VOL. 3, 1–2 WINTER/SPRING 2008 **ISSN 1991–2773**

TYPESETTING: ExMachina Academic Press, Poland
www.exmachina.pl

ExMachina

Review of International American Studies (*RIAS*), is the electronic journal of the International American Studies Association, the onlyworldwide, independent,non-governmental association of American Studies. *RIAS* serves as agora for the global network of international scholars, teachers, and students ofAmerica as hemispheric and global phenomenon. *RIAS* is published three times a year: in the Fall, Winter and Spring by IASA with the institutional support of the University of Silesia in Katowice lending server space to some of IASA websites and the electronic support of the Soft For Humans CMS Designers. Subscription rates or *RIAS* are included along with the Association's annual dues as specified in the "Membership" section of the Association's website (www.iasaweb.org).

All topical manuscripts should be directed to the Editor via online submission forms available at *RIAS* website (www.iasa-rias.org). General correspondence and matters concerning the functioning of RIAS should be addressed to *RIAS* Editor-in-Chief:

Michael Boyden

K.U.Leuven
Faculteit Letteren
Departement Literatuurwetenschap
Blijde-Inkomststraat 21
B–3000 Leuven
Belgium
e-mail: michael.boyden@iasa-rias.org

The RIAS cover art is based on a modified version of the standard Stairs-Up symbol, developed jointly by AIGA and the US Department of Transportation. The system of AIGA symbols is available from the websites of the organization and is copyright-free.

PROBLEMATIC PARADIGMS: RACIAL DIVERSITY AND CORPORATE IDENTITY IN THE LATINO COMMUNITY [1]

Silvio Torres-Saillant
Syracuse University

BORDERS THAT EXIST

The presumption of a seamless, unproblematic Latino identity militates against the unity that US Hispanic communities could and should forge in order to increase their levels of empowerment in American society. The potential for building coalitions, fashioning collaborative agendas, and joining forces in causes of common interest can become a reality only through serious reflection, inclusive dialogue, and tactful planning. Simply to assume Latino unity is to forgo the hard work, long time, and deep thought that bringing it about will take. A good number of scholars and intellectuals have already warned against the danger of uncritically embracing homogenizing discourses in defining the Hispanic subsection of the American population (Klor de Alva, West and Shorris: 1998, 180–89; Oboler: 1995; Flores and Yudice: 1993; Davis: 2000). Juan Flores and George Yudice have described Hispanics in the United States as a 'very heterogeneous medley of races and nationalities', composing not 'even a relatively homogeneous 'ethnicity' (199). These authors and many others have abundantly shown that promoting totalizing representations of the Latino community overlooks the differentiated cultural contributions and the particular social legacy that each individual subgroup has brought to the large canvas of American society. The disadvantages have thus far been articulated in terms of the levels of material or symbolic power that a homogenizing representation can cause Hispanics to lose or fail to acquire vis-á-vis American society's non-Latino political and economic mainstream. But no one, to my knowledge, has alerted us to what is perhaps an even graver danger: the debilitating impact that such representations can have on the ability of individual subgroups to fend off intra-Latino injustices.

Given the varied circumstances under which the various subgroups entered the United States, as well as the differing 'ages' of their relationships with this country, at

[1] This essay previously appeared in *Latinos: Remaking America*, eds. Marcelo Suarez-Orozco and Mariela M. Paez, David Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies, The Regents of the University of California (Los Angeles and Berkeley: U of California P, 2002) 435–55. Reprinted with permission from the author and the editors. http://www.ucpress.edu/books/pages/9812.html.

least these subgroups' economic and political leaderships differ in visibility, access to resources, and levels of empowerment. Differing levels of empowerment imply, of course, unequal degrees of vulnerability. Divides may exist even within Latinos of the same national origin if obstacles such as race and class intervene. Narrating his experiences in Tampa, Florida, in the 1930s, the US-born black Cuban Evelio Grillo recalls that 'black Cubans and white Cubans lived apart from one another in Ybor City' (Grillo, 2000: 9). Not only does Grillo not remember ever 'playing with a single white Cuban child' when he was a kid, but he, unlike his white Cuban compatriots, also had doors of opportunity slammed on him by Jim Crow America because of his color. 'I don't know of any black Cuban college graduate of my generation, and of all the generations preceding desegregation, who is not a graduate of a historically black college', says Grillo, who recalls that even in matters of carnal love, the racial difference between black Cubans and white Cubans outweighed their shared national origin. Thus for black Cubans, dating almost exclusively involved 'eligible black American counterparts' (9–12). A Cuban American scholar who has studied this period notes the irony inherent in the fact that Círculo Cubano and Unión Martí-Maceo, the mutual aid societies that serve Tampa's white and black Cubans, respectively, both engaged in centennial celebrations in 1999–2000 as both approached the hundredth anniversaries of the 'respective clubs (and their memberships' [racial] separation) in significantly different ways' (Dworkin y Méndez , 2000: xii). That is, they reflect even today their unequal condition, an enduring legacy of the fact that one group had to bear the brunt of Jim Crow policies while the other did not. Clearly, these examples of inter- and intra-group divisions among the multiple segments that make up the Latino community argue that we should apply a measure of caution when formulating claims about pan-ethnic Latino identity.

With this background in mind, I would like to suggest that current assertions of a harmonious pan-ethnic Latino identity have the potential to perpetuate intra-Latino exclusions and injustices, thus preventing the emergence of a genuine sense of community among the various Hispanic groups that form part of the US population. A corollary to this critique will be an argument against locating Latino identity in the obtuse vastness of pan-hemispheric or intercontinental cultural spheres. I argue that borders exist, the global economy notwithstanding and despite the transnational dynamics that self-proclaimed postmoderns point to as indicative of the demise of the nation-state. I insist on the need to separate Latin American from Latino identity, especially given the legacy of racial inequality in countries south of the Rio Grande. In so doing, I reject the seductive fusion of the Latin South and the Latino North encouraged by the Hispanic subsection of corporate America.

