux brings up, “she was mistaken for Cuban by Mexicans and for Mexican by Americans” (49). Lorde “was in awe of seeing brown-skinned people, of every hue, wherever she went” in Mexico. She wrote in a missive that “she felt ‘like an onion,’ peeled of layers of its own smothering skins” (50).

One Zora Neale Hurston comment worth citing here is her reflection, “I feel like a brown bag of miscellany propped against a wall. Against a wall in company with other bags, white, red and yellow” (1997: 1010). This statement on the assortment of inhabitants of this mixed brown bag reflects Latino and Latina states too. Hurston is referring, in this regard, to U.S. African American complexion tests that ranked and organized dark and light blackness around the brown paper bag. These tests connote, as Audrey Elisa Kerr has keenly interpreted it, “degrees of acceptance and inclusion

(that is, if one is fairer than the brown bag).” The brown paper bag forms a part of a “complexion lore” that “has been used liberally and with great frequency by African Americans throughout the twentieth and into the twenty-first century, with references to paper bag parties, paper bag churches, brown bag clubs, or brown bag social circles that have resulted in a proscribed language of exclusion and exclusiveness” (2005: 272).

28. Harriet Jacobs expounded on this matter: “Southern women often marry a man knowing that he is the father of many little slaves. [. . .] They regard such children as property [. . .] and it is seldom that they do not make them aware of this by passing them into the slave-trader’s hands. [. . .] and *thus getting them out of their sight*” (2000: 37). Once the visible markers that produce black mixture — and the violence attached to the emergence of “black mestizos” — are out of sight, to borrow from the colloquial expression, they are also out of the normative mind. Mestizaje was dropped from black mixture in the United States. There was no room for this type of mestizaje, as U.S. laws of the time mandated. An appendix in the *Narrative of the Life of Henry Box Brown* (1851) notes that the state of South Carolina did not really differentiate between “negroes, mulattoes, or mertizoes” (H. Brown, 2002: 71). The word “mestizos” in this Anglophone context is listed as “mertizoes.” Both terms are interchangeable. The misspelling of mestizos signals unfamiliarity with — and a “newness” around — an unrecognizable term as well as population. The incomprehensibility of a classification like mestizo and an ideology like mestizaje still create relative confusion in the twenty-first-century United States. The *PMLA*’s tribute to Anzaldúa in January 2006 included a typographical error that demonstrated the foreignness of mestizaje. A recurring misprint identified mestizaje as *mestizahe* (Martín Alcoff, 2006; emphasis added). Although this typo could be regarded as a genuine oversight, the misprint evokes incomprehensibility about racial mixture in America; perhaps, even a negation of the “unreadable” yet contradictory positions that subaltern subjects can occupy. It is easier to see and differentiate “them” as “nonwhite” than to address the ways mixed whiteness permeates in these supposedly unchanging black (and brown) states.

29. My intent here is to show brownness in all its manifestations and in contexts that cannot be reduced to “brown” Spanish-speaking Latino and Latina bodies. I recognize that the brownness of Senna’s dad, Carl Senna, could be attributed to the fact that the family believed he was the son of a Mexican boxer “who had abandoned his wife with three kids and was never seen again” (2009: 16). As far back as 1998 — the year that Senna’s first novel, *Caucasia*, was published — the author identified herself as “a black girl with a WASP mother and a black-Mexican father [with] a face that harkens to Andalusia, not Africa” (1998: 15). But Senna reveals a more complicated

story in *Where Did You Sleep Last Night? A Personal History*, where she uncovers that her paternal grandfather could actually be an Irish priest.

30. The list of racial terms Piri Thomas defines in alphabetical order are “*los blancos*: the whites,” “*mi negrito*: my little black one,” “*morenito*: little dark brown one,” “*moreno*: dark brown, almost black,” “*moyeto*: Negro, black man,” and “*tregeño, tregeña*: dark-skinned” (1967: 332–33). Although the last two words are not amended in the thirtieth-anniversary edition of *Down These Mean Streets* (1997), Thomas may conceivably mean *trigueño* and *trigueña*. Thomas also provides brief definitions for another problematic way of being through sexual orientation. The two debasing labels—the other double haunting a Latino masculinity—are “*maricón*: homosexual, faggot” and “*pato*: faggot, homosexual” (1967: 333). These two derogatory terms in Spanish—*maricón* and *pato*—become formalized in translation through the courteous insertion, in English, of homosexual, which needs no translation in either language: they are both written in the same way and have congruous definitions.

31. Santiago’s glossary defines *negrita* or *negrito* as an “[e]ndearment, little black one” (1993: 273). This theme of abandoning a seemingly authentic national way of life is articulated in Oscar Hijuelos’s first book of nonfiction, *Thoughts without Cigarettes* (2011). Hijuelos titles his memoir’s first chapter more forcefully than Santiago, calling it “When I Was Still Cuban,” leading us to speculate on how his Cubanness was abandoned (or altered) and what he has now become (2011: 3–52).

32. Ginetta E. B. Candelario puts forward that “Dominican whiteness” has been “an explicitly achieved (and achievable) status with connotations of social, political, and economic privilege, and blackness signaled foreignness, socioeconomic subordination, and inferiority.” Dominican “blackness”—or, in Candelario’s language, “discourses of negritude”—are not utilized as a mode of Dominican national representation and self-identification. Instead, “Dominicans use language that affirms their ‘Indian’ heritage—*Indio*, *Indio oscuro*, *Indio claro*, *trigüeno* [*sic*]—and signals their resistance to foreign authority, whether Spanish or Haitian, and their autochthonous claims to sovereignty while accounting for the preponderance of medium to dark skin and complexions in the population” (2007: 5). Candelario’s study hinges on “Dominican identity discourses that negotiate blackness and Hispanicity” (6). She adds, “Although Dominicans often share the experience of being Caribbean immigrants who are perceived to be black, unlike British West Indians Dominicans are also Hispanic. Hispanicity in both the United States and the Dominican Republic offers an alternative to blackness. Although ‘Hispanic’ is a racialized non-white category in the United States, it is also a non-black one” (12).

33. Moraga classifies this approach to and use of “truth” in autobiography as the “fiction of our lives.” Give attention to this fragment: “Through the act of writing

that so-called autobiography, I learned that a story well told is a story embellished and re-visioned just like the stories that poured from my mother's mouth in our family kitchen some forty years earlier. The fiction of our lives — how we conceive our histories by heart — can sometimes provide a truth far greater than any telling of a tale frozen to the facts" (2011: 3–4). These autobiographical moments are reinterpretations of past events, with creative and critical emendations, as the memoirist sees fit.

34. Anzaldúa is mindful of the implications of this color consciousness in her essay, "La Prieta." In penning this composition, Anzaldúa records that she "was terrified," because it necessitated that she "be hard on people of color who are the oppressed victims. I am still afraid because I will have to call us on a lot of shit like our own racism, our fear of women and sexuality" (1983: 198).

35. Menchaca notes that in this hierarchical racial structure "[m]estizos enjoyed a higher social prestige than Indians, but were considered inferior to the Spaniards" (2001: 63). As for blacks in Mexico, Menchaca explicates, "Free *afromestizos* were accorded the same legal privileges as the *mestizos*. Because they were of partially African descent, however, they were stigmatized and considered socially inferior to the Indians and *mestizos*" (64). Under U.S. expansion in the nineteenth century, "state governments prevented 'American-born' racial minorities from exercising their citizenship rights under the Fourteenth Amendment. Anglo Americans argued that the spirit of the Fourteenth Amendment applied only to Blacks and Whites and that therefore Asians, American Indians, Mexicans, and 'half-breeds' were not entitled to its protection." De jure racial segregation applied to nonwhite Mexicans who "were legally excluded from public facilities reserved for whites" (287). For other studies on the role of pigmentation in the U.S. Southwest and its interconnections with race and gender, vide Haas (1996) and Gutiérrez (1991).

36. The larger impression claimed is that strands of the Caribbean resonate throughout the Americas. Certainly the connection to Mexico and Greater Mexico is fitting, given their prominent associations with indigenosity. As Martin writes, however, the Caribbeanness of Mexico is evident to such cognoscenti as Gabriel García Márquez, whose process of "Latin Americanization" occurred while living in that nation. It was there where García Márquez "absorbed the fact that Mexico, a desert country and a high plains country, was also, in effect, a Caribbean country" (Martin, 2009: 264).

37. It bears mentioning that the articulation — or more accurately phrased, the enunciation — of a *Latina* project appears in an aporetic, if not unconvincing, manner in *Borderlands/La Frontera*. Consider, as a brief illustration, how Anzaldúa presupposes that Latinas are fluent Spanish speakers whose purported linguistic hegemony is at par with the Real Academia Española, or the Royal Spanish Academy. She states,

“Chicanas feel uncomfortable talking in Spanish to Latinas, afraid of their censure. Their language was not outlawed in their countries.” Anzaldúa further contends, “We don’t say *claro* (to mean yes), *imagínate*, or *me emociona*, unless we picked up Spanish from Latinas, out of a book, or in a classroom” (1999: 79–80). Latinas, in this instance, mean Latin American women in both Latin America and the United States; additionally, they seemingly stand out as more educated. “The first time I heard two women, a Puerto Rican and a Cuban, say the word ‘*nosotras*,’” she writes, “I was shocked. I had not known the word existed. Chicanas use *nosotros* whether we’re male or female. [. . .] Even our own people, other Spanish speakers *nos quieren poner candados en la boca*. They would hold us back with their bag of *reglas de academia*” (76).

