Perspectives on Las Américas

A Reader in Culture, History, & Representation

edited and introduced by

Matthew C. Gutmann,
Félix V. Matos Rodríguez, Lynn Stephen,
and Patricia Zavella

Blackwell
Publishing

Perspectives on Las Américas

Global Perspectives

In a time of ever-increasing global phenomena, Blackwell Publishing's series *Global Perspectives* offers regionally focused volumes that attempt to move beyond the standard regional studies model. Each volume includes a selection of previously published articles and an extensive introduction by the volume editor, providing an overview of the history and cultures of the region under discussion. The articles are chosen to illustrate the dynamic processes by and through which scholars have described and understood regional history and culture, and to show how profoundly the ethnography of each region has influenced the direction and development of anthropological and social theory. The *Global Perspectives* series thus furnishes readers with both an introduction to the cultures of a vast array of world regions, and a history of how those cultures have been perceived and interpreted.

The contributors include anthropologists, historians, philosophers, and critics. Collectively they show the multiplicities of voice in regional studies, and reveal the interpenetration of ideas and concepts within and across disciplines, regions, and historical periods.

Published

1. Perspectives on Africa: A Reader in Culture, History, & Representation
   Edited and introduced by Roy Richard Grinker and Christopher B. Steiner
2. Perspectives on Las Américas: A Reader in Culture, History, & Representation
   Edited and introduced by Matthew C. Gutmann, Félix V. Matos Rodríguez, Lynn Stephen, and Patricia Zavella

In Preparation

Perspectives on Japan: A Reader in Culture, History, & Representation
Edited and introduced by William Kelly
Perspectives on the Middle East: A Reader in Culture, History, & Representation
Edited and introduced by Richard Tapper
Perspectives on Modern South Asia: A Reader in Culture, History, & Representation
Edited and introduced by Kamala Visweswaran and Ali Mir
Perspectives on the Caribbean: A Reader in Culture, History, & Representation
Edited and introduced by Philip Scher and Kevin Yelvington

Perspectives on Las Américas

A Reader in Culture, History, & Representation

edited and introduced by

Matthew C. Gutmann,
Félix V. Matos Rodríguez, Lynn Stephen,
and Patricia Zavella

Blackwell
Publishing

350 Main Street, Malden, MA 02148-5018, USA
108 Cowley Road, Oxford OX4 1JF, UK
550 Swanston Street, Carlton, Victoria 3053, Australia
Kurfürstendamm 57, 10707 Berlin, Germany

First published 2003 by Blackwell Publishers Ltd

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Perspectives on Las Américas : a reader in culture, history, and representation / edited and introduced by Matthew C. Gutmann . . . [et al.].
p. cm.—(Global perspectives)
ISBN 0–631–22295–2 (alk. paper)—ISBN 0–631–22296–0 (alk. paper)
1. Latin America—History. 2. Hispanic Americans. 3. Latin Americans—United States. 4. Ethnicity. 5. Identity (Psychology) 6. Sex role. 7. Popular culture. 8. Political culture. I. Gutmann, Matthew C., 1953- II. Series.
F1410 .P48 2003
980—dc21

2002007335

A catalogue record for this title is available from the British Library.

Set in 9.5/11.5pt Ehrhardt
by Kolam Information Services Pvt. Ltd, Pondicherry, India
Printed and bound in the United Kingdom
by MPG Books Ltd, Bodmin, Cornwall

For further information on
Blackwell Publishing, visit our website:
http://www.blackwellpublishing.com

Contents

PART V Regional, National, and Transnational Political Cultures

List of Contributors

Editors

Matthew C. Gutmann is the Stanley J. Bernstein Assistant Professor of the Social Sciences – International Affairs at Brown University, where he teaches Cultural Anthropology, Ethnic Studies, and Latin American Studies. He is the author of *The Meanings of Macho: Being a Man in Mexico City* (University of California Press, 1996), *Mainstreaming Men into Gender and Development: Debates, Reflections, and Experiences* (with Sylvia Chant, Oxfam, 2000), and *The Romance of Democracy: Compliant Defiance in Contemporary Mexico* (University of California Press, 2002), and editor of *Changing Men and Masculinities in Latin America* (Duke University Press, 2003).

Félix V. Matos Rodríguez, a historian, is currently the Director of the Center for Puerto Rican Studies at Hunter College (City University of New York). He is the author of *Women and Urban Life in Nineteenth-Century San Juan, Puerto Rico (1820–62)* (University Presses of Florida, 1999); co-author of "*Pioneros:*" *Puerto Ricans in New York City, 1896–1948* (Arcadia, 2001); and co-editor of *Puerto Rican Women's History: New Perspectives* (M. E. Sharpe, 1998).

Lynn Stephen is professor and chair of the Department of Anthropology at the University of Oregon. She is the author of five books: *Zapotec Women* (University of Texas Press, 1991), *Class, Politics, and Popular Religion in Mexico and Central America* (with James Dow, University of Texas Press, 1990), *Hear My Testimony: María Teresa Tula, Human Rights Activist of El Salvador* (South End Press, 1994), *Women and Social Movements in Latin America: Power From Below* (University of Texas Press, 1997), and *Zapata Lives!: Histories and Cultural Politics in Southern Mexico* (University of California Press, 2002). Lynn Stephen's research focuses on gender, ethnicity, political economy, social movements, human rights, and nationalism in Latin America. She is currently working on two projects: (1) on immigration and Mexican farmworkers in Oregon and (2) the role of cooperatives and global marketing on the political, labor, and gender identities of Zapotec women in southern Mexico.

Patricia Zavella is Professor of Latin American and Latino Studies and Co-Director of the Chicano/Latino Research Center at the University of California, Santa Cruz. Significant publications include: *Women's Work and Chicano Families: Cannery Workers of the Santa Clara Valley* (Cornell University Press, 1987); *Telling to Live: Latina Feminist Testimonios*, co-authored with members of the Latina Feminist Group (Duke University Press, 2001), and *Chicana Feminisms: Disruption in Dialogue*, co-

edited with Gabriela Arredondo, Aída Hurtado, Norma Klahn, and Olga Nájera Ramírez (Duke University Press, 2002).

Contributors

Norma Alarcón, Department of Ethnic Studies, University of California at Berkeley, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA.

Antonio Benítez-Rojo, Department of Spanish, Amherst College, 5 Barret Hall, Amherst, MA 01002, USA.

Lionel Cantú died in 2002. He taught in the Department of Sociology at the University of California at Santa Cruz.

Leo R. Chavez, Department of Anthropology, University of California, Irvine, CA 92697, USA.

Jane I. Collins, Women's Studies Center, University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI 53706, USA.

Karen Mary Davalos, Chicana/o Studies, Loyola Marymount University, One LMU Drive, Los Angeles, California 90045–2659, USA.

Marc Edelman, Department of Anthropology, City University of New York, The Graduate Center, 365 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York 10016, USA.

Arturo Escobar, Department of Anthropology, P.O. Box 3115, 301 Alumni Building, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3115, USA.

Claudia Fonseca, Programa de Pós-Graduação em Antropologia Social, Instituto de Filosofia e Ciências Humanas, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul – Campus do Vale, Av. Bento Gonçalves 9500, Prédio 43311, Bloco AI, sala 104, Porto Alegre, RS, Brasil 91509–900.

Jeffrey Gould, Center for Latin American and Caribbean Studies, 1125 E. Atwater Avenue, University of Indiana, Bloomington, IN 47401, USA.

Libia Grueso, Proceso de Comunidades Negras (PCN), Carrera 2D, No. 57–14, Barrio Los Andes, Cali, Colombia.