IMPERIAL CONTIGUITY AND LATINO UNITY

Like any other minority, Latinos lack the freedom to choose the way the larger society configures their ethnic affiliation. Richard Delgado is not far off the mark when he says that 'membership in a racial minority can be considered neither self-induced, like alcoholism or prostitution, nor alterable' (Delgado, 1995: 159). We do not need to repeat the work of documenting the process whereby people with disparate Lat-

in American origins gradually fell under the single homogenizing label of Hispanic or Latino, which Suzanne Oboler has done remarkably well in her *Ethnic Labels, Latino Lives* (1995). But preceding the history of the nomenclature that Oboler maps in her study, there is an earlier imperial history that describes the expansionist imperative of the United States. The logic of self-defense sounded by President James Monroe in his 1823 speech evolved in time into a self-assured affirmation of America's right to expand by virtue of what eventually became known as manifest destiny. With the 1846 US invasion of Mexico under President James Polk, an action that would lead to the acquisition of Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico, and Utah two years later, American might proved its dexterity at gliding over coterminous nation-states. But the US defeat in 1898 of the older Spanish empire, which entailed the domination of several overseas territories, showed that irresistible power could make up for the inconvenience of great distances. In this sense, in a speech delivered on September 16, 1898, Indiana Senator Albert J. Beveridge resignified the idea of contiguity. He said, 'The ocean does not separate us from lands of our duty and desire—the oceans join us, a river never to be dredged, a canal never to be repaired. Steam joins us; electricity joins us—the very elements are in league with our destiny. Cuba not contiguous! Puerto Rico not contiguous! Hawaii and the Philippines not contiguous! Our navy will make them contiguous … American speed, American guns, American heart and brain and nerve will keep them contiguous forever' (Beveridge, 1971: 333).

The contiguity created by American imperial expansion, whether over coterminous territories or across transoceanic land masses, created the historical grounds for the presence of Hispanic communities in the United States. The awareness that one is in the United States today as a result of the defeat suffered by one's forbears, or the understanding that one's original homeland has existed for over a century in a position of subservience vis-á-vis American power in the hemisphere, does seem to create a sense of commonality. Latinos in the United States are a composite of diverse historical realities, national experiences, and collective existential traumas.[2] Before entering American society from the native land, which for each distinct group corresponded to different socio-historical and geopolitical events, one did not see oneself as Latino or Hispanic but as Puerto Rican, Cuban, Colombian, or Dominican, to name only a few of the Latino groups that are most visible in my current base of operation, New York. As members of a diaspora, however, we have become unified in significant ways. We share the experience of having been uprooted by large socioeconomic forces from our original homelands. We come from societies with a history of unequal association with the United States, a country that has influenced and sometimes even dictated political behavior in Latin America. The image of 'backyard', often invoked by US policy makers to identify Latin America's geographic proximity to the United States, entails a qualitative view that construes the region not as partner but as subordinate.

By the third decade of the twentieth century, a good many Latin American nations already had experienced, through the incursion of US armed forces into their terri-

[2] The remainder of this paragraph and the four that follow reproduce almost verbatim the second section of my essay 'Visions of Dominicanness in the United States', in Borderless Borders: US Latinos, Latin Americans, and the Paradox of Interdependence, eds. Frank Bonilla, et al. (Philadelphia: Temple, 1998) 139–52.

tory, the concrete inequality of their relationship with their North American neighbor. They had also become acquainted with the views that often informed these military invasions. For instance, Senator Beveridge, speaking before the US Senate in 1901, had declared, 'God has made us the master organizers of the world to establish systems where chaos reigns … He has made us adept in government that we may administer government among savages and senile people' (Welles, 1996: 916). Similarly, President Theodore Roosevelt is known to have publicly decried the Cubans', Dominicans', Haitians', and Nicaraguans' conduct of their political lives. The famous 'corollary to the Monroe Doctrine' in Roosevelt's annual message to Congress in 1904 hints at the US sense of moral and political superiority to the peoples of Latin America: 'Chronic wrongdoing or an impotence which results in a general loosening of the ties of civilized society, may in America, as elsewhere, ultimately require intervention by some civilized nation, and in the western Hemisphere the adherence of the United States to the Monroe Doctrine may force the United States, however reluctantly, in flagrant cases of such wrongdoing or impotence, to the exercise of an international police power' (Black, 1988: 23).

The preceding background largely explains the political, economic, and cultural 'otherness' to which US Hispanics typically find themselves relegated with respect to the dominant social structure. The awareness of this otherness leads us to assert our commonality with those who share our history of defeat, particularly when we can claim linguistic, religious, and regional links among our various national groups. The experience of diasporic uprooting and the sense of living outside the dominant realm of the receiving society permeate our Latino identity. For even though Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, and Dominicans became ethnic communities in the United States through profoundly different processes, we are bound by political imperatives to see ourselves as one. Ironically, Simón Bolívar's desideratum of a unified Latin American nation and the ideal upheld by Eugenio María de Hostos of the Antillean federation find in us a strange kind of fulfilment. We have come to articulate a collective identity not in our native homelands, as Bolívar and Hostos had dreamed, but within the insecure space of the diaspora. The feeling that ours is a contested terrain—that we do not inherit our social space but must carve it out for ourselves in the face of adversity—leads us to lift the banner of our oneness despite differences in the circumstances under which each of our distinct groups became part of the United States. The language of unity in this case functions as an instrument of survival.

LEVELS OF LATINO MARGINALITY

The foregoing emphasis on the historical, contingent nature of the presumed Latino unity seeks to suggest that the need for unitary political practices does not translate automatically or unproblematically into ontological sameness. The distinct subgroups that make up the US population that is labeled Hispanic are neither identical nor equal. Let us, for argument's sake, concentrate on the dynamic of epistemological inequality among the various subgroups. Dominicans provide an illustrative case. A disdain for Dominican knowledge is evident in several of the overviews, surveys, and compilations that purport to cover holistically the history, culture, and contributions

of Latinos in American society. Because such panoramic vistas are normally penned or coordinated by authors who belong to the Latino subgroups that enjoy greater socioeconomic and political empowerment, it makes sense that they should either omit any mention of the Dominican portion of the Latino experience or dispatch it briefly and superficially. The same logic applies here as with the rapport between dominant and dependent nation-states. Studying the experiences of the larger and better-positioned portions of the Latino population—the 'meaningful' parts that can stand for the whole—seems to lessen the need for complex and in-depth coverage of the smaller and weaker portions.