These perceptions — which occlude the regionalisms and spoken differences in the Spanish language within the Americas — renders U.S. Latinos and Latinas, many of whom speak, like Anzaldúa, a “border tongue” and are thus neither “fully” fluent in Spanish and English, as more linguistically tied to Latin America than the United States. Such understandings could have precarious effects within “the borderlands,” being that Latino and Latina could be read as normative. Their “otherness” is neutralized and, curiously enough, is not “heard” within “brown” border discourses that chronicle “outsiderness” from both English and Spanish. I mention this point not to quibble with Anzaldúa, but as an assigned task — if not an open question — for Latino/a studies scholars to acknowledge: Can Latinoness and Latinaness be disburdened from a suspect state within “established” U.S. groups?

38. Still, there are contradictions in how Chicano, Chicana, Latino, and Latina subjects are often positioned in relatively equalizing terms — even within these two distinct trajectories that somehow institutionally become one. For instance, Chicanos and Latinos *are* discursively collapsed in many U.S. institutions, as evinced in “Chicano/Latino studies programs” at such institutions as California State University, Long Beach; Eastern Washington University; Sonoma State University; the University of California, Berkeley; the University of California, Irvine; Michigan State University; Portland State University; Scripps College; and University of Wisconsin, Madison, among many others.

39. Du Bois’s observations on the term “Negro,” and which groups are subsumed as such, prove fruitful. “As long as the majority of men mean black or brown folk when they say ‘Negro,’ so long will Negro be the name of folks brown and black” (1996a: 70).

40. Moraga’s quotation on her mother and how color creates a different class of people reads, “She often called other lower-income Mexicans ‘braceros,’ or ‘wet-backs,’ referring to herself and her family as ‘a different class of people’” (1983b: 28). Helena María Viramontes’s depiction of Mexican American farmworkers in *Under the Feet of Jesus*, a novel dedicated to César Chávez (1927–93), echoes Moraga’s take on the racial

connotations of fieldwork. The appearance of Estrella, a central figure in the text, is described as “[d]irty face, fingernails lined with mud [. . .] tennis shoes soiled, brown smears like coffee stains on her dress where she had cleaned her hands” (1995b: 137).

41. Hughes also brings this to view in *The Big Sea*: “On many sides, the color-line barred your way to making a living in America” (1993: 86).

42. In using “cosmic” and “uncosmic,” I am referencing José Vasconcelos’s theory, from 1925, of *la raza cósmica*, the cosmic race. For Vasconcelos (1882–1959), Latin America demonstrated greater promise in the development of a new age because of the region’s *mestizaje*. This new age foments aesthetic ideologies, creative endeavors, and racial mixtures that will bring into fruition a new (Latin-American) humanity. Although Vasconcelos embraces the heterogeneity of racial compositions, he does not account for Indianness and blackness. Most provocative about his delineation is its approach to race mixing through an “artistic impulse” dictated by appearance. Vasconcelos’s idea of a “new” racial project moves toward the elimination of blackness, or what Frantz Fanon called a process of “lactification” that “whiten[s] the race” and “ensure[s] its whiteness” (2008: 29–30). Vasconcelos forewarns, “in a few decades of aesthetic eugenics, the Black may disappear, together with the types that a free instinct of beauty may go on signaling as fundamentally recessive and undeserving” (1997: 32). Through what he calls “the faculty of personal taste,” the quest to eliminate “ugliness” emerges. “The very ugly will not procreate,” Vasconcelos instructs. “They will have no desire to procreate. What does it matter, then, that all the races mix with each other if ugliness will find no cradle? Poverty, defective education, the scarcity of beautiful types, the misery that makes people ugly, all those calamities will disappear from the future social change. The fact, common today, of a mediocre couple feeling proud of having multiplied misery will seem repugnant then, it will seem a crime” (30).

This aesthetic breeding process involves what Felix Clay identified, under the framework of “The Origin of Aesthetic Emotion,” as “the pleasures of recognition.” In it, “we find that rhythmical movement, or a harmonious combination of colour or sound, can by themselves give rise to a simple feeling of pleasure that is instinctive and quite independent of any mental or intellectual appreciation of the cause” (1908: 282). One could conjecture that Vasconcelos seeks an emotional response to the (“cosmic”) results based on his theory of race as an art form. Latin American artistic bodies are pushed into the realm of “modern,” “first world” visual *pleasure*. This pleasure of the racial text is “naturalized” to the extent that this regional beauty—or even the race of artists—transacts a message for the rest of the world. As works of “art,” these Vasconcelian concoctions illuminate this question: how will his cosmic beauties—or, to put it with less veneration, cookie-cutter multiplication of cosmic things—be val-

ued and judged by the white American and European worlds he is trying to mimic? Marilyn Grace Miller substantiates that the rise of Vasconcelos's idea "of a beneficial mixed race was riddled with the numerous obstacles and contradictions imbedded in a colonial history in which questions of racial difference and distinction were paramount. The complexity of the racial discourse produced in the colonies is most graphically portrayed, perhaps, in several sets of paintings which catalogues racial types, or *castas*. Proceeding from a strange racial alchemy, earlier broad divisions of Spaniard, Indian, *negro*, and mestizo or mulatto were splintered into retrograde hybrids such as the *lobo* (wolf) and the *salta atrás*" (2004: 2). Seen in this light, this Vasconcelian structuring of dark Latinness as ugly requires a new visual order of aestheticized pleasure.

43. An incident in Thomas's *Down These Mean Streets* mirrors this conflation of "negrito" and "ugly." Thomas describes how after returning from playing one day, his mother urges him to take a bath. As the fourteen-year-old son bemoans this quotidian activity, the mother responds, "I have to love you because only your mother could love you, *un negrito* and ugly" (1997: 19). The use of the "affectionate" negrito differs from Rodriguez's portrait in that there is not a possessive operating here, just the article *un*. This incident also proves provocative for another set of reasons: the qualifiers employed for the teenage Thomas move through a particular racial hierarchy that builds on his actions. Walking into his apartment and slamming the door shut makes him a simple "*muchacho*." His silliness/"monkeying around" is soon assessed as "a funny *morenito*" (18). His compliments to his mother later earn him the expression, "*Ai, qué negrito*" (19).

44. Citing the court transcript of the 1946 landmark case *Mendez v. Westminster*, where educational boundaries in Mexican neighborhoods led to school segregation, Ruiz makes note of "a laundry list of hygienic deficiencies peculiar to Mexican children that warranted, in part, their segregation." The Mexican dirtiness to which Rodriguez alludes can infer, as Ruiz lists the deficiencies of the time: "lice, impetigo, tuberculosis, generally dirty hands, face, neck, and ears" (Ruiz, 2004: 356).

45. Just like a passing black figure portrayed in U.S. African American fiction, people nonfictionally wondered if Rodriguez's mother "is Italian or Portuguese" (1982: 114). But the definitive response is "'We are Mexicans,' my mother and father would say, and taught their four children to say whenever we (often) were asked about our ancestry" (115).

46. Moraga speaks to her "white" U.S. American and "brown" Mexican mixture in her latest enterprise also. Consider the following excerpts: "My racial identity has always been more ambiguous," she observes in *A Xicana Codex of Changing Consciousness* (2011: 12). "Me, a light-skinned mixed-blood Chicana with lousy Spanish" (15).

47. Given Moraga's "social advantage" of looking white, as she calls it (2011: 7), Soto emphasizes her capacity to write "herself *into* a narrative of racialized difference,

emerging as they do from a profound desire to be recognized and engaged as a racialized subject. To that end, Moraga rearranges and reconfigures the epistemological and ontological tropes that one expects to find in accounts of difference” (2005: 238).

48. Soto states, “Moraga’s self-racialization depends on the idea that even if one’s formative socialization did not include the daily experiences and negotiations of being seen and treated by dominant society as racially different and, importantly, racially inferior (the long-term cumulative effects of which presumably could never be alienable), one can grasp the singular concept of race well enough at the theoretical and historical levels to incorporate it decisively into one’s personhood as an adult” (2005: 250).

49. Notions of the “American” tragic mulatto come to mind, of the incessantly conflicted, mixed-race subject that has functioned under Donald Bogle’s lens as “the third figure of the black pantheon” (2001: 9). Hortense J. Spillers expands that “this peculiar new-world invention” is “stranded in cultural ambiguity” (1989: 165). The mulatto was “created to provide a middle ground of latitude between ‘black’ and ‘white,’ the customary and permissible binary agencies of the national adventure, mulatto being, as a neither/nor proposition, inscribed no historic locus, or materiality, that was other than evasive and shadowy on the national landscape.” Yet they embody “an alibi, an excuse for ‘other/otherness’ that the dominant culture could not (cannot now either) appropriate or wish away.” Mulattos are “an accretion of signs that embody the ‘unspeakable,’ of the Everything that the dominant culture would forget, the *mulatto/a*, as term, designates a disguise, covers up, in the century of Emancipation and beyond, the social and political reality of the dreaded African presence.” The “mulatto/a,” Spillers observes, “exists for others,” but he or she is also a “site of contamination” (1989: 165–67; emphasis added).

Spillers’s judicious insertion, in the English language, of a slash and an “a” in the masculine word, “mulatto,” catches the eye. This use is more common now in a romance language like Spanish where categories such as “Latino/a” are written as such to denote gender inclusion. Spillers’s use of *mulatto/a* as far back as 1989 predates Latino/a studies’s employment of “Latino/a” as an analytic classification. *Mulatto/a* invites other views of the masculine-centered trajectory of the mulatto man and, one might add, moves toward forging new corollaries with the mulato or mulata in Latin-American contexts. Although Anzaldúa refers to “mulatto blood” rather than calling herself “mulata,” the same general understanding of the “dreaded African presence” prevails within the indigenous bloodlines her family wishes to advance. On the distinction between mestizos and mulatos in Spanish America, Ilona Katzew submits, “these appellations developed progressively over time and varied from region to region. The terms mestizo and mulato gained widespread popularity from the sixteenth century and remained current until the end of the colonial period. Mestizo referred to

culturally mixed peoples in general and to the combination of Spaniards and Indians in particular, while mulatto — a zoologically inspired term that referred to the hybrid nature of mules — designated the offspring of Spaniards and Africans. [. . .] The term mulatto was appropriate for this kind of mixture instead of the generic mestizo, because this racial combination ‘was deemed uglier and stranger, and to make the point of comparing it to the nature of the mule’” (2004: 43–44).