Matthew C. Gutmann, Department of Anthropology, Brown University, Providence, RI 02912, USA.

Laurie Kroshus Medina, Department of Anthropology, 354 Baker Hall, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824, USA.

Félix V. Matos Rodríguez, Center for Puerto Rican Studies, Hunter College, 695 Park Avenue #E1409, New York, NY 10021, USA.

Frances Negrón-Muntaner, 9 Island Avenue # 1909, Miami, FL 33139, USA.

Ruben George Oliven, Programa de Pós-Graduação em Antropologia Social, Instituto de Filosofia e Ciências Humanas, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul – Campus do Vale, Av. Bento Gonçalves 9500, Prédio 43311, Bloco AI, sala 104, Porto Alegre, RS, Brasil 91509–900.

Américo Paredes died in 1999. He taught for several decades in the Departments of Anthropology and English at the University of Texas, Austin.

Richard Parker, Department of Sociomedical Sciences, Mailman School of Public Health, Columbia University, 722 West 168th Street, 9th Floor, New York, NY 10032, USA.

Néstor P. Rodríguez; Department of Sociology, 450 Philip Hoffman Hall, University of Houston, Houston, TX 77204–3012, USA.

Mark Rogers, Corporate Design & Usability, Eastman Kodak Co., 2400 Mt. Read Blvd., Rochester, NY 14650–3002, USA.

Carlos Rosero, Proceso de Communidades Negras (PCN), Carrera 2D, No. 57–14, Barrio Los Andes, Cali, Colombia.

Rubén G. Rumbaut, Department of Sociology, 316 Berkey Hall, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824–1111, USA.

Lynn Stephen, Department of Anthropology, 1218 University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403, USA.

Steve J. Stern, Department of History, 3211 Humanities Building, 455 North Park Street, University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI 53706–1483, USA.

Silvio Torres-Saillant, Latino–Latin American Studies Program, Syracuse University, Syracuse, NY 13244, USA.

Patricia Zavella, Department of Latin American and Latino Studies, Merrill College, University of California at Santa Cruz, CA 95064, USA.

Ana Celia Zentella, Department of Ethnic Studies, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, 92093–0522, USA.

Editors' Acknowledgments

Matthew C. Gutmann

Thanks to Felo, Pat, and Lynn for the pleasure of working together on this volume. My gratitude as well to colleagues at Brown University in Ethnic Studies, Anthropology, and Latin American Studies. I'd also like to acknowledge a Faculty Research Grant from the Center for the Study of Race and Ethnicity in America and a Richard B. Salomon Faculty Research Award, both from Brown, that were used to get this project started. In the Department of Anthropology at Brown, thanks for secretarial support to Kathy Grimaldi and Matilde Andrade. To Liliana and Maya, "*Este es su mundo. !Cuídenlo bien!*"

Félix V. Matos Rodríguez

To my Caribbean, Latino, and Latin American *colegas* at Northeastern University and at the Centro de Estudios Puertorriqueños at Hunter College for the constant support and exchange of ideas; to my co-editors, for the invitation to join them in this exciting and complex project; to Liliana Arabia and Lucas Andrés Matos, for your *cariño*.

Lynn Stephen

Thanks to former colleagues at Northeastern University who worked with me to build a program in Latino, Latin American, and Caribbean Studies and to begin to figure out how to build a dialogue between Latino and Latin American Studies. Collaborative projects with Oregon's farmworker union, Pineros y Campesinos Unidos del Nordoeste, helped me to see how to work on both sides of the border at once. UC Santa Cruz colleagues in the Hemispheric Dialogues 2 project (listed below) provided a stimulating space for working through questions in the introduction. A special thanks to Jonathan Fox for his helpful comments, to my co-editors for a truly collaborative and innovative project, and to my family – Ellen, Gabi and José – for their love and support.

Pat Zavella

Thanks to my colleagues at the University of California, Santa Cruz who have participated in the projects, Hemispheric Dialogue and Hemispheric Dialogues 2: Bridging Latin American and Latino Studies. These were joint projects between the Chicano/Latino Research Center and the Latin American and Latino Studies Department, funded by the Ford Foundation. The following faculty have been centrally involved in these dialogues: Sonia Alvarez, Pedro Castillo, Guillermo Delgado, Jonathan Fox, Wally Goldfrank, Susanne Jonas, Norma Klahn, Manuel Pastor, and Juan Poblete. Thanks also to Verónica López Duran, who provided admirable and timely research assistance.

From All the Editors

We would like to offer our editor at Blackwell, Jane Huber, our warmest gratitude for her enthusiastic support of this volume which, being neither "a Latino Studies Reader" nor "a Latin American Studies Reader," purposely sets out to span book markets in ways that would make more squeamish publishers shy away from the project. As we completed the final stages of editing this book we learned that one of our contributors, Lionel Cantú, had suddenly died. Lionel's passing is a terrible tragedy; his scholarship and enthusiasm will be missed in many ways.

This volume is dedicated to the people of Las Américas who have taught us the value of difference, dialogue, and collaboration.

Acknowledgments to Sources

Norma Alarcón, "Traddutora, Traditora: A Paradigmatic Figure of Chicana Feminism," from *Cultural Critique*, Fall 1989, pp. 57–87.

Antonio Benítez Rojo, "From the Plantation to the Plantation," from *The Repeating Island: The Caribbean and the Postmodern Perspective*, pp. 61–71 (excerpted). Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1992.

Lionel Cantú, "A Place Called Home: A Queer Political Economy of Mexican Immigrant Men's Family Experiences," from *Queer Families, Queer Politics: Challenging Culture and the State*, edited by M. Bernstein and R. Reimann, pp. 112–36. New York: Columbia University Press, 2001.

Leo R. Chavez, "Immigration Reform and Nativism: The Nationalist Response to the Transnationalist Challenge," from *Immigrants Out! The New Nativism and the Anti-Immigrant Impulse in the United States*, edited by Juan F. Perea, pp. 61–77. New York University Press, 1997.

Jane I. Collins, "Transnational Labor Process and Gender Relations: Women in Fruit and Vegetable Production in Chile, Brazil and Mexico," from *Journal of Latin American Anthropology* 1(1), pp. 179–99, 1995. Reproduced by permission of the American Anthropological Association. Not for sale or further reproduction.

Karen Mary Davalos, "*La Quinceañera*: Making Gender and Ethnic Identities," from *Frontiers: A Journal of Women's Studies*, pp. 101–27. Copyright © 1996 by Frontiers Editorial Collective. Reprinted by permission of the University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln.

Marc Edelman, "A Central American Genocide: Rubber, Slavery, Nationalism, and the Destruction of the Guatusos-Malekus," from *Comparative Study of Society and History* 40(2), pp. 356–90, 1998. Cambridge University Press.

Claudia Fonseca, "Inequality Near and Far: International Adoption as Seen from a Brazilian *Favela*," from *Law and Society Review* 36(2), 2002.

Jeffrey Gould, "Gender, Politics, and the Triumph of *Mestizaje* in Early 20th-Century Nicaragua." Reproduced by permission of the American Anthropological Association from *Journal of Latin American Anthropology* 2(1), pp. 4–33, 1996. Not for sale or further reproduction.

Libia Grueso, Carlos Rosero, and Arturo Escobar, "The Process of Black Community Organizing in the Southern Pacific Coast Region of Colombia," from *Cultures of Politics/Politics of Cultures: Re-visioning Latin American Social Movements*, edited by Sonia E. Alvarez, Evelina Dagnino, and Arturo Escobar, pp. 196–219. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1998.

Matthew C. Gutmann, "For Whom the Taco Bells Toll: Popular Responses to NAFTA South of the Border," from *Critique of Anthropology* 18(3), pp. 297–315, 1998.