Witness the coverage that Antonia Darder and Rodolfo D. Torres pursue in their collection *The Latino Reader: Culture, Economy, and Society* (1998). The book includes no chapter on, and no extended consideration of, the Dominican experience. The editors proceed as though they deemed knowledge about the life of that subgroup irrelevant to understanding the Latino community. The exclusion of Dominicans, as authors and as subject matter, from the 94-chapter anthology *The Latino/a Condition: A Critical Reader* (1998) edited by the scholars Richard Delgado and Jean Stefancic seems to say no less. From the perspective of the major Latino subgroups, then, the experience of the lesser groups does not promise to yield knowledge capable of transcending the limits of such a community. We see here a case of what could be called intra-colonial epistemological inequality that leaves Dominicans out of the master narrative of the Latino experience. In addition to omitting Dominicans, the dynamic also manifests itself as a casual treatment of the lesser group. When *Washington Post* journalist Roberto Suro writes a book on Latinos, his Dominican chapter is devoted to rebuking the community's leaders for not attacking with sufficient energy the drug problem in their midst and for not being proactive in circumventing the limits of the enclave economy (Suro, 1998: 197,202–03). Exhibiting a similar sense of superiority, Univisión anchorman Jorge Ramos assigns himself the poetic license to coin his own genteelisms to name Dominicans: 'Portodominicans' (portodominicanos) for those living in Puerto Rico and 'Neodominicans' (neodominicanos) for those living in New York (Ramos, 2000: 179–85). I cannot help but conjecture that if this Mexican brother had been writing about a group with a greater degree of power vis-á-vis the other Latino subgroups, he would have consulted appropriate sources to find out what the members of the community actually call themselves, instead of inflicting on them his own flair for neologistic acrobatics.

By the same token, *New York Daily News* journalist Juan González, the author of the book *Harvest of Empire: A History of Latinos in the United States* (2000), does not invest in Dominicans anywhere near the intellectual labor apparent in his coverage of Chicanos and Puerto Ricans. For Chicanos and Puerto Ricans, González draws amply from the existing scholarship on the lives of those communities in the United States. As a result, he writes competently on them. But in the case of Dominicans, he seems to have felt no compulsion to consult the bibliography that US Dominicans have generated, most of which has been annotated by Sarah Aponte (Aponte, 1999). Apparently confident that he could discern the intricacies of the Dominican experience without the aid of the work done by Dominican American scholars, and disdaining the archival resources of the City University of New York's Dominican Studies Institute,

González proceeds to explain the community *ex-nihilo*, basing his account largely on scanty reading and several interviews with Dominican New Yorkers. Not surprisingly, his Dominican chapter is fraught with intellectual poverty. A Dominican reader would indeed find it very hard to concur with Juan Flores's assessment of *Harvest of Empire* as 'no doubt the most wide-ranging, engaging, and critically reflective book about Latinos to date' Flores, 'Review', 2000: 43). A piece of irony here: *Magic Urbanism* (2000), an overview of Latinos written by the distinguished Anglo author Mike Davis, stands out as the only one among such efforts that shows an interest in accessing the knowledge produced by Dominican scholars and integrating it into the larger pan-ethnic conversation. Perhaps Anglo colleagues, unencumbered by membership in any of the individual subgroups, have at present a better chance than Hispanics to look panoptically at Latinos, ensuring that no subgroup is left out of the picture.

WHITE-SUPREMACIST HYBRIDITY

The reiterative musings about borderlessness, hybridity, and transnational dynamics that pervade recent scholarly production on the Latino experience have only ostensibly celebrated diversity. The exclusionary ideological structures that lie at the core of corporate identity formulations in the community remain virtually unchallenged. The academia, the media, and the consumer market for the most part have rallied around the consensus that promotes the notion that US Hispanics constitute a seamless unit. Few have stopped to consider the resonance of that view with the elitist, Eurocentric, and white-supremacist ideas on *hispanidad* that cohered in the minds of the Latin American intelligentsia of the generation that witnessed and mourned the change of imperial guard that took place in 1898 in the Western Hemisphere. Although they paid lip service to the virtues of *mestizaje*, the celebrants of *hispanidad* or (*latinidad*) in practice supported negrophobic and anti-Indian regimes. José Martí may have denied the existence of 'races' in an often-cited 1894 essay, arguing for the essential, unquestionable humanity of all peoples, but to think of his view as common to many Latin American intellectuals at the time would be erroneous.

This warning matters especially, given the present context in which, spurred by the recognition of a certain geopolitical and economic interdependence between the United States and Latin America, many Latino scholars find it natural to proclaim their intellectual kinship to a history of ideas rooted in the Iberian side of the hemisphere. The distinguished scholar Frank Bonilla, who has himself invested enormous energy in creating bridges of intellectual communication between Latin Americans in the south and Latinos in the North, has borne witness to serious obstacles that have emerged at given moments, sometimes even connected to our varying ways of understanding key concepts such as ethnicity, culture, and racism (Bonilla, 1998: 224). Many colleagues accept too quickly the view that the Spanish-speaking world has a less racialized and more humane understanding of the difference among human beings. A 1996 conversation on the topic of race relations between Latino scholar Jorge Klor de Alva and African American essayist Cornel West, moderated by Earl Shorris, left little doubt that Klor de Alva felt that his privileging linguistic background and culture to define US Hispanics constituted a more accurate rendition of social identity than

his African American colleague's focus on blackness to speak of his community (*Harper's* 1996: 55; Klor de Alva, West and Shorris, 1998). Latino colleagues at times can hardly conceal their pride at the thought that their culture is less racist than that of the Anglos. As Nicolás Kanellos would put it, '[Although] 'race' distinctions and prejudice exist in Spanish America, they do not take, nor ever have they taken, the form of institutionalized discrimination as in the United States; they are more subtly expressed (some glaring exceptions are to be found in the history of Cuba and Puerto Rico under US domination)' (Kanellos, 1998: 178).

I would be less sanguine about exonerating Latin America of official, institutionalized racial misconduct, especially in light of the many countries in the region that at various points in history specified a preference for whites in their immigration legislation. Jorge Cañízares Esguerra has even advanced the idea that modern racism originated in Latin America. He contends 'that the science of race, with is emphasis on behavioral-cultural variations, and its obsession with creating homogenizing and essentializing categories, was first articulated in colonial Spanish America in the seventeenth century, not in nineteenth-century Europe' (Cañízares Esguerra, 1999: 35). At any rate, without clear, tangible institutional barriers exacerbating the subjugation of particular racial communities, one would be hard put to explain most of the violent racial clashes that Latin America has witnessed (the 1912 uprising of blacks and their subsequent mass killing in Cuba stand out as a particularly glaring example.)