For an analysis of racial mixture in American literature that dissects the ways in which mulatto and mestiza representations are intertwined, refer to Suzanne Bost’s *Mulattas and Mestizas: Representing Mixed Identities in the Americas, 1850–2000*. “Just as biracialism leads African-American writers to think about the nature of racial identity,” Bost states, “contemporary work by Chicana/o writers often centers on the issue of racial mixture” (2003: 19). There are, of course, moments of divergence. Bost asks, “If mixed-race identity arouses pride for the Latina/o *raza*, why have relatively few African-Americans celebrated the biracialism of the mulatto? Is the mulatto not a border figure and a cultural translator as much as the Mexican-American mestiza? [. . .] While Mexican and Chicana/o histories feature *Mestizaje* as a central component in defining national identity, African-American identity has been built on greater polarization” (20–21). As the reader can discern, I am interested in the structuring of a “brown” — or, in Bost’s phraseology, a “Latina/o *raza*” — mixture that shuns blackness, even one that is mixed, as “mulatto” attests in this Anzaldúan moment of grave concern for her exposing, tumultuous dark marker. African American mixture or fluidity does not become “mixed” only through white contact. Another insightful nexus might be that of the Hispanophone mulata and the function of the mestiza.

50. Soto attends to this reference also, appraising it as a statement that “frame[s] and enact[s] ‘going brown’ as an ongoing discursive process performed at a number of levels, not the least of which is the writing or illocution itself, as the utterances perform the very action they describe. That is, Moraga not only describes a certain kind of speaking to and for her mother (here rendered symbolic of Chicana and Mexican women) that enables her to ‘go brown,’ but uses this kind of speech — indeed, repeats it again and again — to speak/write to us, her readers” (2005: 252).

51. It is also a new image of brownness and brown sexuality vis-à-vis *india* love. Observe, for instance, this stanza: “When her India makes love / it is with the greatest reverence / to color, texture, smell” (Moraga, 1993: 91).

52. Brownness and Indianness conflate and participate in a shared danger. “Since my earliest childhood,” Moraga attests, “I knew Mexican meant Indian. [. . .] I knew ‘Indian’ was dangerous, like lesbianism” (2011: 13).

53. Moraga strives, as well, for these illegitimacies that replenish queerness, unbelonging, and nonnormativity, proclaiming, “May we strive always for illegitimacy

and unlawfulness in this criminal culture. May our thoughts and actions remain illicit. May we continue to make art that incites censorship and threatens to bring the army beating down our desert door” (2011: 17).

54. This is not to say that Anzaldúa’s dark brownness has been entirely evaded and discounted at the academic level. Nor do I suggest that Anzaldúa has conveniently, evenly, and facilely fled from dark brownness. And I certainly do not claim that Anzaldúa’s theories have not been instrumental for Chicanos, Chicanas, Latinos, and Latinas. I am, however, interested in the further excavation of her *dark* matter, insomuch as she is mostly made out as “a brown-skinned” or brown subject (Keating, 2000: 2; 2009). There are glimpses of Anzaldúa’s darkness at the level of criticism. Sonia Saldívar-Hull provides a good example of how Anzaldúa’s “New Mestiza revolutionary theory” operates as a way for “dark women to [reclaim] the right to theorize and create new world visions” (2000: 62–63). Anzaldúa thus accomplishes, in Saldívar-Hull’s estimation, a “conscious rupture with all oppressive traditions of all cultures and traditions” (Anzaldúa, quoted in Saldívar-Hull, 2000: 63).

Indeed, one is inclined to think that Anzaldúa’s personal history of abject dark brownness and her *prieta* status is hinged on an intrinsically oppressive tradition. As a result, her procurement of brownness is fundamental because she resists and attenuates the “traditional” abject location of dark brownness. This *mestiza* spin on Anzaldúa’s burgeoning brownness becomes a new strategy and symbol for the self as well as for the larger constitution of a Chicano and Chicana — and by extension a Latino and Latina — browned “we,” or in Saldívar-Hull’s terms, “collective *historia*” (2000: 71). Yet the thought I do want to advance is that dark brownness has been jettisoned at the discursive level. The social and familial unacceptability of *la prieta* that the reader witnesses in Anzaldúa’s work remains unacceptable and inadmissible. Might there be any limits in a collective self’s recreation, as it fixes itself by shedding dark brownness? Are we relegating dark brownness to an autobiographical memory — a scenario from the transcended past? Brownness hovers over dark brownness as a site and framework of subject recognition. And brownness, in turn, becomes a recognizable counterstory to dark brownness. I encourage further critical labor on dark brownness. The asymmetrical and still untold story of the kinship between brown and dark brown needs to be problematized and analogously brought into the conversation. Studying the “other” part of brownness — dark brownness — would give rise to the reshaping and rewriting of “brown” existence. Far from a signifier of brown estrangement, dark brownness would surface as a key component of Latino and Latina subject formations.

55. By interracial literature Sollors means “works in all genres that represent love and family relations involving black-white couples, biracial individuals, their descen-

dants, and their larger kin—to all of whom the phrasing may be applied, be it as couples, as individuals, or as larger family units” (1997: 3).

56. It is not that U.S. Latinos and Latinas, as a plenitude of mixtures, are monoracial, of course. Rather, I am alluding to how a collective articulation of brownness brings about a *mestizaje* whose new fabric is tinged by a homogeneous, yet stimulative, brownness.

57. A brown space as constitutive of U.S. Latinas and Latinos comes to mind. Shane T. Moreman and Dawn Marie McIntosh build on “brown scriptings and re-scriptings” of Latina drag queens through a “brown space” (2010: 118). Brown, in their view, “more captures the fluidity of cultural identity that is characterized by the fluctuating representations of those who can claim to this identity.” Brownness can be captured and enacted only by brown practitioners with their rightful claim to being “Latina/o, Hispanic and even Chicana/o.” Informed by Angharad N. Valdivia, they deem Latino and Latina as “the ‘Brown race,’ falling somewhere between White Eurocentric and Black Afrocentric racial categories. [. . .] Not *purely* a particular race, brown is a ‘hybrid of hybrids.’ [. . .] Latina/o is not simply brown, but a hybrid negotiation of browns that moves across borders” (119). I concur with brownness as a hybrid negotiation of browns. But I also differ in the sense that this hybrid brownness assumes that its mobility and negotiation can be attained only through Latinoness and Latinaness. Non-“Latino/a” hybrids that have hybridized brownness are shut off from Latinoness and Latinaness.

CHAPTER FOUR. Disorienting Latinities

1. I am following the 1900 introduction of the Du Boisian color line, as Brent Hayes Edwards has underscored, not through the wide currency it later gained with the publication of *The Souls of Black Folk*, but through its international antecedent, the Pan-African conference in London. The color line can be situated beyond the “U.S. debates and civil rights struggles that are commonly taken to be its arena, [and] in the much broader sphere of ‘modern civilization’ as a whole” (2003: 1–2). Indeed, events in Central America from the beginning of the twentieth century strengthen the weighty significance of places like Panama, particularly through the 1914 U.S. construction of that nation’s canal, which underpins additional terrains and dates from the Global South. The year 1903, for example, charts Panamanian independence from Colombia; nine years after the U.S. Congress passed the Panama Canal Act. This date provides a foundation for a Panamanian/Central American scholarly link to American studies, Chicano/a studies, ethnic studies, and Latino/a studies discussions that historically mark deracinated subjects in the Americas, namely through key imperial occurrences

like the 1846–48 Mexican-American War and the 1898 Spanish-American War. The construction of the República de Panamá, largely supported by the United States as a means to control the canal uniting both the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans, provides a correlative model of annexation, nation formation, and expansion. A new Panamanian nationality came into being from the previously recognized Colombian citizenship. There was, as well, the advancement of a new “racial ‘ladder’” during this period, celebrating U.S. engineering innovation. As Matthew Parker writes, “the Americans and the hundred or so British [were] at the top; next came the Panamanians and the Spanish ‘almost-whites’; at the bottom were the blacks, with the West Indians beneath the locals in status” (2009: 413–14). Salaries were organized in a way where gold coins were largely reserved for white U.S. citizens and local currency, Panamanian silver, for the West Indian darker shades. U.S. segregation in the Canal Zone stressed an acute observation by a patroller in the area that runs thus: “Panama is below the Mason and Dixon Line” (381).

2. As Peter Chapman points out, a banana republic does not “have to produce bananas to qualify for the title. Nicaragua, for example, did not grow bananas in any great commercial quantity. The country’s banana republicanism resided in the happy coincidence of views enjoyed by the ruling Somoza family, United Fruit, and the U.S.” (2007: 6).

3. Consult, for example, the introductory volume of the journal the *Global South*. Alfred J. López, the editor, wrote that the Global South “can and does serve as a signifier of oppositional subaltern cultures ranging from Africa, Central and Latin America, much of Asia, and even those ‘Souths’ within a larger perceived North, such as the U.S. South and Mediterranean and Eastern Europe” (2007b: 8). Note López’s qualification of “Central and Latin America.” It seems cognizant of how Central America is excluded from the Latin American map. Central and Latin America need to be named through this conjunction. And yet Central and Latin America simultaneously mark their separateness. Curiously, the Caribbean is omitted from this Latin American equation.