Laurie Kroshus Medina, "History, Culture and Place-Making: 'Native' Status and Maya Identity in Belize." Reproduced by permission of the American Anthropological Association from *Journal of Latin American Anthropology* 4(1), pp. 134–65, 1999. Not for sale or further reproduction.

Félix V. Matos Rodríguez, "'¿Quién Trabajará?': Domestic Workers, Urban Slaves, and the Abolition of Slavery in Puerto Rico," from *Workers, Slaves, and the Abolition of Slavery*, pp. 62–82. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.

Frances Negrón-Muntaner, "Jennifer's Butt," from *Aztlan* 22(2), pp. 181–94, 1997. Copyright © 1997 Frances Negrón-Muntaner.

Ruben George Oliven, "Two Sides of the Same Coin: Modern *Gaúcho* Identity in Brazil," from *Journal of Latin American Anthropology* 4(2)/5(1), pp. 106–25, 2000. Reproduced by permission of the American Anthropological Association. Not for sale or further reproduction.

Américo Paredes, "The United States, Mexico and *Machismo*," from *Folklore and Culture on the Texas–Mexican Border*," edited by Richard Bauman, pp. 215–34. Austin, TX: CMAS Books, 1993.

Richard Parker, "The Carnivalization of the World," from *The Gender/Sexuality Reader: Culture, History, Political Economy*, edited by R. N. Lancaster and M. di Leonardo, pp. 361–77. New York: Routledge, 1997.

Néstor P. Rodríguez, "The Real 'New World Order': The Globalization of Racial and Ethnic Relations in the Late Twentieth Century," from *The Bubbling Cauldron: Race, Ethnicity and the Urban Crisis*, by M. P. Smith and J. R. Feagin, pp. 211–25. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1995.

Mark Rogers, "Spectacular Bodies: Folklorization and the Politics of Identity in Ecuadorian Beauty Pageants," from *Journal of Latin American Anthropology* 3(2), pp. 54–85, 1999. Reproduced by permission of the American Anthropological Association. Not for sale or further reproduction.

Rubén G. Rumbaut, "The Americans: Latin American and Caribbean Peoples in the United States," from *Americas: New Interpretative Essays*, edited by A. Stepan, pp. 275–307. Boston, MA: WGBH Educational Foundation, 1982.

Lynn Stephen, "The Construction of Indigenous Suspects: Militarization and the Gendered and Ethnic Dynamics of Human Rights Abuses in Southern Mexico," from *American Ethnologist* 26(4), pp. 822–42, 2000. Reproduced by permission of the American Anthropological Association. Not for sale or further reproduction.

Steve J. Stern, "New Approaches to the Study of Peasant Rebellion and Consciousness: Implications of the Andean Experience," from *Resistance, Rebellion, and Consciousness in the Andean Peasant World, 18th to 20th Centuries*, pp. 3–25. Copyright © 1987 by Steve J. Stern. Reprinted by permission of the University of Wisconsin Press, Madison.

Silvio Torres-Saillant, "Dominican Blackness and the Modern World," from *Dominican Studies Working Paper Series* 1, 1999. City College of New York, Dominican Studies Institute.

Patricia Zavella, "'Playing with Fire': The Gendered Construction of Chicana/Mexicana Sexuality," from *The Gender/Sexuality Reader: Culture, History, Political Economy*, edited by R. N. Lancaster and M. di Leonardo, pp. 392–408. New York: Routledge, 1997.

Ana Celia Zentella, "Returned Migration, Language, and Identity: Puerto Rican Bilinguals in Dos Worlds/Two Mundos," from *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 84, pp. 81–100, 1990.

Introduction: Understanding the Américas: Insights from Latina/o and Latin American Studies

Lynn Stephen, Patricia Zavella, Matthew C. Gutmann, and Félix V. Matos Rodríguez

Global, transnational, hybrid, multilingual, multiethnic, deterritorialized – these words are often used to describe the reality of living on earth in the twenty-first century.[1] Just as often, we are also reminded that borders are concrete and material and that states stage both real and theatrical defense of their borders. For example, the U.S. government deploys the National Guard along with the U.S. border patrol to apprehend undocumented Mexican migrants, yet simultaneously has a de facto economic policy for commercial agriculture that encourages and depends on undocumented immigrant labor to harvest and process U.S. fruits and vegetables (Rosaldo 1997; Andreas 1998). States also have the power to intervene in the mobility and quality of human life (Sassen 1998; Chang 2000). Nations can deny full citizenship rights to those living legally within their limits and look the other way to abuses inflicted upon those who do not have a formally recognized legal status (Flores 1997). An accurate description of twenty-first-century life might include all of these ideas and experiences, particularly in the region we have come to call the Américas, an area of the world more conventionally carved up into North, Central, and South America, as well as the Caribbean.[2] Upon closer inspection, however, we see that what we often think of as the ongoing tension between the integration of the peoples of the Americas and their simultaneous local, regional, and national Balkanization is not just a product of the twenty-first century, but has been an ongoing process for many centuries.

The articles in this interdisciplinary volume have been selected to provide a conceptual overview and concrete examples of research that examine the historical, cultural, economic, and political integration of the Américas in the present and recent past. They come primarily from the fields of anthropology and history. The selections include case studies in specific places at particular times. While several articles in Part I, "Colonialism and Resistance," deal with the colonial period in Latin America and the Caribbean, the bulk of the material in this volume is contemporary. The first intellectual purpose of this reader is to provide teachers and students with theoretical tools and concrete examples of how to think about culture, history, and representation in terms of (a) local realities in relation to transnational processes, (b) identities spread between multiple cultures and states, and (c) emerging identities that come through processes of migration from Latin America and settlement in the United States. Another way of

thinking about these issues more broadly is through exploring how U.S. Latina/o Studies and Latin American/Caribbean Studies both present useful understandings of changes brought about through globalization of the Américas. The second intellectual goal of this reader is to initiate a discussion about ongoing differences in Latina/o and Latin American/Caribbean Studies approaches and to look for possibilities for dialogue and collaboration between the two fields. Both approaches are inherently interdisciplinary (particularly through emphasizing history, culture, and language), both involve narratives of origins and have their respective "national moments" within larger discussions of "Latin American" and "being Latino" (for example, the importance of being a Peruvian, Cuban, or Mexican in Latin America or being Chicano, Nuyorican, or Cuban-American within a discourse on being Latino). Both fields involve transnational imaginaries and have some history of community activism and solidarity with social movements. Latin American and Latina/o Studies use the notion of translation both linguistically and cross-culturally, and both fields decenter and question the United States as the primary political, economic, and social center of the Américas.

Changing Demographics, New Perspectives

Any discussion of the relationship between Latin American/Caribbean Studies and Latina/o Studies must be centered in the changing constructions of identity, current demographic realities, and histories of both fields. Both the United States and the countries of Latin America and the Caribbean have been significantly changed by the arrival of new populations from overseas as well as by internal migration, particularly since the 1970s. In Latin America migration from the countryside, along with reclassification of what constitutes rural and urban, caused about 40 percent of urban population growth from the 1950s to the 1970s and about 35 percent in the 1980s (Tam 1994; United Nations 1996). Now Latin America has become a major urban region of the world, with 75 percent of the population living in cities (Gonzalez 2002:3). Urbanization rates are impressive in many countries – Venezuela (92 percent), Uruguay (90 percent), Argentina (88 percent), Chile (84 percent), Brazil (78 percent), Cuba (76 percent), and Mexico (75 percent) (United Nations 1995). Urbanization has taken longer in Central American countries because of smaller economies and a dependence on subsistence agriculture. However, it is estimated that, by 2010, 55 percent of Central America's population will live in cities as well (Gonzales 2002:3). This growth has been spurred by civilians who fled the countryside as a result of civil wars, as well as current development programs that offer little or nothing for farmers and concentrate on drawing foreign investment for low-paying factory jobs.