The following incident comes to mind. In the evening of Thursday, February 25, 2000, a Haitian-descended Dominican woman named Sonia Pierre suffered abuse upon entering the United States through JFK Airport in New York City. She had traveled to the North in her capacity as head of the Santo Domingo-based Dominican-Haitian Women's Movement (MUDHA). A guest at a national conference organized by the group Dominicans 2000 at City College, which featured First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton among the keynote speakers, Pierre had come prepared to enlighten the audience regarding the plight of Dominican-born children of Haitian parents whom Dominican government authorities have thus far denied the right of citizenship on the basis of their ethnicity. She came loaded with data to show the extent to which the intellectual heirs of the Trujillo dictatorship would go in publicly declaring Haitian ancestry to be antithetical to and incompatible with the very concept of Dominicanness. She could not possibly have imagined that the affronts she suffered daily as a member of a despised community in the Dominican Republic would follow her all the way to JFK. After all, what do 'Americans' know about ethnic tensions in the Caribbean island of Hispaniola? However, Pierre had the misfortune to be received at the immigration checkpoint not by an Anglo but by a Latina INS agent, a Dominican-descended US citizen with the name Goico on her tag. When Pierre presented her passport and other qualifying papers, Ms. Goico challenged their authenticity and accused her of forgery. She felt confident that from a look at Sonia's 'Haitian appearance' (that is, her coarse hair untamed by relaxers and her negroid facial features), she could tell that the passenger was a Haitian trying to pass for Dominican. The last name Pierre did not help, of course. The letter of invitation from the conference organizers did not suffice. An overwhelming amount of documentation, a close examination of the papers suspected to have been forged, and lengthy interviews with several INS officers ensued

before Pierre, after nearly two hours of excruciating detention, was allowed to proceed without receiving an apology from Ms. Goico.

Ms. Goico's anti-Haitian antipathy corresponds to a pre-diasporic experience of Dominican society, dating back to an earlier milieu that encouraged hatred for the neighbors on the other side of the island of Hispaniola. Dominican anti-Haitianism gradually fades in the diaspora, especially among people with some community involvement. Community activism brings Haitians and Dominicans together as they, free from the supervision of the State that fueled their ethnic antipathy, learn to recognize each other as allies in a common struggle for survival as minorities of color. The affirmation of her difference as a person of color who recognized herself as an 'other' with respect to the Anglo norm would have fostered in Ms. Goico a sense of kinship with other Caribbean people, Haitians included, as well as with African Americans and other nonwhite ethnic groups. Apparently having been deprived of such an enlightened background, Ms. Goico clung to the negrophobia and anti-Haitian sentiments that formed part of her 'education' on matters related to nation, cultural identity, and Dominicanness in the home country during the Trujillo and Balaguer regimes. Importing her original homeland's racial hang-ups, she forgot herself. Entrusted, as an INS officer, with the task of guarding the US statutory border against illegal entrants, she instead spent nearly two hours trying to bar a Haitian ethnic from entering the space of Dominicanness. She thus trampled the civil rights of a human being and momentarily deprived her victim of the protection that US law guarantees.

I believe this incident illustrates the extent to which blurring the boundaries between the Latin American South and the Latino North can complicate the process of cultural and political self-definition of US Hispanics. Should that blurring take place, the Latino community would abdicate its position as a vanguard committed to the further democratization of the United States. For we can play that role creditably only when we free ourselves from the influence of those aspects of our Latino American background that militate against equality and justice.

I do not see Ms. Goico as a unique or isolated case. Her ethnic antipathy matches that of a good many individuals in the Latin American population. Nor is she alone in importing to the Latino North a hatred that belongs in a specific part of the Latin American South. I see a parallel in the racial misconduct of the business executives who control the TV programs that Spanish-speaking Hispanics watch. Just as Ms. Goico has not rid herself of a deleterious racial ideology she inherited from her home country, so do the corporate leaders behind Univisión and Telemundo resist allowing black and Indian faces to appear before the cameras even in these post-desegregation United States. One could surmise that in an applicant's effort to land a job as a newscaster on a Spanish-speaking TV station or network, Scandinavian ancestry would be very helpful. Conversely, displaying the Indian features of nineteenth-century Mexican president Benito Juárez or the black features of Cuban independence leader Antonio Maceo would seriously reduce the applicant's chances. Anyone who watches Hispanic TV in the United States will easily recognize the white-supremacist value system that governs the way mass-media corporations promote the collective visage of the Latino community. It is through the white faces of our anchor-persons

that Hispanic TV networks have chosen visually to represent the homogeneity that our corporate identity is supposed to embody.

I argue against embracing uncritically the notion that US Hispanics are unified by the all-powerful bond of a shared linguistic heritage and a common culture, precisely because such a view impairs our ability to combat the anti-Indian and negrophobic traditions we inherit from Latin America. The claim that Latinos constitute one big happy family conceals the tensions, inequities, and injustices in our midst, contributing to a conceptual ambience that legitimizes the absence of black and Indian faces and voices from Latino fora. The operating logic seems to be that, because everyone in our polychromatic community is really the same, everyone is inherently represented even when only one color continues to peer out at us from the tube. Public visibility translates into intellectual representation. In a related observation, individuals with pronounced indigenous features seldom appear in Latino academic forums, speaking as producers of knowledge and as the intellectual equals of their colleagues. To enjoy such a privilege, an Indian would normally have to achieve a distinction comparable to that of Nobel Prize winner Rigoberta Menchú. Characteristically, the Mexican American essayist Richard Rodriguez, the one Latino thinker with perceptible Indian features who enjoys intellectual prominence, has attained his celebrity through Anglophone mainstream media venues such as PBS, not through the Hispanic venues of Univisión or Telemundo. He begins one of his essays by evoking a time when he 'used to stare at the Indian in the mirror. The wide nostrils. The thick lips … Such a long face—such a long nose—sculpted by indifferent, blunt thumbs, and of such common clay. No one in my family had a face as dark or as Indian as mine' (Rodriguez, 1991, 1998: 535).

The Univisión TV station Channel 41, which serves New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, has lately been airing a well-orchestrated publicity campaign that sings the praises of our common *hispanidad*. The campaign features many popular entertainers from the music industry. Their song insistently dwells on the language, the culture, and the traditions that make us *una sola familia*. Although I am intellectually skeptical about the views propounded by the whole campaign, I have reacted most viscerally to the one spot that in my view most abusively mocks historical truth, scoffing at the suffering of the conquered. The spot I have in mind features an Andean band made up of *indios* who enthusiastically sing the praises of *hispanidad* and our shared Spanish heritage. The spot displays utter disregard for the grief of the indigenous populations of South America and the rest of the hemisphere who fell under the genocidal hand of the old Spanish empire that invaded their land. Such historical amnesia also has the effect of completely exculpating the Latin American ruling elites responsible for perpetrating great evils against Indians since independence from Spain. At least from the time of Argentinean statesman Domingo Sarmiento onward, anti-Indian scorn has too often entered the official discourse of Latin American nations and influenced public policy, with dire consequences for the indigenous populations. The moving story told by the film *El Norte*, which dramatizes the plight of aboriginal peasants who have to flee their native Guatemalan home in order to save themselves, testifies to the resilience of anti-Indian violence in contemporary Latin America.