4. U.S. Salvadoran migrants textually appear in Latino/a fiction as fetishized, unassimilated, monstrous bodies, albeit torture and civil strife. Consult, for example, Demetria Martínez’s *Mother Tongue*, which occupies a notable literary space in Chicano/Latino literature. Martínez’s narrative was first published by the Arizona-based Bilingual Press/Editorial Bilingüe in 1994, and reissued in 1996 through a corporate publisher, One World/Ballantine Books, a division of Random House. Awarded the 1994 Western States Book Award for Fiction, *Mother Tongue* illustrates how Salvadoran refugees inhabit the U.S. terrain. But despite its aims at sociopolitical solidarity, Martínez’s work writes Salvadorans outside of U.S. life. The novel is

double voiced: it is told through the two competing narratives of a Chicana, María, and a Salvadoran, José Luis. My observations focus on María's impressions of the Salvadoran figure. Engagement with the novel's first part calls for a pressing attentiveness to how invisible secondary Latino and Latina groups become visible Latinos and Latinas. Martínez provides stimulus for exploring how Salvadoran "silence" speaks through Chicana literature. As I argue, to "be" Central American is to be that which is about to emerge, about to be seen, and possibly, about to be heard. María falls in love with José Luis, a tortured refugee who flees to Albuquerque. José Luis's arrival may be a reference to 1986, when New Mexico governor Toney Anaya declared this state (the first in the nation) as a sanctuary for Central American refugees. Because José Luis is in danger, his name is a pseudonym. (His *nom de plum* later turns out to be his birth name.) María looks after José Luis in the absence of her godmother and is determined to fall in love with him. Her desire is included in the novel's first sentence: "I knew I would one day make love with him." María adds familiarity to her subject's dark brownness by describing José Luis's features: "His face was a face I'd seen in a dream. A face with no borders: Tibetan eyelids, Spanish hazel irises, Mayan cheekbones. I don't know why I had expected Olmec: African features and a warrior's helmet" (1996: 3–4). María romanticizes a war hero who is anything but Salvadoran, extending her Mexican Olmec past. But how would El Salvador's Pipil Indians fit within José Luis's multiple racial and ethnic compositions? José Luis's facial traits have no borders and add a different twist to José Vasconcelos's cosmic race, as civil war becomes a racializing ingredient. *Mother Tongue* presents the remaking of a new political, Cold War Latino mestizo. As María procreates with José Luis, their child represents the forging of an unnamable Latino union. This Latinized Cold War mestizaje presents a U.S. citizen whose identity is informed by his mother's Chicaneness. Through this Cold War mestizo, the reader sees the discursive fracturing of what turns out to be a U.S. Latino disunion. U.S. Salvadoranness is nonexistent, even though its North American rebirth stems from a mixed Indianness in relation to an English-speaking empire. Since José Luis speaks only Spanish, the Americanization of his U.S. Salvadoranness cannot be literally heard. U.S. Salvadoran "speech" is outside of "Latino" (and American) normativity. The new Cold War mestizo is a U.S. inflection of U.S. Salvadoran/"Latino" bastardry.

5. McGrath's narrator, a psychiatrist, explains, "Their buried materials was throwing up nightmares and other symptoms, and would continue to do so until the trauma could be translated into a narrative and assimilated into the self" (2008: 31). It can be said that a discursive Latino or Latina self perceives and chronicles the "buried trauma" of Central American nightmares and their deficient conditions. But what still needs to be translated and assimilated, narratively speak-

ing, is the language of multiple Central American selves, as they resurface in the United States.

6. The armed conflict displaced so many Central Americans that even Gabriel García Márquez's 1982 Nobel Laureate address speaks to the outpouring of Salvadoran migrations: "Since 1979, the civil war in El Salvador has produced almost one refugee every twenty minutes." García Márquez also puts into words the larger diasporic "nation" formed by Latin populations of displacement, adding, "The country that could be formed of all the exiles and forced emigrants of Latin America would have a population larger than that of Norway" (1982).

7. By U.S.-centered American ideologies, I mean to denote nationalist characterizations of citizenship, opportunity, equality and justice, and democracy and order. U.S.-centered forms of Americanisms are localized within U.S. renditions of being American. Nations in the Americas have their own foundations for understanding, using, and claiming their particular American identity in relation to themselves or in a hemispheric context that counters U.S.-centrism.

8. John Rechy, for instance, provides such a glimpse of a disorienting Latino or Latina in *The Miraculous Day of Amalia Gómez*. Facing a day of socioeconomic and individual complications in "East Ellay" that can be resolved only through a miracle, the leading character in this novel thinks about an underlying but unspeakable question. Amalia, the protagonist, contemplates why her son, Juan, allows a motherless Salvadoran teenager to sleep in their garage. The teenager's motherless state is more credible than his nationality, and Amalia asks herself, "Was he Salvadoran? Had Juan told her that only to disorient her?" (1991: 94). Representations of refugee and motherlessness notwithstanding, what makes this passing interest of marginal U.S. Salvadoranness so disorienting? Is it because of the contemporaneity of both U.S. Salvadorans and Salvadoranness in a geography that can be bound only to Aztlán? Do these disorienting citizens orient us to graver (U.S. Salvadoran) problems than one's (non-Salvadoran) own?

9. Political iconomy centers on "the operations of the image economy, the now ubiquitous and vastly important system of symbolic exchange between people, interest groups, cultures, an exchange conducted largely but never exclusively through visual images, both actualised and imagined" (T. Smith, 2003: 33).

10. El Salvador, for instance, was dubbed by Nobel Laureate Gabriela Mistral as the Little Tom Thumb of America, *el pulgarcito de América*. The smallness of the Little Tom Thumb perpetuates the supposition that there is cultural dearth in the region. This "affectionate" diminutive reduces El Salvador to a charming, quaint region whose size is equivalent to that of Massachusetts. Contemporary equations of El Salvador to Tom Thumb echo early European writers who, in the sixteenth and seventeenth

centuries, would contrast a monster, Gargantua, to Tom Thumb, a nameless pigmy. This discourse of smallness indicates that there are many Tom Thumbs within the U.S. and European neocolonial imaginaries. Anne Lake Prescott remarks that “Europeans had in fact long associated giants and pygmies, for both inhabit distant or doubtful terrain and both raise question about size’s relation to status (especially as traditional pygmies would be tiny—half a cubit, said one authority)” (1996: 75). While El Salvador is not collapsible to the giant monsterhood that is Gargantua, its anomaly is nonetheless emphasized in size, development, and culture. These aberrations also serve as a threat. The political activities of Tom Thumb could turn the pigmy into the monstrous Gargantua; the 1980s civil war in the region is a case in point.

11. The idiom is indexed in a threefold manner: (1) “De guatemala se fue a guatepeor,” (2) “Salió de guatemala y cayó en guatepeor,” and (3) “Salí a guatemala y entré a guatepeor” (Glazer, 1987: 148–49).

12. Central America, historian Greg Grandin contends, keeps “showing up” in the United States “in the oddest ways” (2006: 223). It was there that the Republican Party “first combined the three elements that give today’s imperialism its moral force: punitive idealism, free-market absolutism, and right-wing Christian mobilization” (3). In the exercising of a “new revolutionary imperialism” after “America’s latest episode of imperial overreach in the wake of 9/11 [. . .] a recycling of personnel” was ushered into the George W. Bush administration. They were “veterans of Ronald Reagan’s Central American policy in the 1980s,” involving advisers and hangers-on like “Elliott Abrams, Bush’s deputy national security adviser in charge of promoting democracy throughout the world; John Negroponte, former U.N. ambassador, envoy to Iraq and intelligence czar; Otto Reich, secretary of the state for the Western Hemisphere during Bush’s first term, and Robert Kagan, an ardent advocate of U.S. global hegemony.” John Poindexter, President Reagan’s former national security adviser convicted of lying to Congress during the Iran-Contra scandal, was subsequently appointed by Donald Rumsfeld to direct the Pentagon’s Total Information Awareness Program. And John Bolton, who “served as Reagan’s point man in the Justice Department,” had a role as the twenty-fifth U.S. ambassador to the United Nations (4–5). This cast of political personae is not superfluous. The cabinet members became the political “founding fathers” (or stepfathers, if you will) of Central American–American beginnings.

13. There are various Facebook pages mocking this expression. One of these platforms, which joined Facebook on 2 March 2010, calls itself “Irte de guatemala a guatepeor.” As of 8 June 2012, this page had 4,838 “likes.” The page’s “about” tab lists another Spanish expression, “La suerte de la fea, la guapa la desea,” as its main and only source of information. The phrase roughly translates to “The ugly girl’s luck is what the good-looking girl wants.”

14. As the title of Myra Mendible's anthology *From Bananas to Buttocks: The Latina Body in Popular Film and Culture* (2007) suggests, the banana emerges as a representational icon and marker of U.S. Latino and Latina existence in popular culture typifications of Latinidad. Mendible's volume specifically centers on Latina subjects, although it bears mentioning that the banana has also evoked a "tropical" optic emphasizing, more generally, the differences between countries with varying levels of industrialization. For the most part, U.S. Latino/a cultural studies have turned to the banana from a Hispanophone Caribbean standpoint to stress misrepresentations from the "other" Americas as well. But this banana trope spreads to Central and South America and can be positioned and referenced through its own particularities. The inability to ground the banana in other discursive, Latinized forms overlooks the expansive terrain of Latinidad and the conditions that insert—or "write in"—one's arrival to this realm. Such cultural domain has not been an equitable one, as Kirsten Silva Gruesz has written. She points out "the idea that Central American nations are even later arrivals than the rest of Latin America to the table of modernity" (2008: 141).