Rural–urban migration, in combination with the globalization of social movements in Latin America, has produced important realignments of ethnic identities and racial labels. For example, what historians have called in the past "Indians into Ladinos" in Guatemala (Grandin 2001) and "indigenous mestizos" in Peru (de la Cadena 2000; Paerregaard 1997) may still be happening at some level as a result of rural–urban migration and pressures to assimilate to national cultures in Latin American cities. The shift of rural population to the countryside, however, has also occurred in the context of regional and global congresses and campaigns by indigenous peoples. In some cases, this has resulted in the emergence of pan-indigenous movements within countries such as Mexico, Ecuador, and Guatemala, where distinct ethnic indigenous groups have come together in coalition to push back on exclusionary versions of nationalism that prevented them from demanding rights to territory, recognition of their culture and language, and the right to political participation (Warren 1998; Yashar 1999). National pan-indigenous movements have also participated in transnational networks and campaigns (see Brysk 2000:70). Many indigenous peoples in Latin America are also spread across national borders, such as the Aymara who live in Peru, Bolivia, Chile, and Argentina, forming a transnational population. In urban areas of Latin America the reconstitution of local cultures has also changed the meaning of categories such as

"mestizo" and "Ladino" as the ethnic composition of urban areas is rapidly changing (see Weismantel 2001). Internal conflicts and civil wars such as those waged in Peru, Guatemala, and currently in Colombia have also produced large numbers of internal refugees who are "forced migrants."

Most migration in Latin America has been within the same country from rural to urban areas or out of the country, in large measure to the United States. Countries like Venezuela, Bolivia, Guatemala, Brazil, Colombia, Peru, and El Salvador all have negative net migration rates, indicating that they are losing population to other countries. Because of their economic success until recently, Chile and Argentina were attracting low levels of migrants, most from nearby countries. In 1998, Chile had an estimated 55,000 illegal immigrants, 40,000 of them from Peru. Most were in low-paying jobs (Gonzalez 1998).

While most migration in Latin America has been interregional, the United States has served as a major host country for migrants from Latin America and the Caribbean. Both the increase in the absolute number of Latin American migrants to the United States since the 1970s, as well as the changing composition of where those migrants come from within Latin America, have been reflected in the linguistic terminology and the identity politics of what it means to be a Latin American immigrant in the United States.

The use of multiple umbrella terms such as "Spanish," "Hispanic," or "Latino" indicates the tension among Latinas/os regarding their identities and coalitions with other groups. In the 1970 census, the Census Bureau used the term "people of Spanish origin," which pleased no one. Recognizing the need for a comprehensive term, the Census Bureau convened an advisory committee formed from representatives of various Chicano, Mexican, Puerto Rican, and Cuban political organizations. After heated debate, the committee eventually agreed to the term "Hispanic," which to many represented more mainstream political viewpoints. Beginning with the 1980 census, the term became a specially designated one including four subcategories: Mexican, Mexican American, or Chicano; Puerto Rican; Cuban; Other Spanish/Hispanic. Yet because the term lumped together groups with very disparate histories, socio-demographic characteristics, language capabilities and knowledge of Spanish, political interests, and treatment upon immigration to the United States, many activists and community members found Hispanic problematic. The term is a catchall that lumps together the categories of language, ethnicity, nationality, and the socially constructed notion of race (see Rodríguez 2000).[3]

The term "Hispanic" became popularized during the 1980s especially, with media hype about the "Decade of Hispanics" (Gómez 1992; Oboler 1995). The term "Latino" gained popular currency during the 1970s, reflecting an anti-assimilationist political consciousness arising from community-based organizing (Padilla 1985; Klor de Alva 1997). The aim was to be more inclusive of the multiple ethnic compositions of working-class communities, as well as the continued migrations from Latin America, especially Mexico and Central America, which remained high in large cities like Chicago, New York, or Los Angeles. The term "Latino" was included for the first time in the 2000 census. In that census, people of "Spanish/Hispanic/Latino" origin could identify as Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, or "other Spanish/Hispanic/Latino." Though it emerged in opposition to the homogenized "Hispanic," "Latino" has also become exoticized and trendy, and potentially another form of commodification or what Eliana Rivero (1994) calls "the neutral soup of *Latinismo*." Even corporate interests and politicians' agendas now routinely include utilizing the Spanish language and national-ethnic identity markers (Dávila 1997, 2001).

Regardless of particular terms used by individuals to identify themselves, the overall Latino population is one of the fastest growing minority groups in the United States and is now equal to African Americans in size (Schmitt 2001). Latinization – the growing numbers and noticeable presence of Latinos – is occurring throughout the United States (Zavella 2000a), pushing scholars, government officials, and community members to reconceptualize what we mean by the Américas. Current demographic figures for the number of Latinos in the United States make a strong case

for considering the country as as a significant part of Latin America and the Caribbean. The 2000 U.S. Census identified 35.3 million people as "Spanish/Hispanic/Latino." Recent estimates by demographers suggest that if those without documents were counted, the Latino population would be significantly larger. If the number of Latinos in the United States from the 2000 census (35,305,818) is compared with the populations of the largest Latin American countries – Brazil with 172,860,370, Mexico with 100,349,766, Colombia with 39,996,671, and Argentina with 39,685,655 – the United States would rank fifth.[4] Canada's last census was conducted in 1996 and showed 228,580 Spanish speakers and 222,870 Portuguese speakers out of a total population of 31,281,092, or 1.3 percent of the total (O'Mally et al. 2001).[5]

The ever-increasing presence of Latino immigrants in states like California, in combination with debates over cultural issues such as bilingual education and periodically higher unemployment rates, have resulted in ebbs and flows of nativist backlash (Perea 1997; Chavez 2001 and in this volume) and anti-immigrant legislation, such as Proposition 187 passed by California voters in 1994 (although rejected by nearly four out of five Latino voters).[6] Anti-immigrant physical and verbal violence has also been recorded in regions as different as Los Angeles, Chicago, and Long Island. Puerto Rican Congressman Luis Gutiérrez, for example, was harassed and humiliated by a guard at the visitors' entrance to the Capitol in 1996, who suggested that the Chicago-born congressman "go back to [his] country." Latin American immigration to the United States has promoted the economic, social, and cultural integration of the Américas–a point seen as the positive side of the "Latinization" of the United States through film, music, cuisine, dance and Spanish-language print and broadcast media networks (Gutiérrez 1998:315–316; Holston 1997). However, anti-immigrant cultural and political forces have simultaneously pushed back at Latin American immigrants, often portraying them as "different" from the dominant society because of racial, cultural, and linguistic characteristics that mark them as "other" (Flores 1997:256). Scholars (Comaroff 1992:60; Hall 1988:2; Omi and Winant 1987) point out that socially constructed categories such as race and ethnicity are perceived as impassible symbolic boundaries that become fixed in nature and take on the appearance of an autonomous force capable of determining the course of social and economic life. As Latinos become fixed and naturalized as "other" in broader American culture, one result is the homogenization of Latinos/as, the erasure of differences of history, identity, and culture tied to people's specific stories of immigration, settlement, or long-time history of living in the United States. At the same time, however, distinct groups of immigrants continue to construct nationalist-based identities through hometown associations, festivals, and other institutions that continue their specific ethnic and national identities.