For Univisión to have Indians appear on TV praising the glory of our presumably common Spanish heritage is to mock the victims of a continuous five-century genocide in Latin America. By the same token, when the aforementioned publicity campaign has the late Afro-Cuban star Celia Cruz adding her voice to the praise of the common culture, traditions, and Spanish language that make all Hispanics *una sola familia*, one wonders whether she was aware of the negrophobic and anti-Indian project she legitimized. As *Washington Post* journalist Michael A. Fletcher has noted, Afro Latinos or indigenous people are rarely cast in Spanish-language television shows in the United States, and the few that are 'most often play demeaning roles'. In the widely popular 'telenovelas', the soap operas, 'darker skinned people most often play maids, gardeners, chauffeurs or dabblers in witchcraft' (Fletcher, 2000). Because of her blackness, the popular New York-based radio personality Malín Falú, producer of a long-running talk show on WADO, has confronted insurmountable barriers in her attempts to land jobs in Spanish-language television in the United States. The Tomás Rivera Policy Institute surveyed 4,000 Latino members of the Screen Actors Guild to learn that the majority of the respondents thought dark skin was a liability for any Latino actor who hoped to get opportunities in Spanish-language television productions (Fletcher, 2000).

I had occasion to raise the issue of race with the former president and CEO of Univisión, Henry G. Cisneros, when he, in the role of keynote speaker, addressed the participants in a major Latino studies conference held at Harvard University in April 2000. At the end of his speech, I courteously asked him whether, from his influential position in the network, he 'envisioned a time in the near future when one would not have to be *güero* to serve as an anchorperson in Univisión'. After much circumlocution, Cisneros did not really commit himself to an answer, but he did reassure his audience that network managers had been looking seriously into the issue of representation. He urged us to look for evidence of their concern in the composition of the live audience that appears in the very successful *Show de Cristina*, which is hosted by the Cuban Cristina Saralegui, the author of a memoir significantly entitled *Cristina! Confidencias de una rubia* (1998) [*Confessions of a Blond*]. Cisneros also said that the cast in the early-morning variety show 'Despierta América' reflects a concern with representing diversity, a clear allusion to Rafael José, a Puerto Rican mulatto featured among the hosts at the time. Clearly, I had posed a difficult question, and the answer Cisneros gave was no more satisfactory than that of Telemundo spokesperson Ted Guefen, who, fumbling for evidence to show his network's concern for racial inclusiveness, cited the case of the successful show 'Xica', a soap opera based on the life of a nineteenth-century Afro-Brazilian slave who used her sexual prowess to earn her freedom and climb socially. The Brazilian-made program, noted for risqué love scenes, features the hyper-sexualized young actress Tais Araujo, reportedly the first black actress ever to land a leading role in a Latin American soap opera.

Cisneros trod on firmer rhetorical ground in answering the second part of my question, wherein I inquired whether Univisión was planning to change the objectionable scenario depicted by the telenovelas, which invariably present blacks and Indians as housemaids or servants. He immediately absolved his network of any responsibility for those portrayals by quickly responding, 'We have no control over what goes

into the telenovelas because they are made in Mexico'. A natural follow-up question would have demanded further satisfaction; as the telenovela producers' client, the network ought to have the power to influence the merchandise it purchases. But the follow-up became unnecessary as Cisneros proceeded to expound on the importance of the telenovelas as the network's number-one revenue-producing venture. Thanks to the telenovelas, Univisión has often gotten a greater share of the national market than the major English-language television networks. 'Without them', the former HUD Secretary said, 'we would be out of business', emphasizing that Univisión has to see itself first and foremost as a profit-making enterprise. Cisneros unambiguously pointed out that because the telenovelas bring in such great profits the way they are currently made, the network could not take any chances by altering the nature or the texture of the shows. His answer also reflected the conviction that Mexican society is less preoccupied with racial sensitivity than the United States.

LATINO CORPORATE IDENTITY AND THE CORPORATIONS

Whether Latino scholars and artists know it or not, their remaining loyal to a holistic view of Latino identity perfectly serves the economic interests of the Latino portion of corporate America. When over 30 million people can see themselves as a unit, sharing values, language, culture, and aspirations, capital can accumulate more rapidly. Businesses can target their publicity campaigns and marketing strategies with greater precision. The 17. 3 million Spanish-speaking Hispanics willing and able to watch television, listen to the radio, and read newspapers, are a gold mine that business is eager to tap into. Spanish speakers in the US population outnumber speakers of the most numerous among other 'foreign' language speakers ten times over. Hispanic buying power by 1999 had reached $348 billion a year, up 65 percent since 1990, according to the Selig Center for Economic Growth of the University of Georgia (Sleeper, 1999: 10). One can therefore understand the insistence with which Univisión and Telemundo promote the idea of US Hispanics as an ethnically and culturally homogeneous people. The premise clearly informs Univisión's extremely successful variety program *Sábado Gigante,* hosted by the Chilean TV announcer Mario Kreuzberger, who is popularly known as Don Francisco. The same applies to the talk show *Cristina*, hosted by Saralegui. Vigorously embracing the view that US Hispanics have a common heritage that makes them one people, these shows also exhibit the all-encompassing hemispheric notion that Hispanics North and South share one worldview. The most successful of the shows air in almost every city of Latin America as well as in the United States, and some, such as 'Sábado Gigante', are produced alternately in Latin America and the United States (Fox, 1997: 47–49).