One example of a "Caribbeanized" banana, as it has been charted in Latino/a studies, is Frances Aparicio's and Susana Chávez-Silverman's edited volume on cultural representations of U.S. Latinos and Latinas, *Tropicalizations: Transcultural Representations of Latinidad* (1997b), where they draw from Victor Hernández Cruz's work by adding a plurality to their anthology's title, an homage to that poet's first book, *Tropicalization* (1976). The editors elicit Hernández Cruz's alienation from the U.S. metropolis, one in which the poet substitutes snow for green bananas in the cold urban landscape, forecasting a "Weather report: Green bananas have been reported falling from heaven in some parts of the city." Through this verse, U.S. Latino and Latina voices "transform the U.S. landscape into realities informed and subverted by visual icons, cultural practices, texts, and language from the Hispanic Caribbean" (Aparicio, 1997: 194). Aparicio's sharp points Caribbeanize the island of Manhattan from the Global North. But Hernández Cruz's tropical conversation with the frigid "first world" moves toward richer banana connotations that get eliminated from Latinidad. His jocular approach—a retropicalized Caribbean-specific response—is rooted at the level of the witty and has not been placed in interlocutory discussion with the sobering effects of the banana for those in Central and South America whose national identities are shaped by U.S. economic and political interests.

The ways that intellectuals from "banana republics" studiously navigate the transformation of local landscapes need to be conjoined to a Latinidad that would be significantly sharpened by relating to—and often diverging with—how such figures from the Global South may (or may not) be in dialogue with U.S. Latino and Latina cultural producers. The United Fruit Company (UFC), founded in 1899, created a

group of “Banana Zone gypsies,” to paraphrase from Gerald Martin, that included, in places like Santa Marta, Colombia, “artisans, merchants, boatmen, prostitutes, washerwomen, musicians, [and] bartenders.” These migrant, “tropicalized” communities, not unlike U.S. Latinos and Latinas, “became plugged into the international market of goods,” a consumptive Americanization, one could claim, with a range of such U.S. products as “Montgomery Ward catalogues, Quaker Oats, Vicks Vaporub, Eno Fruit Salts, [and] Colgate Dental Creme” (2009: 39). I would argue that one pressing preoccupation that can be teased out and rendered more complex in Latino/a studies involves how literary figures from the “tropics” *untropicalize* the banana by transporting us to this fruit as (1) a symbol of labor exploitation (Ernesto Cardenal, Nicaragua), (2) a “civilizing” tool for the developing nation (Carlos Luis Fallas, Costa Rica), (3) an allegory for a “new” quadcultural mestizo and mestiza (Francisco Goldman, Guatemala and the United States); and (4) a haunting national memory (Gabriel García Márquez, Colombia).

Take Cardenal’s foundational poem, “Zero Hour,” which draws on the ways in which this Nicaraguan poet chronicles the U.S. banana industry in that nation while tracing the life of revolutionary leader Augusto César Sandino. Cardenal’s tropicalization stresses a southern Latinity where the crudity of U.S.-sponsored economic and political violence in Nicaragua is implied in location. Cardenal depicts Central America as a place of chaos and dictatorship, tropicalized no less than by the U.S. intervention that propels Nicaraguan struggles for democracy. The poem’s opening sentence attests to this point: “Tropical nights in Central America, / with moonlit lagoons and volcanoes / and lights from presidential palaces, / barracks and sad curfew warnings” (1980: 1). Here, bananas — their color, green or yellow, is beside the point — are not merely used to represent an inversion of U.S. climate. They are applied to direct attention to the demands of U.S. capital: “The banana is left to rot on the plantations, / or to rot in the cars along the railroad tracks / or it’s cut overripe so it can be rejected / when it reaches the wharf or be thrown into the sea; / the bunches of bananas declared buried, or too skinny, / or withered, or green, or overripe, or diseased: / so there’ll be no cheap bananas, / or so as to buy bananas cheap. / Until there’s hunger along the Atlantic Coast of Nicaragua” (1980: 3).

Other forms of banana tropicalizations from the Global South include Fallas’s novel, *Mamita Yunai* (1966), which focuses on the life and working conditions of *bananeros* in “La Yunai,” the popular pronunciation of the UFC. Goldman’s *The Long Night of White Chickens* posits that North American market-driven tropicalizations have created a “quadcultural synthesis” in Central America (1992: 242). This quadcultural character accounts for a Guatemalan mixture that reflects “banana-boat loaders and North American fruit company clerks, Indian, African blood, Spanish-Moorish and who knows what else?” (160). Goldman’s and Cardenal’s analytic acts of southern

Latinities are critiques of a tropicalizing Latinidad that are reported back to North Americans. Indeed, Goldman narrates Guatemala's formation as a banana republic in his third novel, *The Divine Husband*, a provocative representation of the political and economic emergence of Central America in the nineteenth century. He writes about the exotic appropriation of a "nearly naked, vixenish, and seed-eyed Indian woman, wearing a flamboyant serpent-feather headdress, standing in a canoe piled with fruits and paddled by monkey, parrot, and lizard" for the U.S. branding of Chiquita bananas (2004: 142). U.S. capitalist demands vis-à-vis banana investments also extend to South America.

García Márquez reports in *Living to Tell the Tale* about the socioeconomic impact of the investments by the UFC in Colombia. More than countering a northern tropicalization, the economic exploitation of the banana workers marks for Colombians, as García Márquez's mother tells it, a place where the world ends. The Nobel Laureate makes known, "I followed the direction of her [his mother's] index finger and saw the station: a building of peeling wood, sloping tin roofs, and running balconies, and in front of it an arid little square that could not hold more than two hundred people. It was there, my mother told me that day, where in 1928 the army had killed an undetermined number of banana workers. I knew that event as if I had lived it, having heard it recounted and repeated a thousand times by my grandfather from the time I had a memory: the soldier reading the decree by which the striking laborers were declared a gang of lawbreakers; the three thousand men, women, and children motionless under the savage sun after the officer gave them five minutes to evacuate the square; the order to fire, the clattering machine guns spitting in white-hot bursts, the crowd trapped by panic as it was cut down, little by little, by the methodical, insatiable scissors of the shrapnel" (2003: 14–15). The repetition of labor—coupled with the redundancy in telling his story, a political tale that marks the time the author "had a memory"—makes this account part of Colombian national history.

15. "Guatepeorianness" and nothingness, as a conjunction, summarize Goldman's assertion that "Guatemala doesn't exist" in the epistemological sense (1992: 21). Goldman hence qualified this statement about Guatemalan and Central American modernity as "poor little countr[ies], no luck at all, nothing ever goes right" (243).

16. Santiago may mean "guate-peor" instead of "guata-peor," although the latter use coincides with the common misspelling, in English, of Guatemala to Guatamala. Given that Peoria exists as a geographic location in the United States and as a reference point for dull and uninspiring American attitudes, de Guatemala a Guatepeor could be translated as "from Guatemala to Guatepeoria," or simply "from Guatemala to Peoria."

17. Some well-known U.S. Central American authors also reproduce this trope of Guatepeorianness. Mario Bencastro's novel, *Odyssey to the North*, is one example that

molds the untamable lifestyles of Salvadorans in the United States. Primarily the story of Calixto, a dishwasher in a Washington, D.C., hotel, *Odyssey to the North* takes place in the 1980s and early 1990s. Calixto works alongside three other men: the distinctively named Caremacho (“Machoface”), Juancho, and Cali. Other character names include Pateyuca (“Yucafeet”), Lencho, and Chele Chile. The last two designations are too regional and folkloric to attempt to make an English translation. All the same, Bencastro’s figures enter the U.S. domestic realm through economic disillusionment. The novel’s introduction to U.S. Salvadoranness occurs through the representation of the hardworking Salvadoran — with “enough” victimhood in his narrative to represent these migrants as “likeable” and tolerable but ultimately unacceptable. From the strong Salvadoran matriarch/tamale vendor who hides in the bushes to give birth only to immediately return after this incident to continue selling her cornmeal dish to unruly immigrants in D.C., Bencastro’s portrayal of unbecoming Salvadoran attributes dehumanizes them. Calixto, for example, shares a foul-smelling one-bedroom apartment with nineteen other people. Those living in this unit lack documentation and fear having their housing conditions and legal statuses detected by authorities. As a result, they take shifts: ten people live in the apartment during the day, and the other ten at night. The ways that the twenty individuals dispose of their feces is alarming. According to Calixto, the residents “use plastic bags or newspaper and throw everything into the incinerator. The one who was actually renting the apartment used to say that the building superintendent complained of the terrible stench that filled the building when he burned the garbage” (1998: 15). To gain a kind of Latino literary entrance, Bencastro has to adopt a recognizable Guatepeorianness within the broader U.S. Latino and Latina world.

18. Cristina García also created a fictional Central American — Guatepeorian — nation in *The Lady Matador’s Hotel*. This tropical Guatepeor is a “wedge of forgotten land between continents, [a] place of hurricanes and violence and calculated erasures” (2010: 4). There are insurmountable deaths in this nation; it has “coffins, pine-wood coffins stacked up to the sky” (8). The violence of the 1980s civil war lingers, even though the region’s twenty-first-century forms of violence and fear are due to transnational gangs, or *maras*. The economy of García’s nation is predictably tied to bananas, as the “President of the Universal Fruit Company, Federico Ladrón-Benes” makes his home there. The novel also alludes to representations of buried trauma and collective amnesia. One of García’s characters, Aura, “is convinced that the entire country has succumbed to a collective amnesia. This is what happens in a society where no one is permitted to grow old slowly. Nobody talks of the past, for fear their wounds might reopen. Privately, though, their wounds never heal” (9).