The increasing numbers of people of Latin American origin who have migrated to the United States have stimulated a new theoretical perspective, from that of immigration to transnational migration. Immigration models often assume a linear model of change where migration and settlement entail discernible stages of liminality, transition, and adaptation to the host country by migrants. Instead, theorists of the "new transnationalism" argue that we should examine transnational circuits, spaces, or networks as people migrate from one country to another's borders (Glick Schiller et al. 1992, 1995; Rouse, 1992; Sassen 1988, 1988). Further, the current links between migrants and home societies are of a different order than previous generations, since people are pushed into the migrant stream by new circuits of capital which are sustained by transformations in technologies of transportation and communication. Thus transnational theorists make the useful suggestion that we have a "bifocal" orientation and examine the processes by which migrants construct links between their country of origin and their country of settlement.

With this transnational perspective in mind, Latinas/os who have migrated to the United States are transforming U.S. demographics as well as the culture, politics, and the economy, and provide a new set of relations that Latin American Studies and Latina/o Studies could

explore. But first we will present histories of the two fields, to illustrate how such explorations will require new sets of lenses and means to explore common political agendas.

Latin American Studies: Foundations and Innovations

Dominant cultural attitudes in the United States that continue to view Latin American immigrants and second-, third-, fourth- and longer-generation Latinos as "outsiders" have, in part, a direct link to the way that Latin American Studies was originally framed from within the U.S. academy. The study of Latin American "others" originated from the vantage of U.S. political and economic hegemony in the region. U.S. cold-war ideology, which coincided with the destruction of the final structures of formal colonialism, framed history as the struggle between the "free West" led by the United States and the "Communist East," which could crop up anywhere, especially in Latin America after the "fall" of Cuba (Kearney 1996:31). Ironically, in this era that was supposed to mark a new world order (after colonialism), the United States continued to maintain a colonial presence in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. Puerto Ricans have been U.S. citizens since 1917, yet the island continues as a U.S. territory and political debate between statehood, status quo, and independence is ongoing.

One of the paths for orchestrated efforts at preventing communism involved the invention of area studies – in this case, Latin American Studies: the creation of academic regional specialists and institutes devoted to the study of the history, economics, politics, sociology, and anthropology of Latin America, as well as the financial involvement of institutions like the Ford Foundation, the Social Science Research Council, and the American Council of Learned Societies in the region. Area specializations such as Latin American Studies coincided with the rise of a branch of economics known as development economics, focused on "the rescue of the poor countries from their poverty" (Galbraith 1979:26,30, cited in Escobar 1995:67). If poor countries could be rescued from their poverty, the reasoning went, then communist-inspired governments and movements had a lesser chance of gaining a toehold in Latin America and elsewhere. Latin American countries, like others in the "Third World," were to be salvaged, managed, and fixed:

> In sum, the major ingredients of the economic development strategy commonly advocated in the 1950s were these: (1) capital accumulation; (2) deliberate industrialization; (3) development planning; and (4) external aid. The underdeveloped economies were thought to be characterized by a number of features that set them apart from the economies studied by orthodox economics... high levels of rural underemployment, a low level of industrialization, a set of obstacles to industrial development, and a disadvantage in international trade. (Escobar 1995:74–75)

Family planning was also seen as integral to ameliorating social problems that originated in the economy, and as early as 1965 a Pan-American Congress identified population increases in the region as too high compared to other regions (Stycos et al. 1971:26). Puerto Rico in particular also became a testing ground for contraceptive drugs and birth-control programs, informed by social science research in the region (López 1993).

In order to repair and control Latin American countries, great quantities of information had to be gathered and organized according to formulas for improvement. For some, Latin America and the Caribbean were viewed as post-World War II social science laboratories for U.S. academics to test out paradigms such as W. W. Rostow's (1960) stages of economic growth in Latin America, and ways to prevent "communist takeovers." One project in particular, described below, became famous and helped to move forward a current in Latin American Studies that was critical of U.S. foreign policy in the region.

Project Camelot, started in 1963 and funded through the Special Operations Research Organization (SORO – a campus-based contract research organization that serviced the Defense Department's research effort), was aimed at combating Soviet-inspired "wars of national

liberation" and had a special focus on Latin America (Herman 1995:154–155). This nonprofit organization was dedicated to conducting "non-material research in support of the Department of the Army's missions in such fields as counterinsurgency, unconventional warfare, psychological operations, and military assistance," and the research was aimed at producing a model of a "social system experiencing internal war accurate enough to be predictive, and therefore useful, to military policy planners" (Herman 1995:155, 156). Project Camelot was exposed when anthropologist Hugo Nutini lied to Chilean scholars about the funding for the project, and this information was contradicted by a Norwegian sociologist who provided information about the project's military funding to Chilean journalists. The project was publicly denounced in a special session of the Chilean senate and was eventually cancelled. This provided an ample political opening for Latin Americanist experts who disagreed with the interventionist nature of U.S. foreign policy to gain public attention and establish a position within the field of Latin American Studies.

In looking at the important trends in the first decades of the development of the field of Latin American Studies, it would be a mistake only to focus on the efforts coming out of the United States. The interdisciplinary focus of Latin American Studies was strengthened early on in Latin America through the founding of innovative research centers and organizations such as the Latin American Faculty for Social Sciences (FLACSO – founded in 1957) in Chile, Argentina, Brazil, Costa Rica, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, and Mexico; the Latin American Council of Social Sciences (CLACSO – founded in 1967) in Argentina; the Brazilian Center for Analysis and Planning (CEBRAP – founded in 1969) in Brazil; the Center for Research and Advanced Studies in Social Anthropology (CIESAS – founded in 1973) in Mexico; the Center for Social Investigations (CIS – founded in 1942) at the University of Puerto Rico, and Casa de las Américas in Cuba (founded in 1959), among others. These think-tanks often involved groups of scholars who theorized about the relationship between different aspects of social, cultural, political, and economic life. Influential theory developed within these research centers often made its way into the U.S. academy from the south to the north, although not always with its Latin American intellectual history intact.

For example, many U.S. academics identify dependency theory as a unified strand of theory that became accessible to North American readers through the work of Andre Gunder Frank (1967, 1969), Paul Baran (1957), and Theotonio Dos Santos (1970). In fact, the roots of "dependency theory" can be found in the late 1940s and early 1950s in Latin America through the analysis based on Prebisch, Furtado, and others before them who opposed "orthodox" theories "justifying the nonindustrialization of the region in view of the comparative advantages that might be obtained with agricultural production for export" (Cardoso 1977:9). In an article on the intellectual history of dependency theory in Latin America, Fernando Henrique Cardoso describes what he calls the U.S. "consumption of dependency theory" and documents how critiques of the developmentalist approach existed within the Economic Commission for Latin America, ECLA (founded in 1948, now called Comisión Económica para América Latina y el Caribe) itself, and also in the work of intellectuals who emphasized "not only the 'obstacles' and 'distortions' of capitalist development . . . but also the inequality of opportunities and wealth that was inherent in forms of development derived from the expansion of capitalism and the strengthening of imperialism" (1977:9). Cardoso points out that what became identified as "dependency theory" has continuity with earlier critiques of structural-functionalism and Keynesianism in Latin America.

As understood by most American academics, dependency theory turned the logic of underdevelopment economics on its head and looked at how the assumptions of development economics (capital accumulation, industrialization, development of markets) instead resulted in the extraction of economic value away from the periphery (Latin America) and directed it toward the core of the capitalist world system

(the United States and Europe). Processes of underdevelopment often replicated those internal processes in Third World countries between the capital and outlying areas, and between European-oriented elites and indigenous peoples (Weismantel 2001). The results of this kind of "development" were dependency and, in fact, de-development accompanied by racialization and denigration toward rural, indigenous peoples.