Media executives have a huge stake in ensuring that US Hispanics see themselves as one, for these executives can use their power over the community's perceptions and opinions as a bargaining tool in their competition with their corporate counterparts. Raúl Alarcón, president of the Spanish Broadcasting System, and Jesus Chavarria, publisher of *Hispanic Business*, have complained about major advertisers who in their view distribute advertising dollars unfairly to the advantage of Anglo companies. They cite such examples as the 'Miami Univisión TV station Channel 23, which is

ranked number one in terms of ratings but receives considerably less advertising revenue than other TV stations in its market' (Dougherty, 1999: 26). In response to that perceived unfairness, Hispanic media executives have joined their African American counterparts, with the support of political leaders and legislators, in creating the Madison Avenue Initiative to advance the interests of minority-owned media companies. They can wield no greater weapon, however, than the assurance that they have a unified Hispanic community backing them. The corporate leadership gains a competitive edge when Latinos subscribe to a corporate identity. Counting on a homogeneous community supportive of their business interests, the Hispanic media executives can then exert greater pressure as they step up their demand for a larger piece of the economic pie. They can invoke 'the community' to advance their ends. They have even gone as far as threatening to 'engage in boycotts', as was made clear by a New York Latino legislator who, siding with the Hispanic media executives, asserted that advertisers that 'continue to ignore' our community 'can suffer economic casualties' (28). Nor do these Hispanic media executives have any doubt about their own ability to forge a sense of pan-Latino identity, because, in the words of the publisher of *The Miami Herald* and *El Nuevo Herald*, Alberto Ibarguen, 'technology and economic forces' have the power to define 'community identity' (Sleeper, 1999: 3). Also, in as much as, for them, North and South have fused into one market, it is in their best interest to promote pan-hemispheric visions of Latino identity. As Ibarguen has said, 'Miami is the central communication point for all of the Caribbean and much of South America … Television, ad agencies, banks, music recording companies all have their Latin American headquarters here' (3).

RESTORING BORDERS TEMPORARILY

I hope the foregoing makes clear that both the homogenizing views of Latino identity and the pan-hemispheric compulsion to erase the dividing line between the Latin South American and the Latino North coincide with the figurations promoted by powerful economic interests in the mass media and other market forces, as well as with political structures. Latin American governments and corporate leaders have become cognizant of the growing economic value of keeping their diasporas loyal to their lands of origin in order to preserve the constant flow of remittances. They may also hope to prevail on diasporic communities to advocate in favor of the interests of the ancestral country in the context of US foreign policy. Those governments and corporate sectors will certainly encourage consolidation of pan-hemispheric Latino/Hispanic identity. These governments, along with corporations on both sides of the Rio Grande, are likely to relish an idea of Hispanic/Latino identity akin to that proposed by Cuban-born philosophy scholar Jorge J. E. Gracia, which is not only pan-hemispheric, spanning both North and South, but also transatlantic, covering practically the entire globe. Gracia describes Hispanics as 'the people of Iberia, Latin America, and some segments of the population in the United States, after 1492, and the descendants of these peoples anywhere in the world as long as they preserve close ties to them' (Gracia, 2000: 52). I believe that this formulation confounds rather than clarifies the issues involved in the debate on Latino identity. Gracia concerns himself with what he calls

'the total Hispanic/Latino population in the world', as well as by shared 'origin, culture, and values' in the context of a long history of *mestizaje* (ix, 128–29). Yet the debate in the US academy has been predicated on an understanding of Latinos as a US ethnic minority, the only conceptual location where it could possibly make sense. It is only in the United States that Dominicans and Guatemalans can come to see themselves as Hispanics or Latinos. In that respect, we can say, with Harvard political scientist Jorge Dominguez, that 'Latinos are a problematique of Americanness'.[3]

However, despite his unfortunate thesis, Gracia insightfully construes the notion of Hispanic as one that refers to 'a group of people who have no common elements considered as a whole' and justifies their 'unity' as 'not a unity of commonality' but 'a historical unity founded on relations' (50). Similarly, although he describes Hispanic unity as resembling that of a family, a figure that he draws from Wittgenstein, he cautiously explains that 'the metaphor of the family must be taken broadly to avoid any understanding of it as requiring genetic ties … Indeed, the very foundation of a family, marriage, takes place between people who are added to a family through contract, not genesis' (50). Here Gracia allies himself conceptually with what is arguably the most sober approach to defining the nature of ethnic identification. Many scholars today would agree that 'it is primarily the political community, no matter how artificial, that inspires the belief in common ethnicity' (Weber, 1965: 306–07). This understanding of ethnic identification corresponds almost entirely with the idea of a minority group, which, one might recall, does not necessarily depend on numbers. As Louis Wirth argued decades ago, a group may outnumber another and yet remain a minority by virtue of its social, political, and economic subordination (Wirth, 1965: 310). A minority defines itself by its unequal status vis-á-vis 'a corresponding dominant group enjoying higher social status and greater privilege' as well as by its 'exclusion from full participation in the life of society' (309).

In keeping with Gracia's useful caveat, then, and focusing strictly on the historical relations—that is, the material conditions, the social forces, and the political dynamics that frame the experience of Latinos—one might perhaps explore ways of speaking about US Hispanics holistically without imposing a priori notions of homogeneity. As in the case of Dominicans discussed earlier, essentialistic claims will not take us very far in this conversation. Definers of the essential features 'shared by most Hispanics independent of their national background, birthplace, dominant language, or any other sociodemograpic characteristic' have placed too great a demand on our imagination (Marin and Marin, 1991: 2). To claim, for instance, that Rosa, a descendant of Spanish settlers in New Mexico who no longer speaks Spanish, is ontologically indistinguishable from José, an undocumented Nicaraguan who has just arrived in the United States, is to rely unduly on the power of so-called cultural values (2). Scholars Gerardo Marin and Barbara VanOss Marin speak unambiguously of 'the common cultural values that remain strong and personally significant across generations and that may lead both Rosa and José to think of themselves as sharing "something" that they do not share with non-Hispanic residents of the United States' (2)

[3] Comment made as part of his remarks when he served as discussant to a panel in the April 2000 Latino Studies conference at Harvard.

Marin and Marin attribute to Latinos the quality of 'familism'—a 'strong identification with and attachment to their nuclear and extended family' which these theorists regard as one of the most important culture-specific values of Hispanics (13). Such arguments would be stronger if these authors were to supplement their findings with comparative data that would show whether Latinos in fact cherish their relatives appreciably more than other groups, such as Irish Americans, Italian Americans, African Americans, and Jews. Indeed, a number of scholars have argued that immigration and displacement are highly stressful to Latino families (Suárez and Páez, 2002: 274–88, 289–301). David Abalos, for example, has argued that the disquieting levels of disruption affecting the Latino family are a consequence of migration, displacement, and the trauma that ensues (Abalos, 1993: 54). Most disconcerting among the sources of stress affecting the family unit is a variable that one could describe as 'cultural' because it is grounded in the place of male authority in the traditional Spanish family (Suárez and Páez, 2002: 274–88). Abalos highlights the place of male privilege and the patriarchal system that informs the politics of sexism in the Latino family with dehumanizing consequences for both men and women (Abalos, 1993: 53). Given this scenario, rather than highlighting 'familism' as a special quality of the community, we might more convincingly assert that the institution of the family may be in no better shape among Latinos than among any other subsection of the country's population.