19. The Salvadoran agricultural landscape is described as full of birds. It also includes tamarind and orange trees. Marta Claros is introduced as a child vendor who walks the “roughly paved streets of her San Salvador” to sell used clothing (C. García, 2007: 18). Her brother Evaristo first lives in a coral tree in San Salvador, followed by a banyan tree (22, 87). Both of these branched and leafy homes are later substituted for a eucalyptus tree in Los Angeles. Marta hails from a land where peasant Salvadoran machos fight by avocado trees during *quinceañera* parties. Banana trees are in abundance too. Just as Marta’s stepfather dies after a “commotion” during a *quinceañera* celebration, someone naturally rips off one of the bountiful leaves from a banana tree and begins fanning the dead body (56). Along fairly similar lines, Z. Z. Packer’s *Drinking Coffee Elsewhere* offers an analogous comparison. Packer pens the fictional Lupita, a Guatemalan migrant who takes care of the birds owned by the main character’s black father in the short story, “The Ant of the Self” (2003: 73–104). The narrator informs us more concretely that “Lupita knew about birds [. . .] because she’d once owned a rooster when she was five back in Guatemala.” Lupita, a charming caricature in diminutive, becomes a literary element that emphasizes the black character’s pitiful life in the Midwest. To put it boldly, Lupita dresses like a cheaply adorned dissolute woman, wearing “satiny pajamas that show her nipples. Pink curlers droop from her hair like blossoms.” Packer’s representation reaches laughable proportions when Lupita, echoing Speedy Gonzalez, yells remarks like, “What do *joo* want?” “Enough eez enough!” and “*Joo* are never thinking about maybe what Lupita feels!” Even the birds echo Lupita’s speech, reciting, “*Arriba, ‘riba, ‘riba*” (82–83).

20. Julia Alvarez presents a revealing autobiographical moment in *Once upon a Quinceañera*, where two distinct episodes of mistreatment in the public sphere build on the racialization of her use of the Spanish language and the presumed communism of both her family’s political migration to the United States and their struggles for U.S. socioeconomic advancement in the 1960s. Though told from a Dominican perspective, Alvarez’s fragments nonetheless connote strained versions of U.S. belonging and the idea of American success. In effect, Alvarez’s Dominicanness can be seen as an embryonic form of a political migration that stands as too ideologically loaded and that somewhat parallels the present Central American–American situation: unpronounceable, estranged, and un-American. Alvarez’s passage remaps the Dominican Republic as being next to Cuba — erasing Haiti in this process but still attempting to find Latin corollaries in the United States: “Pale as we were, hadn’t my sisters and I been told by passersby on the street who heard us talking loudly in Spanish: *Spics! Go back to where you came from!* There had been several incidents at my school, older boys spitting at me, throwing pebbles at me, chasing me down the block, accusing me of being a Commie because they had overheard me say that our island was next to Cuba,

where the dreaded Castro was getting ready to launch a bomb against the United States" (2007: 26).

21. We could conceive this "pan-third world" literary moment with what Marc Zimmerman has identified as a "literature of settlement," which looks back "on the homebase and immigration, but from a more settled-in framework, with an existing Latino tradition behind it, now reaching out to other minority and mainstream (U.S. mainly but also Latin American, African, etc.) to expand horizons and move either to pan-Latin American, 'pan-third world' or U.S. mainstream identifications" (1992: 21). I insist, however, that the way in which such solidarity among nations is constructed warrants closer scrutiny, especially when "Latino" or "Latina," as we have seen in this book, is not a given but an identificatory process gathered from different perspectives and subject positions that do not always involve the national. Zimmerman is certainly aware of this point, remarking in his book that "of course [. . .] there are no Latinos, that the word is a construct bringing together diverse people who while they clearly share certain bases, are often quite distinct and only identify with each other in opposition to the non-latinos and that usually for very specific, contingent and often political, epiphenomenal and ephemeral concerns" (40). Latinos and Latinas "exist" through *Latinidad*. This book, however, has strived to show that Latino and Latina textures can and do exist through the variants of *Latinities*. These referents convey meaning beyond the brown reach of *Latinidad*.

22. In a Chicano and Chicana context, Francisco A. Lomelí and Donaldo W. Urioste (1976) posit this "sympathetic fiction" as *literatura chicanesca*, or "Chicanesque literature." Hector Torres writes that "early in the history of Chicano/a critical discourse" *literatura chicanesca* designated "a body of literature written about the Chicano/a experience by a non-Chicano/a writer" that provided "a valuable external point of view on the Chicano/a experience" (2000: 159).

23. In addition, 1992 heralded, as Arias has pointed out, the Los Angeles uprising. Although this year marked the Peace Accords in El Salvador, the "peace dividend never took place" in that nation. As Arias elaborates, "the arrival of peace did end actual military combat, as guerrillas turned their weapons in and formed legal political parties that now play the role of a loyal opposition in Congress and have, in El Salvador's case, succeeded in winning many municipal elections, including the city of San Salvador. But the much-promised international aid never did arrive in sufficient quantity. What was expected to be a massive Marshall-like plan to fully modernize these nations to uproot a model of underdevelopment marked by massive amounts of landless peasants, racism against Maya indigenous peoples, and an inability to train the bulk of their populations in the basic rudiments of modern life, including reading and writing, all of these major issues that fed into the civil wars' conflicts, became only a trickle that dwindled to almost nothing after 2000" (2007: 175).

24. I have reworked this concern to advance Patricia Zavella's question raised in *Feminist Dilemmas in Fieldwork*: "What happens when ethnic insiders gain access to a community similar to their own?" (1996: 139).

25. Michael Parenti finds that civil conflict in Central America enabled the United States to perform the role of a "helpless giant" pushed around by third-rate powers" (1989: 1). The position of many Central American nations as third-rate powers also intones matters of cultural dearth and irrelevance on U.S. and Latin-American realms. Arias has pointed out the absence of Central American literature from Latin American and U.S. literary discourses. He notes that work from this region is "almost like an invisible literature to the degree that it is not addressed critically, it doesn't exist. [Literature from Central America is] not in the bibliographies, it's not on the Modern Language Association panels, it's not named, and so it has to be named" (quoted in Roberts, 1997: 32). Arias's comments identify the invisibility of Central American letters within the Americas.

Evidence of this literary absence can also be found within Central America. The editor of a Salvadoran anthology, spanning from 1880 to 1955, wrote, "It has often been said that El Salvador is an intellectual desert, in no way fertile ground for manifestations of the spirit." The text reads, "Se ha dicho repetidas veces que El Salvador es un desierto intelectual, en nada propicio para manifestaciones del espíritu" (Barba Salinas, 1959, 10; my translation). Nearly four decades later, Salvadoran novelist Horacio Castellanos Moya tackles this motif in his existentialist novel, *El asco*. He reappropriates Latin American and U.S. perceptions about El Salvador. Castellanos Moya, possibly distraught by the emptiness that surfaces in relation to most "things" Salvadoran, forces his public to think about the implications of cultural and geographic obscurity. The novel progresses through the often-disgusted monologue of Thomas Bernhard, a Salvadoran émigré, now a naturalized Canadian citizen, who is obliged to visit his birthplace because of a death in the family. The protagonist's countless denunciations are incitations prompting Salvadoran "pathologies," as living subjects, to begin uncriminalizing the misrepresentations of Salvadoranness. The narrator declares, "This race quarrels with knowledge and with intellectual curiosity, this country is out of time and the rest of the world, it only existed when there was carnage, it only existed thanks to the thousands that were assassinated, thanks to the criminal capacity of the military and the communists, outside this criminal capacity [El Salvador] has no possibility of existence" (1997: 57–58; my translation). Central America, far from being an "intellectual desert," has long housed intellectuals and critics of what C. L. R. James calls the role of the United States as "the representative banker, armorer and political mentor of one political system in opposition to another" (1993: 201).

26. The translation of García Canclini's passages is my own. The quoted excerpts, in the original Spanish, read, "América latina no está completa en América latina" and

“Podemos decir que ‘lo latinoamericano’ anda suelto, desborda su territorio, va a la deriva en rutas disperas” (2002: 19–20).

27. Arias asks, “when we look at the phenomenon of Central American–Americans captured in the United States and deported to their alleged country of origin, where they are perceived as tattooed aliens — that is, doubly alien, alien in the sense of being foreigners to the nation-state that does not recognize their blood tie to it, their belongingness to their particular sovereign space, and aliens in the sci-fi sense of appearing to be a different species altogether with their innumerable tattoos, postmodern space travelers of a sort — who is global, and who is, indeed, local?” (2007: 182).

28. Ilan Stavans, the editor of the Penguin Classics edition of *Rubén Darío: Selected Writings*, explains, “*Modernismo* was, more than anything else, a metaphysical pursuit by a cadre of [Latin American] intellectuals disenchanted with institutionalized religion and with the ideological currents available” (2005: xxx). The modernista movement — or revolution, as Stavans calls it — “occurred roughly between 1885 and 1915 (or with Darío’s death, a year later), and although it spilled into other artistic arenas, its central tenets apply to literature almost exclusively, and to poetry most vividly” (xxxi).

29. President Reagan’s reminder of this particular territory’s value noted, “Central America is a region of great importance to the United States. And it is so close — San Salvador is closer to Houston, Texas, than Houston is to Washington, D.C. Central America is America; it’s at our doorstep” (Reeves, 2005: 218).

30. The idea of an “additional otherness” and its connection to other U.S. ethnoracial groups commonly perceived as “homogeneous” is being unraveled in other spheres. Consult, for example, Shaw-Taylor and Tuch (2007), which unsettles the construction of an “insular” blackness in the U.S. racial taxonomy.

31. Peru Ana and Ana Peru manifest a type of “geographic Latinities” that does not extend to just individuals with mercurial sociocultural qualities. Typifying a landscape whose migratory movements and cultural crossings underscore the malleable attributes of the city and its citizens, Peru Ana’s and Ana Peru’s geographic Latinities delocalize and denationalize — consuming whatever may fall under urbanity. V. S. Naipaul seemingly speaks to this state of urban and national statelessness when he notes, in connection to London life in the 1950s, that “[c]ities like London were to change. They were to cease being more or less national cities; they were to become cities of the world, modern-day Romes, establishing the pattern of what great cities should be, in the eyes of islanders like myself and people even more remote in language and culture” (quoted in French, 2008: 68).