Latin American and U.S. versions of dependency theory were not the only critiques leveled at the U.S.-centered vision of Latin American Studies, packaged in cold-war ideology. As early as the late 1950s and consolidated by the mid-1960s, a stream of scholarship critical of U.S. foreign policy in Latin America, beginning with Cuba, emerged within the field of Latin American Studies. Publications such as the *North American Congress on Latin America (NACLA)'s Report on the Americas* was founded in 1966 as a newsletter with the purpose of communicating major political, economic, and social trends in Latin America and their relationships to the United States. Early issues featured a strong critique of U.S. hegemony in the region and included pieces by prominent scholars in Latin American Studies as well as non-academics. In 1969 the NACLA newsletters featured articles such as "The Proletarianzation of the Puerto Rican," "The U.S. Media Empire in Latin America," and "USAID Spurs Population Relocation in Northeast Brazil." *Latin American Perspectives*, an academic areas studies publication, was founded in 1973 and first published in 1974 to provide a forum for debate on the political economy of capitalism, imperialism, and socialism in the Américas – also a perspective critical of U.S. foreign policy. The first issue contained articles titled "Socialism and Dependency" and "The Future of Latin America: Between Underdevelopment and Revolution," among others. In addition to publishing in these two critical venues, some Latin American Studies scholars were involved in founding and building solidarity organizations with links to labor, students, peasants, women, and political parties in Chile, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Guatemala, and elsewhere. Such political work also spilled over into Latin American Studies Association (LASA) sessions in the 1970s and 1980s when the politicization of the Central American wars pushed LASA to the left. A multitude of academic sessions were devoted to critiquing the role of the United States in Central America and often brought Central American activists and politicians to meetings, as well as academics. Since the 1970s, some Latin Americanists were also involved in political work dedicated to Puerto Rican independence and promoted the concept of internal colonialism in their work.

Two developments in the 1980s were crucial to the further development of Latin American Studies in Latin America and its turn toward the study of history and culture in the social sciences in both the United States and Latin America – a key focus of this book. The first is the emergence of the field of Cultural Studies, in part as a response to the commodification of culture in late capitalism. As pointed out by John Beverly, "although Cultural Studies, particularly in its poststructuralist or Birmingham strands, has been politically connected with the Left and the new social movements, it also depends on the character and possibilities of capitalist production and circulation of commodities; it is something like a superstructural effect of economic deterritorialization" (1996:221). Thus the trajectory of capitalist development itself contributed to the integration of culture with political economy. In addition, the economic paradigm of what came to be called dependency theory, while certainly challenging modernist economic theory, did not work well in the realm of culture. Theorists such as Claudia Ferman (1966:ix) have pointed out that while terms such as "center" and "periphery" may describe some of the political and economic power of Latin American reality, they cannot express the nature of cultural production. "Cultural productions are neither 'central' nor 'peripheral' . . . from the standpoint of the producers and consumers of that cultural production, that product is always central" (1996:ix). Latin American Cultural Studies (as in other regions) not only decentered political economy as the main category of analysis in social sciences, but also redefined what is meant by culture. The distinction between "high culture," which usually represented the domain of European elite artistic

traditions, has been blurred with "low culture," often designated as "handicrafts," "folklore," and "folk art." Discussions of culture in Latin American Studies now include a wide range of indigenous and hybrid cultural forms, from *corridos* (northern Mexican folk ballads) to comic books, to the art of Diego Rivera or Frida Kahlo.

The second development that was significant in refashioning the social sciences in Latin America was a questioning and redefining of the socialist political project in Latin America not only by intellectuals, but also by grass-roots movement activists such as feminists, indigenous groups, and others (see Escobar and Alvarez 1992; Slater 1985; Stephen 1997). In Latin American countries that lived under military dictatorships, such as Brazil, Chile, Argentina, and Uruguay in the 1970s, a key concern of social scientists became working toward and understanding processes of democratization, not the development of socialism under impossible conditions. Most evident in places like Pinochet's Chile, economic modernization – particularly in relation to a neo-liberal model – did not accompany democracy, as economic modernization proponents often argued. The cultural realm of politics and social conditions for democracy were deemed to be perhaps more important than economic models for dismantling military dictatorships. John Beverly and José Oviedo point out:

> What began to displace both modernization and dependency models, therefore, was an interrogation of the interrelation between the respective spheres (culture, ethnic, politics, etc.) of modernity, an interrogation that required of social scientists a new concern with subjectivity and identity as well as new understandings of, and tolerance for, the cultural, religious, and ethnic heterogeneity of Latin America. (1995:7)

As a part of the trend toward looking at issues of democratization and economic development, beginning in the mid-1970s, a significant group of women scholars emerged in the field of Latin American Studies who opened the door to later research focused on gender and sexuality. The seminal work of researchers such as Carmen Diana Deere and Magdalena Léon de Leal[7] in Peru and Colombia showed how monetization of local economies and the entrance of commercial capital affected different classes of women in distinct ways. Their work pushed others to look at women not just as a homogenous category, but also in relation to class and ethnicity. Two other major books, edited by June Nash and Helen Safa (1976, 1986), provided a comparative basis for understanding gender and class in Latin America. Other researchers built on this and integrated an analysis of ethnicity into their work, as well as taking on questions of gender and class (see Bourque and Warren 1981; Babb 1989; Silverblatt 1987; Stephen 1991). Since the mid-1980s, women's studies and gender studies have emerged as one of the strongest components of Latin American Studies, taking on masculinity and masculine sexuality (Gutmann 1996; Kulick 1998; Lancaster 1992; Prieur 1998; Quiroga 2001), as well as historically examining issues such as sexuality, marriage, gender roles, and nationalism (Dore and Molyneux 2000; Matos Rodríguez and Delgado 1998; Suarez-Findlay 1999; Summer 1991).

During the 1990s, social scientists working in Latin American Studies embraced a wide range of subjects that strongly confirmed the globalization of the subject. There is a concern with identities and subjectivities, a broad definition of politics that includes social movements and grass-roots organizations as well as the politics within the home, the community, and in formal political systems, a focus on transnational economies, and concerns about democracy and citizenship (Gutmann 2002). Perhaps more relevant to our anthology, recently Latin American Studies has become concerned with migration throughout the region, especially northward toward the U.S. and Canada (Bonilla 1992), although the consequences of Latino settlement are among many contemporary issues in an era of globalization.

Latina/o Studies: Foundations and Innovations

Latina/o Studies had its origins in student activism and identity politics of the 1960s, led by Chicanas/os and Puerto Ricans. In the late

1960s, the struggle of activists and scholars led to the creation of Chicana/o and Puerto Rican Studies departments, student support programs, and research centers within academia. By the 1990s, in response to the demographic and political shifts discussed below, some of these programs would broaden to include Latinas/os, or to focus on the Caribbean and/or Hispanic Studies more broadly.

In the late 1960s, student organizations such as the United Mexican American Students (UMAS), the Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano de Aztlán (MEChA), the Puerto Rican Student Movement (PRSM), and the Puerto Rican Student Union (PRSU) were active in campus politics, and they explicitly sought coalitions with student organizations from other racialized groups. Students demonstrated so that colleges and universities would offer courses that were relevant to their lives, recruit Latino faculty and staff who could serve as mentors and role models, facilitate open admissions, and commit to making college education accessible to students who had come from working-class barrios. Both MEChA and PRSU maintained ties to political organizations in Mexico and Puerto Rico, respectively, anticipating the cross-border perspective that would emerge later in Latina/o Studies (Muñoz 1989; Serrano 1998; Torres 1998).