THE TENUOUS TIES THAT BIND

We can rest assured that, whatever its problems, the idea of a pan-Latino community with a claim to some kind of wholeness is here to stay (Torres, 2000 and Obler, 2000). We therefore face the challenge of articulating an all-encompassing narrative that might historicize the US Hispanic experience, all national groups and ethnic constituencies included. But we must remain acutely aware of the problematic paradigms that inform our effort. Perhaps we ought to start by avoiding any query that might point to the interstices of the Latino soul. Essentialistic claims will take us nowhere, as Klor de Alva warned over a decade ago, urging us to reflect on the importance of class differences within the Latino community. Equating 'class' with 'culture', he questioned the very existence of 'such a thing as *the* Hispanic family' because in his view family, kinship, and gender roles all vary along socioeconomic and generational lines (Klor de Alva, "Telling", 1988: 116, 122). It follows, that 'the poor inhabit a different cultural and socioeconomic world' from other strata of society among Latinos as among any other portion of the US population (116). Along with many other colleagues from colleges and universities throughout the United States, I have joined the Recovering the US Hispanic Literary Heritage Project, an effort spearheaded by Nicolás Kanellos at the University of Houston that seeks to map the literary and intellectual presence of Hispanics in this country from the beginning of the conquest in the early 1500s to 1960. But I would caution against letting white-supremacist instincts shape the contours of the totalizing narrative we construct.

No doubt we could benefit from devising a historiographic model that enables us to claim a North American heritage that goes back to the colonial period, spanning the exploits of explorers such as Juan Ponce de León and Hernando de Soto, along

with literary and historical texts produced by the likes of Alvar Núñez Cabeza de Vaca and Gaspar Pérez de Villagrá. But we might wish to think twice before concurring with Carlos G. Vélez-Ibáñez in accepting Cabeza de Vaca as 'the first Chicano' writer (Vélez-Ibáñez, *Border,* 1996: 213). The basis for this rather rapid affirmation is the author's understanding of the sociocultural sameness of the conqueror and the conquered. He asserts, for instance, that the majority of the 'Hispanos/Mexicans who migrated north from New Spain after the post-Pueblo Revolt of 1680 were primarily crafts people and agropastoralists who had more in common with the Pueblo peoples than they did with the upper reaches of the peninsular caste/class sector' (266).

One wonders whether such a view of the fundamental similarity between the native peoples and the invaders during the colonial transaction in what is now the Southwest of the United States might not lie at the core of the practice of erasing difference when imagining Latino history. One thinks of examples such as a 1972 overview that closed with sixty biographical sketches of Hispanic individuals from Juan de Oñate to Herman Badillo and mentioned not one Indian or black, not even Estevan, the black Moor who came in the expedition that brought the author of *Naufragios* to the North (Alford, *Proud*, 1972).

Clearly, we must come to terms with our traumatic past. We must also acknowledge as cultural progenitors the indigenous population who suffered the consequences of that early Hispanic presence in what is now the United States. We inherit a racist imaginary from both Latin and Anglo America, and we must try to keep it from dictating the logic of our remembering as we construct a Latino history. Given the pervasiveness of that pernicious imaginary, I propose that we protect ourselves by instituting analytic safeguards in our models. Specifically, I recommend that we once and for all admit the utility of borders—those confines that initially at least, enable people to recognize one another in their difference. I would urge us temporarily to erect intra-Latino borders so that the differentiated experiences of specific national groups can come to light. I believe it is as wrong to demonize borders as it is to pastoralize the common linguistic heritage that by some unexplained mutation turns all our disparate national and ethnic groups into one big happy family. We need to pause for a moment and begin to train our eyes on unearthing the distinct histories of all the Latino subgroups that make up the US Hispanic population, going beyond the exclusive focus on Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, and Cubans. A serious effort also needs to be made to determine the exact location of Brazilians within the larger spectrum of US communities sharing a Latin American heritage. Even if the term *Hispanic* would tend to leave Brazilians out, the term *Latino* would seem to allow for their inclusion (Margolis, 1998: 103–04).

Similarly, I can see great utility in isolating those ethnic identity zones that trespass the boundaries of what David A. Hollinger calls 'the ethnoracial pentagon', the five communities of descent into which the US population is divided for census purposes (Hollinger, 1995: 8). I think we can learn a great deal by looking closely at the differentiated experiences of white Latinos, Indian Latinos, Asian Latinos, and Afro-Latinos. I find no mere coincidence in the fact that the blacker components of the US Hispanic population have recently become more visible in Latino forums just as initiatives have emerged for highlighting the Afro-Latino experience. In mid-September 1999,

the White House hosted a program aimed at addressing the concerns of the African-descended portion of the Latino community. Concurrently with the White House activities, and extending through October 12, the Smithsonian Institution's National Portrait Gallery also devoted its Latino Festival Program to the differentiated experience of Afro-Latinos. As a result, Dominicans, who seldom get invited to national conversations about the Latino agenda, enjoyed inclusion in panels and had a chance to participate. This example suggests to me that by creating structures designed to examine intra-Latino difference, we can achieve greater inclusiveness than we have at present. Such structures can help us counteract the omnipresence of our white-supremacist education. I believe that temporarily erecting intra-Latino borders can lead to our self-recognition in our complex diversity. These borders can help us discern our own internal oppressions, making us accountable for the same principles of equality and justice by which we purport to judge the behavior of Anglo society. Recognizing our differences and understanding the tensions that often mark our rapport, we might develop the skill to see one another clearly, protect ourselves from too facile an identification with one another, rectify our tendency to stand in the way of one another's progress, and come to respect one another. With that goal securely achieved, it will then be realistic for us to aspire to federate our distinct constituencies and communities with the purpose of actually becoming, eventually, that one big family striving together in pursuit of common happiness.