32. I am not making a motion for each Latino and Latina group to have a corresponding field of inquiry apart from Latino/a studies based on their “inherent,”

“all-informing” national identity. Rather, my proposition is that Latino/a studies lacks a feasible comparativist project that, like *Latinidad*, is “produced in tension,” as Mérida Rúa has put it. Rúa has offered some glimpses into Latino and Latina futures categorized by a conjunction of Latin American nationalities that do not only challenge Latino/a studies but also widen its meanings. She deliberates on “interLatino relationships and how prospective identities [. . .] unfold from them” vis-à-vis her research with Puerto Rican–Mexican Chicago residents in their twenties and thirties (2001: 118). Her characterization of “PortoMex” and “MexiRican” subjectivities cues us into the rupturing of the relatively “neat” subject delineations found in Puerto Rican studies, Chicano/a studies, and Latino/a studies. To these modalities, we can also recall Angie Chabram-Dernersesian’s (1994) transnational connection and interrogation of her “Chicana-Riqueña” plurality.

Rúa seeks an inter-Latino/a studies model that has not been geographically divided by a U.S. East and West dyad predicated on “when the Chicano encounters the Nuyorican” (2001: 120). Her ethnographic investigation illustrates how a dual Latinoness has been induced by a subject’s convergence of coeval Puerto Ricanness and Mexicanness. This nationally mixed Latino and Latina subject “seldom receives scholarly attention” from their “respective” disciplines: Chicano/a studies and Puerto Rican studies (119). I would note, however, that the analytic and conceptual role of Latino/a studies for Latino and Latina multitudes that do not solely and particularly depend on national identities and signifiers has yet to be explored. Rúa’s study is certainly instructive, as is her view of *Latinidad*. The latter is “a cultural expression that embraces blood and fictive kin, lovers, friends, neighbors, co-workers, and even strangers in an everyday form of community building. Individuals engaging in these community-building efforts come to know themselves by way of their interactions with members of diverse Latino ethnoracial groups.” I concur with this stance to an extent, but I must also question whether one needs a binationally transmuted Latino or Latina to make sense of one’s self. More specifically, does one need a “diverse” Latino and Latina to make sense of one’s own diversity? Is a Latino or Latina with one nationality invariably uniform and uninformed about “the malleable boundaries” of Latino and Latina life (120)?

One must be cautious, for to privilege a Latino or Latina based on a double national Latin American background renders this positioning in biological terms. If one is not born into these binational circumstances, one lacks that “lived experience of everyday *Latinidad*” (Rúa, 2001: 118). Aparicio seems to advance this claim of “hybrid Latino subjects who are the offspring of Latinas/os of two different national groups” and their distinct negotiation of Latino and Latina identity. It varies, Aparicio writes, “from the Anglo-Latino power dyad that has structured most of our understanding

about Latinas/os in the United States. [. . .] [They] make strategic decisions about national differentiation based on a variety of contextual, family, and social factors. Thus, their identity constructions tend to be more concentric, multiple, and diffused than what we are accustomed to” (2007: 45). These mixtures propel a panethnicity for certain Latinos and Latinas that moves away from the specificity of being a Chicano, Chicana, or Nuyorican into different processes of binational identification. But we should also question the idea of Latinoness and Latinaness as definitive, determined, and empirical. Latinoness and Latinaness seem to consistently share one agreeable definition because *one* nationality coherently guides a particular Latino or Latina. Aparicio also enumerates other national Latino and Latina varieties, among them, “Cubolivians [and] Mexistanis (Mexican and Pakistani),” which are “but a few of the possible hybrid identities that populate our urban centers” (47).

33. I would venture to add that Juan Gonzalez presents an interesting prototype not just for a U.S. *Latino* Puerto Ricanness but also through his drafting of U.S. Latino and Latina history in *Harvest of Empire: A History of Latinos in America*. Herewith, Gonzalez enacts a fascinating hopscotch of Latin American and U.S. history: his account executes a hemispheric narrative of “states” of Latinaness and Latinoness vis-à-vis a *simultaneous* examination of nation formation in the United States and Latin America. Gonzalez, a Puerto Rican who grew up in New York City, claims a Latino identification not merely as a form of Latinidad but plausibly within the context of my focus here, as a Latinity aware of the many cross-identificatory tenets gestating U.S. Latino and Latina states. Bridging Latino, Latina, and Latin American outlooks from various geohistorical locations, *Harvest of Empire* reminds the U.S. “common reader” that although there may be “a growing number of Latino professionals, students, and intellectuals who may know a great deal about their particular ethnic group — Chicano, Puerto Ricans, Cubans,” they understand “little else about other Hispanics” (2000: xvi). Gonzalez situates his writing as one advanced by “the perspective of a Latino,” calling it “a frank attempt to make sense of both the Latin American and North American experience” (xvii–xviii). His work underscores that “Latino/a” becoming is tied to U.S. growth and territorial expansion of Latin America.

34. To this end, we can profit from Michaeline Crichlow and Patricia Northover’s *Globalization and the Post-Creole Imagination*, where they wrestle with the politics of forging place in the Caribbean, a specificity that resonates with other groups. The Caribbean can be extended to Central America, alongside the traveling meanings of Central American–American, which signals the location of “other” Central Americans within the isthmus and the ongoing mappings of Central American–Americanness. Such a project applies to notions of being as they relate not only to existence but also to articulations of place and space and a subject’s capacity to be present. The sup-

posed fixity of a nation and standard identifications of a region must deal with the traveling body. These moving bodies are “journeys toward the refashioning of the self, times, and places and the intertwining of global and local processes,” since they invariably shift and redirect our understanding of creolization (2009: ix). Such maneuvering—or “mobile strategies”—invite theoretical groundings and dynamics (xiv). They provide an entry into a continual “mapping of the present”; new geographic and cultural milieus restart through creolization processes (22). The “original” Caribbean setting of creolization is therefore broadened and becomes an exchange of boundless presencing, or the “ontologies of lived space.” These anthologies are driven by multi-directional “hi/stories” delineating human identity stories (18–20).

35. Themes of indigence and underdevelopment, confusion, violence, and monstrosity abound in Graciela Limón’s *In Search of Bernabé*, a novel that received the American Book Award from the Before Columbus Foundation in 1994 as well as literary honors, in 1991, from the Chicano Literature Contest at the University of California, Irvine. One of the main characters in Limón’s work, Luz Delcano, takes refuge in the Los Angeles-based Casa Andrade, which functions as a “temporary home, town hall, and information center” (1993: 80). The services provided by Casa Andrade become a form of dependency for Luz, who, as Limón writes, “had never lived under the same roof with so many people, some of them crowded into rooms according to families, age or sex. [. . .] Luz had always worked for her keep, and she found her stay at Casa Andrade difficult to accept. She tried to compensate by helping out in the kitchen or by watching children who had no one to take care of them or by cleaning the house. But nothing helped to dispel her feeling of dependency” (1993: 80). Despite Helena María Viramontes’s allegiance with U.S. Central Americans, the complexities of revolutionary processes are simplified and commodified for U.S. readers. In “The Cariboo Café,” a short story published in *The Moths and Other Stories* (1995a), Viramontes attempts to localize Nicaraguan revolutionary politics in the U.S. realm. But one of the concurrent narratives in this story implies that the loss of a mother’s son is linked to the “contras,” the Sandinistas. Viramontes has not properly addressed this type of literary obfuscation. To this end, Ellen McCracken attempts to explain this confusion in a chapter footnote of her book, *New Latina Narrative: The Feminine Space of Postmodern Ethnicity*. McCracken notes that Viramontes “intended the term to refer generically to a political group against any government. Given the American media’s prevalent usage of the term ‘Contra’ to refer to anti-Sandinista at the time the story was published (1985), Viramontes’ use of the word is overcoded to imply strongly that the Sandinistas are responsible for this woman’s misfortune. Perhaps in a subsequent edition of the story, Viramontes will devise a mode to distance the term clearly from its common usage in the United States” (1999: 208–9).

Carole Fernández's *Sleep of the Innocents* takes place in a fictional town of Soledad (solitude, in English), which tropes, to a certain extent, on Gabriel García Márquez's construction of Macondo in *One Hundred Years of Solitude*. Soledad residents live in adobe huts, but the poor village still manages to glow in the afternoon sun (1991: 27).

36. While U.S. Central American bodies can be read as passing into U.S. states of Mexicanness, Chicanoness, or Chicananess, such admissions are not always altogether "complete." As Tobar intimates in *The Tattooed Soldier*, Central Americans incorporate, but do not fully assimilate, Mexican cultural practices in their lives. The Spanish sounds of Los Angeles are a fusion of Central American and Mexican Spanish, coupled with English. Tobar's linguistic example reads, "*Fijate vos, que ese vato from La Mara got in a fight with that dude from la Eighteenth Street who lives down the block. Yeah, right there in the class. Real chingazos. El de La Salvatrucha estaba bleeding y todo*" (1998: 59). In the memoir of Los Angeles radio host "El Cucuy de la Mañana" — a story tantamount to a U.S.–Central American testimonial, since Almendárez Coello's autobiographical account is told through interview form — Renán Almendárez Coello also illustrates this point of U.S. Central American–Mexican linguistic fusion. Almendárez Coello expresses himself through Honduran/Central American regionalisms and Mexican expressions. His "Mexicanization," or even Mesoamerican Latinity, can also be due to the fact that as a child he lived for some time in Guarizama, a small town in the department of Olancho, Honduras. Guarizama, in his words, was a "small piece of Mexico hidden in the navel of Honduras." He elaborates that "even the people spoke with a Mexican accent." Almendárez Coello's quote, in Spanish, reads, "era un pedacito de México escondido en el ombligo de Honduras. Hasta las gentes hablaban con el acento mexicano" (2002: 52; my translation).