The rationale for developing Chicana/o and Puerto Rican Studies departments and programs was to promote the link between knowledge and social action, especially addressing the socioeconomic problems faced by Chicana/o and Puerto Rican communities, and to study the particular experiences of these communities in the United States. The *Plan de Santa Bárbara*, for example, drafted by student and faculty activists in 1969, called for Chicano Studies programs throughout the Southwest and made explicit the connection between activism and scholarship through action research:

> How can the university contribute to the liberation of the Chicano people? In the long term, probably the most fundamental contribution it will make will be by producing knowledge applicable by the Chicano movement. The systemic character of the racist relationship between *gabacho* [white] society and Chicanos will not be altered unless solid research becomes the basis for Chicano political strategy and action. (Chicano Council on Higher Education 1970:70)

However, the nationalism of the *Plan* and other movement documents, especially its model of *la familia* with its masculinist, heteronormative assumptions, were contested by those who called for broad-based political agendas that included women, gay men, and lesbians (Blackwell forthcoming; García 1989, 1997). In New York, the creation of Puerto Rican Studies departments and an open admissions policy were among the achievements of Puerto Rican students and activists within the City University of New York (CUNY). In 1973, CUNY's Center for Puerto Rican Studies was initiated to "create new knowledge and quickly and comprehensibly transfer it to a long denied community" (Committee for Puerto Rican Studies and Research 1972:3).

Chicana/o and Puerto Rican Studies programs were designed to push for the transformation of higher education, including through professional associations, from an elitist, racist, and hierarchical institution to one that served the concrete needs of these communities. The National Association for Chicana and Chicano Studies (NACCS), for example, founded in 1972, drew the connection explicitly between activism and research, which includes the critique of research paradigms and the importance of ideological struggle:

> NACCS recognizes the broader scope and significance of Chicana and Chicano research. We cannot overlook the crucial role of ideas in the construction and legitimization of social reality. Dominant theories, ideologies, and perspectives play a significant part in maintaining oppressive structures on theoretical, experiential, and policy levels. NACCS fosters the construction of theories and perspectives which attempt to explain the oppression and resistance of the Chicana and Chicano past, present, and future. Ideas must be translated into political

> action in order to foster change. (National Association for Chicana and Chicano Studies website: http://latino.sscnet.ucla.edu/research/NACCS/)

Such goals could not be more different from the initial purpose of Latin American Studies, aimed to develop experts and institutes to collect information to maintain U.S. political and economic hegemony over Latin America and the Caribbean.

Eventually, over twenty-five programs in Chicano, Hispanic, Mexican American, or Puerto Rican Studies and fewer than ten joint programs that include one of these with a Latin American Studies program were established and contributed to the scholarly development of the field. For example, the Chicano Studies Department at the University of California, Santa Barbara (founded in 1969, based on the *Plan de Santa Bárbara* and thus one of the oldest programs) has an endowed chair, a research center, and a library collection devoted to Chicana/o Studies. The interdisciplinary curriculum focuses on gender, culture, and institutions, and in 2001 the department established the first Ph.D. program in Chicana/o Studies. Although there has been expansion and development in Chicano/Puerto Rican Studies, the current political climate has affected many departments. For example, the Puerto Rican Studies Department at City College (CUNY), which was founded in 1971 under the auspices of substantial student activism, was downsized to a small program in the 1990s.

There were some similarities in development and origins between Latin American Studies and Latina/o Studies. Both fields were multidisciplinary and had a primary focus on history and culture. Like Latin American Studies, Chicana/o and Puerto Rican Studies initially had a heavy emphasis on political economy and development. Influenced by Fanon (1963, 1965) and by Marxist historical materialism (Flores 1986), Chicana/o and Puerto Rican scholars interrogated the "internal colonies" theoretical paradigm which found structural similarities between Blacks, Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, and Native Americans (Almaguer 1975; Barrera et al. 1972; Bonilla and Campos 1981). Scholars began researching and recovering histories left in the margins by dominant paradigms, and interpreting them from a revisionist perspective (Acuña 1972; Almaguer 1994; Camarillo 1979; Gutiérrez 1991; Gutiérrez 1995; Montejano 1987; Paredes 1958; Sánchez and Stevens-Arroyo 1987; Sánchez Korrol 1983). In addition to the mission of action research, Chicana/o and Puerto Rican studies were concerned early on with notions of borders. Indeed, within Chicana/o Studies, the notion that "we didn't cross the border, the border crossed us" (Acuña 1996:109; Paredes 1993), after the U.S.–Mexico war which ceded about half of Mexico to the United States, is paradigmatic. Contesting the masculine bias in the early revisionist historical and social scientific research, feminists began focusing on the experience of women (de la Torre and Pesquera 1993; Gonzalez 1999; Matos Rodríguez and Delgado 1998; MALCS 1993; Ortiz 1996; Pérez 1999; Ruiz 1987; Zavella 1987).

Literature also played a key role as a new generation of Chicano and Puerto Rican writers communicated their experiences through poetry and prose. This literature, often angry and abrasive, commented on and reflected on the problems of poverty, marginalization, and discrimination faced by Latinos/as. The students and scholars who founded Chicano and Puerto Rican Studies programs revered texts like Rodolfo "Corky" Gonzales's *Yo soy Joaquín* and Pedro Pietris's *Puerto Rican Obituary*. These authors had their counterparts in the writers of the "boom" generation in Latin America, such as Gabriel García Márquez, Julio Cortázar, and Alejo Carpentier, among others.

Similar to Latin American Studies, Latina/o Studies was also heavily influenced by the emergence of Cultural Studies, especially by feminists and gay and lesbian theorists. Lesbian feminist Gloria Anzaldúa (1987) offers a theory of *mestizaje*, hybridity, and the "borderlands" as a geopolitical site of poverty and racism, "*una herida abierta* [open wound] where the Third World grates against the first and bleeds," as well as fluid processes of consciousness and identity formation. Her work has been influential in Latin American Studies as well as Latina/o Studies (Mignolo 2000; Saldívar 1997; Saldívar-Hull

2000; Vélez-Ibáñez 1996). In another critical intervention, Rosa Linda Fregoso and Angie Chabram Denersesian critiqued the nationalist, masculinist assumptions implicit in Chicana/o movement discourse, that of a unitary subject:

> Our reframing of Chicano cultural identity draws from those theoretical insights elaborated by Hall and through which he reconstitutes cultural identity within the problematics of difference production, and positionality.... We seek therefore to recuperate that which was silenced by both the Chicano movement and cultural movements such as poststructuralism, and to give voice to historically persistent forms and practices of resistance of our own people. This enunciation is necessary if cultural studies are to begin to respond effectively to the complexities of a historical experience, fissured by race, class and gender, by linguistic discourses, and which are constructed by myriad cultural forms, some incorporated, others not fully incorporated. (1990:205, 207)

Puerto Rican scholars were also concerned with borders, fueled by the frequent migrations between the United States and Puerto Rico, as well as the great waves of migration and settlement of Puerto Ricans in the United States. Puerto Rican feminist scholars have also analyzed critically the rich cultural metaphors for the frequent moves between the island and the mainland, such as *la guagua aérea* ("airborne bus"), or "salsa" to name the style of Caribbean diasporic music based on mixture, hybridity, and creative energy that emerged in the late 1960s (Aparicio 1988).