WORKS CITED

— Abalos, D.T. (1993) *The Latino Family and the Politics of Transformation*.
— Westport and London: Greenwood.
— Alford, H.J. (1972) *The Proud Peoples: The Heritage and Culture of Spanish-Speaking People in the United States*. New York: McKay.
— Aponte, S. (1999) *Dominican Migration to the United States, 1971–1997: An Annotated Bibliography*. Dominican Research Monographs. New York: CUNY Dominican Studies Institute.
— Beveridge, A. J. (1971) 'Beveridge Trumpets Imperialism', in P. Jacobs and S. Landau with E. Pell (eds) *To Serve the Devil* (Vol. 2) New York: Vintage.
— Black, G. (1988) *The Good Neighbor: How the United States Wrote the History of Central America and the Caribbean*. New York: Pantheon.
— Bonilla, F. (1998) 'Rethinking Latino/Latin American Interdependence: New Knowing, New Practice', in F. Bonilla, et al. (eds) *Borderless Borders: US Latinos, Latino Americans, and the Paradox of Interdependence*. Philadelphia: Temple: 217–30.
— Cañízares Esguerra, J. (1999) 'New World, New Stars: Patriotic Astrology and the Invention of Indian and Creole Bodies in Colonial Spanish America, 1600–1650', *American Historical Review* 104(1): 33–68.
— Darder, A. and R. D. Torres, eds. (1998) *The Latino Studies Reader: Culture, Economy, and Society*. Malden & Oxford: Blackwell.
— Davis, M. (2000) *Magical Urbanism: Latinos Reinvent the US City*. London and New York: Verso.
— Delgado, R. (1995) 'Words That Wound: A Tort Action for Racial Insults, Epithets, and Name-Calling', in *Critical Race Theory: The Cutting Edge*. R. Delgado (ed) Philadelphia: Temple: 159–68.
— Delgado, R. and J. Stefancic, eds. (1998) *The Latino/a Condition: A Critical Reader*. New York: New York UP.
— Dougherty, T. (1999) 'Media versus Minorities', *Hispanic Business*: 26–28.
— Dworkin y Méndez, K. (2000) 'Introduction', in *Black Cuban, Black American: A Memoir*. E. Grillo (ed) Houston: Arte Público: vii–xiv.

— Flores, J. and G. Yudice, eds. (1993) *Divided Borders: Essays In Puerto Rican Identity*. Houston: Arte Público.
— Flores J. (2000) 'Review of *Harvest of Empire: A History of Latinos in America*, by Juan González', *Color Lines: Race Culture Action* 3(3): 43.
— Fletcher, M. A. (2000) 'Latino Actors Cite Color Barrier in US' *Boston Sunday Globe*, August.
— Fox, G. (1997) *The Hispanic Nation: Culture, Politics, and the Construction of Identity*. Tucson: U of Arizona P.
— González, J. (2000) *Harvest of Empire: A History of Latinos in America*. New York: Viking.
— Gracia, J.J.E. (2000) *Hispanic/Latino Identity: A Philsophical Perspective*. Malden and Oxford: Blackwell.
— Grillo, E. (2000) *Black Cuban, Black American: A Memoir*. Introduction by Kenya Dworkin y Méndez. Houston: Arte Público.
— Hollinger, D.A. (1995) *Postethnic America: Beyond Multiculturalism*. New York: Basic Books.
— Kanellos, N. (1998) 'Hispanics and Race', in *Reference Library of Hispanic America*, Vol. 1. N. Kanellos (ed) Detroit: Gale Research: 176–84.
— Klor de Alva, J.J. (1988) 'Telling Hispanics Apart: Latino Sociocultural Diversity', in *The Hispanic Experience in the United States: Contemporary Issues and Perspectives*. E. Costa Belen and B.R. Sjostrom (eds). New York: Praeger: 107–36.
— Klor de Alva, J.J., C. West, and E. Shorris. (1998) 'Our Next Race Question: The Uneasiness Between Blacks and Latinos', in *The Latino Studies Reader: Culture, Economy and Society*. A. Darder and R. D. Torres (eds) Malden and Oxford: Blackwell: 180–89.
— Margolis, M. L. (1998) *An Invisible Minority: Brazilians in New York City*. New Immigrants Series. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
— Marin, G., and B. VanOss Marin. (1991) *Research with Hispanic Populations*. Vol. 23. Applied Research Methods Series. Newbury Park: Sage.
— Oboler, S. (1995) *Ethnic Labels, Latino Lives: Identity and the Politics of (Re)Presentation in the United States*. Minneapolis and London: U of Minnesota P.
— Oboler, S. (2000) 'Contemporary Constructions of Latino Identity: Rethinking the Discourse in Race Relations in the United States'. Paper presented at the conference on Emerging Trends and Interdisciplinary Discourses in Latino Studies. Latino Studies Program, Cornell University, April 14–15.
— Ramos, J. (2000) *La otra cara de América: Historias de los immigrantes latinoamericanos que están cambiando a Estados Unidos*. Mexico, DF: Editorial Grijalbo.
— Rodriguez, R. (1998) 'Mixed Blood: Columbus's Legacy: A World Made Mestizo'. Originally in *Harper's* 1991. Reprinted in *Progressions: Readings for Writers*. B. S. Wilbert (ed) New York and London: Norton: 535–49.
— Saralegui, C. (1998) *Cristina! Confidencias de una rubia*. New York: Warner Books.
— Sleeper, J. (1999) *Should American Journalism Make Us American?* Cambridge, MA: Joan Shorenstein Center on the Press, Politics and Public Policy and the John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University. (15 pp. pamphlet).
— Suro, R. (1998) *Strangers Among US: Latino Lives in a Changing America*. New York: Knopf.
— Torres, A. (2000) 'Latino Cultural Identity and Political Participation: Scanning the Recent Literature'. Paper presented at the conference on Emerging Trends and Interdisciplinary Discourses in Latino Studies. Latino Studies Program, Cornell University, April 14–15.
— Torres-Saillant, S. (1998) 'Visions of Dominicanness in the United States', in *Borderless Borders: US Latinos, Latin Americans, and the Paradox of Interdependence*. Frank Bonilla, et al (eds) Philadelphia: Temple: 139–52.
— Vélez-Ibáñez, C.G. (1996) *Border Visions: Mexican Cultures of the Southwestern United States*. Tucson: U of Arizona P.
— Weber, M. (1965) 'Ethnic Groups', in *Theories of Society: Foundations of Modern Sociological Theory*. T. Parsons et al (eds) One-volume edition. New York: The Free Press: 305–09.
— Welles S. (1996) *Naboth's Vineyard: The Dominican Republic, 1844–1924*. Mamaroneck, N.Y.: Paul P. Appel: 916.
— Wirth L. (1965) 'The Problem of Minority Groups', in *Theories of Society: Foundations of Modern Sociological Theory*. T. Parsons, et al (eds) One-volume Edition. New York: The Free Press: 309–15.