EPILOGUE. @

1. *Dora the Explorer* made its television debut during the summer of 2000. Dora was first intended as a computer-integrated program for two- to five-year-old children. The *New York Times* makes known that the Latina character "solves every challenge — in English and Spanish" and "builds confidence in children because she shows them how to deal with different situations" (Olson, 2010). National Public Radio (NPR) reported that *Dora* cocreator Chris Gifford and his team "set out to engineer a character who could motivate kids to participate [and initially] tried several animated characters — a squirrel, a martin. One promising idea: a bunny." But the idea of "something altogether different was brewing," in light of the fact that Brown Johnson, the president of Nickelodeon's animated programming, had "learned that Latinos aren't terribly well represented in children's television. And she was out to change that."

NPR's Rolando Arrieta recounted that "schoolteachers, sociologists, historians and cultural and language experts were all brought in to help" in Nick's manufacturing of *Dora*. There were mistakes along the way, like the naming of Dora's friend, Tico, who was always asleep under a tree. Johnson explained, "Our cultural consultant said, 'Not such a good idea.' A Latino character, who only speaks Spanish, the littlest character, always asleep. Just *not* a good idea" (2008).

Most notable is Arrieta's parenthetical clarification, "(If nothing else, such a character might have angered Costa Ricans, who affectionately call themselves 'Ticos')." Carlos Cortes, a history professor at the University of California at Riverside, told Arrieta that Dora was consciously framed as a "pan-Latino character, so she can be a source of pride and identity for anyone of Latino background. [. . .] For example, make sure the words we're using were universal. Not Spanish terms that meant one thing in Cuba and something else in Mexico and something else in Peru" (2008). Rather than seeing this as synthetic, I would add that many Latinos and Latinas speak this kind of generic Spanish — "Telemundo Spanish," as Patricia Engel's protagonist would call it (2010: 120). This version of the Spanish language is perhaps a standardized U.S. form of the language, where many Latinos and Latinas strive to be generally or commonly understood by groups outside their specific national and cultural milieus. The Spanish enacted in the United States may also appropriate many regionalisms from Latin America and infuse such terms with their own ("national") Spanish. Although Dora's age is marked as a seven-year-old, the year 2010 heralded her tenth birthday. Since her first appearance, her cultural influence involves, as Hank Stuever recapitulated it for the *Washington Post*, the selling of "a few billion dollars' worth of toys, books, DVDs and clothing every year." Stuever added, "she's on TV all over the world. The back-to-school industry alone owes her big-time. Macy's made her into its first Thanksgiving parade balloon of a minority cartoon imp" (2010).

2. Airing from 1991 to 1995, the PBS Daytime Emmy Award-winning series *Where in the World Is Carmen Sandiego?* was targeted toward eight- to thirteen-year-olds. It was described as a U.S. phenomenon, with some schools hosting what *USA Today* called "Carmen events" (Woessner, 1992). *Where in the World Is Carmen Sandiego?* was partly a response to that decade's studies, which disclosed "a tremendous ignorance of geography among Americans: according to a National Geographic survey, one in four cannot locate the Soviet Union or the Pacific Ocean. It also comes in the wake of successful game shows for children on commercial television, most notably 'Double Dare,' that offer zany, fast-paced antics but little educational substance" (Rabinovitz, 1991). But as Robert Woessner also cautioned, "don't call [the show] educational to the creators of *Carmen Sandiego* at Broderbund Software Inc., Novato, Calif. To them, educational equals boring. They prefer 'explorational'" (1992). *Carmen Sandiego's*

explorational qualities, in addition to her geographic approach, are important antecedents to *Dora the Explorer*.

3. Nicole M. Guidotti-Hernández, for example, engages with *Dora the Explorer* through the normative mainstream media venues that create Latinidad, but mostly through Dora as a product and commodity: “The reconfiguration and popularization of Latino/a identity is most effectively analyzed through discourses of Latinidad, which are processes where Latino/a identities and cultural practices are contested and created in media, discourse, and public space. Latinidad influences the construction of Dora, which means that she is not merely created by ideas about Latinas, but she also creates ideas about Latinas.” Guidotti-Hernández also comments, “Dora represents no particular Latino/a national identity, but her otherness is not far removed from the U.S. context, so most viewers assume she is Mexican or Puerto Rican” (2007: 212). From my end, I have been attracted to Dora precisely because she is not tied to any Latin American nation. Dora’s Latin@ “origins” can be explored not through Latino and Latina “wholeness” but through her animated elation and immersion with other Latinos and Latinas enlivening a new @ genealogy.

4. Nationality, Paul Gilroy reminds us, “conditions the continuing aspiration to acquire a supposedly authentic, natural and stable identity. This identity is the premise of a thinking ‘racial’ self that is both socialised and unified by its connection with other kindred souls encountered usually, though not always, within the fortified frontiers of those discrete ethnic cultures which also happen to coincide with the contours of a sovereign nation state that guarantees their continuity” (1991: 4).

5. One of the subjects that has yet to be charted within Latinidad also lacks an at-ness within the @ economy: indigenous groups. The emergent categories for indigenous populations could read thus: “indi@,” “indigen@,” “May@,” “Aymar@,” and so on. “Afro-Latin@s” are mentioned in this register of at-ness, but the qualifier also poses some questions. As identified in *The Afro-Latin@ Reader* (Jiménez Román and Flores, 2010), for instance, Afro-Latin@s already have an @ within Latin@. But we must also probe into the inclusivity of the category “Afro.” As it currently suggests in English, the Latin@ part of “Afro-Latin@” is inclusive of both genders. The Afro component, however, could be read as neutral, since it maintains a gender bias. It can also be ostensibly interpreted as avoiding a responsibility to semiotically include women, in view of the fact that “Afro” is a term in the English language that lacks grammatical gender in words. Under the logic of gender inclusion for U.S. ethnoracial categories with Latin backgrounds, Afro-Latin@ ought to read, “Afr@-Latin@.” My purpose is not to pettifog or nitpick over language and seemingly paltry details. My focus is to bring attention to the types of terms summoned in Latino/a studies to *do* the representational work for gender inclusion. *Latino* seems to be the sole word carrying the weight for this type of indexing in the field.

6. On 22 March 2010 the Department of Architecture and Design at the Museum of Modern Art (MoMA) publicly announced that it had acquired the @ symbol. Its value and function, MoMA argued, “has become an important part of our identity in relationship and communication with others.” MoMA’s *Inside/Out* blog offers a historical commentary on this emblem, which bears Latin and Spanish linguistic similarities in connotation. As clarified, “Some linguists believe that @ dates back to the sixth or seventh century, a ligature meant to fuse the Latin preposition *ad*— meaning ‘at,’ ‘to,’ or ‘toward’— into a unique pen stroke. The symbol persisted in sixteenth-century Venetian trade, where it was used to mean *amphora*, a standard-size terracotta vessel employed by merchants, which had become a unit of measure. Interestingly, the current Spanish word for @, *arroba*, also indicates a unit of measure” (Antonelli, 2010).

7. Viego prompts us to “more productively read the term *Latino* as a term outside and beyond ontologies of race and ethnicity, not because it appears to point to the postraciological but rather because in fact it is a term that is first and foremost remarking on questions of temporality” (2007: 121). Seen in this manner, the Latino category resignifies a temporality that is not just marked by ethnoracial constructs and circumstances. I veer this “Latino temporality” to a *Latin@* direction so that the @ in Latin keeps us “on the run”— that is, it permits us to take the detours of Latinness and to recognize its impermanence.

8. The Valdés title I cite here, *El dolor del dólar*, was actually published in 1999 as *Te di la vida entera* (*I Gave You All I Had*) in Spanish. This descriptive heading has been on my radar since finding Valdés’s book at a Parisian bookshop as *La Douleur du dollar* in 1998. Valdés brings to light matters of translation as well as the titular changes of this novel in her blog, *zoevaldes.net*. She writes in a 16 March 2008 post, “*El dolor del dólar* (The Pain of the Dollar) sounded bad in Spanish, and I had to change it for *Te di la vida entera*. Soon [the significance of] this title in Spanish was lost enormously in translation. [. . .] It sounded better in French than the original one, *La Douleur du dólar* [*sic*].” In Spanish, Valdés’s excerpt reads, “*El dolor del dólar* sonó mal en español y tuve que cambiarlo por *Te di la vida entera*, y luego este título en español perdía enormemente en la traducción, resultada un título cheísimo, y en francés sonó mejor el que fue realmente el original, *La douleur du dólar* [*sic*]” (“París era una rumba,” *zoevaldes.net*, 16 March 2008; my translation).

9. *Embajadora*, in Spanish, denotes a woman ambassador. I am exercising a playful use of the Spanish noun to form a nexus with Dora. This evocation would translate as “ambassaDora” in English.

10. One of the most persuasive uses of the slash, as applicable to U.S. ethnoracial identity, has come from Asian American studies and its excogitation of what David Palumbo-Liu identifies as “Asian/American.” Inserting a slash between Asian and American, Palumbo-Liu states that this Asian/American split “signals those in-

stances in which a liaison between ‘Asian’ and ‘American,’ a *sliding* over between two seemingly separate terms, is constituted.” He details, “As in the construction ‘and/or,’ where the solidus at once instantiates a choice between two terms, their simultaneous and equal status and an element of indecidability, that is, as it at once implies both exclusion and inclusion, ‘Asian/American’ marks *both* the distinction installed between ‘Asian’ and ‘American’ *and* a dynamic, unsettled, and inclusive movement” (1999: 1).

11. As an instance of the urgency for referents like *Chicana* and *Latina*, take note of Sonia Saldívar-Hull’s trajectory of renaming herself as a *Chicana* feminist, one who, in her phrasing, “refused the Chicano” (2000: 29). She submits, “To my ear, the *o* in *Chicano* struck a dissonant chord. The *o* began to signify that position bajo cero under the *o* of tradition, *costumbres*, what *Ms.* [magazine] instructed me to identify as patriarchal constraints” (26). Use of the *Chicana* signifier by “feminists scholars, activists, and writers — who have lived under the *o* in *Chicano*” gives, for this reason, meaningful shape and content to “the historical record written by men and male-identified women” (27).