Latina/o scholars have long been interested in diversity, notably among the experiences of migrants (Chavez 1991; Hondagneu-Sotelo 1994) and between migrants and those of multiple generations of settlement in the United States (Browning and De La Garza 1986; Portes and Rumbaut 2001). Another key issue has been how language use – whether Spanish-dominant, bilingual, or English-dominant – is constructed in response to locale, the presence of varied language groups, or assimilationist pressures in schools (Pedraza 1985; Zentella 1997 and in this volume). The imbrication of gender, race, ethnicity, class, sexual preference, generation, etc., makes for different social locations among Latinas/os (Zavella 1994), and there has been a wealth of work which interrogates this diversity or focuses on particular communities (Trujillo 1991).

Like Latin American Studies, Latino Studies was always interdisciplinary and inherently also challenged the ways that university bureaucracies defined the production and reproduction of knowledge outside of traditional departments. In particular, the experiences of the Chicana/o and Puerto Rican populations in the United States could not be understood without reconceptualizing the paradigms, methodology, and pedagogy inherited from traditional departments and from area studies.

Nonetheless, problems and tensions emerged within Latina/o Studies programs. As new groups migrated to the United States from Latin America – notably those from El Salvador and Guatemala to the west coast, and Colombia or the Dominican Republic to the east coast – students increasingly wanted Latina/o Studies to incorporate their experiences. Some programs eventually expanded their focus: the Department of Hispanic and Caribbean (formerly Puerto Rican) Studies at Rutgers University, or the Department of Raza (formerly Chicano) Studies at San Francisco State University are but two examples. At other universities, research institutes such as CUNY's Dominican Studies Institute (1994) emerged to help address the needs of Dominican students and scholars.

Other tensions are more endemic. Some of the migrants from South America or Cuba come from middle-class or elite-class backgrounds with more conservative political viewpoints, and often cannot relate to the Latino migrants from peasant or working-class origins who often are more radical in outlook. In multiethnic contexts like large cities, Latina/os from diverse national/ethnic backgrounds living in close proximity often have to negotiate stereotypes, prejudice toward, or differences in material resources accorded those who migrated earlier, even among members of their own group (Aparicio 2000; Torres 1998). Sexism and homophobia have been flash points of conflict,

where feminists and gay and lesbian scholars and activists have had to push Latina/o Studies programs or professional associations to be more inclusive. In other cases, women have formed their own organizations, such as Mujeres Activas en Letras y Cambio Social (MALCS, "Activist Women in Letters and Social Change"), founded in 1983 in support of scholarship and professional development of Latinas. Indeed, some scholars question whether a common Latino experience really exists (Delgado 2001). Others, notably feminists of diverse backgrounds, have problematized differences and constructed a relational theoretical framework on Pan-Latina identities:

> [O]ur collaborative process, which used the method of *testimonio* [life story], ultimately, was framed by common political views about how to create knowledge and theory through our experiences. . . . Seeking to contest and transform the very disciplines that taught us the skills to recover our subjugated knowledges, we reclaimed *testimonio* as a tool for Latinas to theorize oppression, resistance, and subjectivity. Despite its complicated history, *testimonio* captures Latinas' complex, layered lives. . . . Our group histories and lived experiences are intertwined with global legacies of resistance to colonialism, imperialism, racism, anti-Semitism, religious fundamentalism, sexism and heterosexism. When theorizing about feminist *latinidades* [Latina/o identities], we reveal the interrelationships among these systems of power. Trained as critical thinkers, we are forced to acknowledge that occasionally institutions or discourses about which we are critical, such as religion or the family, produce contradictory effects on us, serving as sources of disempowerment and autonomy, repression and privilege. (Latina Feminist Group 2001:8, 17, 19)

Clearly the work of documenting and theorizing Latina/o experiences is producing innovations within academia beyond what the original student organizers had envisioned.

Dialogues and Collaboration between Latina/o and Latin American Studies: Possibilities and Limits

Despite the different histories and shifting concerns, there are a number of important reasons for Latin Americanists and Latina/o Studies scholars to collaborate. Perhaps the most important is the increase in migration from Latin America to the United States and Canada (as mentioned previously). Latinos and people in Latin America share common experiences under neo-liberal economic models, which have led to greater socioeconomic stratification within the United States and within Latin American countries. There is evidence, for example, that the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA, implemented in 1994) led to an increase in the number of U.S. firms in some sectors that moved production to Mexico, which has led to increased unemployment and poverty among Latinas/os who worked in those sectors (Borrego 2000; Zavella 2000b). Increased globalization of the economy has led to concentration of more recent immigrants in the United States and within Latin America in the service sector, as well as the feminization of labor markets. Both fields consider it important to distinguish experience by race, ethnicity, class, gender, and sexuality. When particular types of migrants – young male workers, for example – move between the United States and Latin America, there are repercussions on both sides of the border. While return migration, and migration with Latin America has not been a high priority topic in Latin American Studies, it should be, and much could be learned from U.S. Latino/a Studies. Moreover, both approaches find it necessary to look at culture and political economy together. Through transnational cultural expressions such as music, dance, film, websites, magazines, etc., transnational community connections are constructed. Human rights activists in the United States increasingly must contend with discrimination and abuse endured by migrants, and grass-roots movements for social justice – environmental racism, labor, etc. – must negotiate working with multiracial coalitions that include

migrants (Delgado 1993; Milkman 2000; Milkman and Wong 2000; Pulido 1996; Soldatenko 1991; Stephen 2001b).

The many changes brought on by globalization and transnational migration have led some analysts to reconceptualize the world of the Latino in the United States. As far back as 1958, for example, Américo Paredes suggested the concept of "greater Mexico" to illustrate how Mexicanos' cultural expressions transcend national boundaries. David Gutiérrez (1998:327) suggests that we consider Latino migrants as living in a "transterritorial third space carved out between the political and social worlds of the United States," in which cities such as Los Angeles in California, Las Cruces and Santa Fe in New Mexico, and Yuma in Arizona, and significant parts of Chicago and New York are firmly rooted in the circuits of Latin America. Indeed, De Genova suggests that south–north migration has led to the "reinvention of Latin America" in relation to racial categories and the use of space in places like "Mexican Chicago," where "something about Chicago itself has become elusive, even irretrievable, for the U.S. nation-state" and Chicago has a "proper place within Latin America" (1998:89–90). These new ways of thinking about Latinas/os and Latin America have led scholars to integrate scholarly work from both fields, and to problematize what a cross-border perspective entails (Romero et al. 1997; Darder and Torres 1998; Bonilla et al. 1998; Gutmann 1999, 2003).

Beyond globalization and transnationalization, there are other significant commonalities that should encourage dialogue between Latin American and Caribbean Studies. Both fields are inherently interdisciplinary and have consciously drawn on an integrated understanding of history, culture, language, and political economy in order to provide holistic perspectives on the lives of Latin Americans and Latinos. As interdisciplinary fields, both have had to defend their existence in the context of academic institutions that tend to support conventional disciplines and departments over interdisciplinary ones. In the words of Peter Smith, "interdisciplinary work has come to be viewed as 'undisciplined.'... We are jacks of all trades, but masters of none... It is perhaps in reflection of this view that, at the end of the day, deans and provosts tend to support mainstream departments rather than interdisciplinary programs" (Smith 2002:8). While Smith does not advocate dialogue between Latino and Latin American Studies, his remarks suggest the importance of such programs working together within academic institutions to mutually support one another and emphasize the contributions of an interdisciplinary approach in two fields that now have some significant issues in common.

Possibilities for dialogue across Latino and Latin American Studies also depend on the willingness of academics in each field to learn each other's intellectual history and to look for common experiences. As discussed above, both Latin American Studies and Latino Studies have an intellectual history that involves academics also becoming activists and serving as "agents of solidarity" in movements within the United States and south of the border (see Arias 2002:3). Both fields also struggle with a dual tension between "nationalisms" that may pressure their disintegration from within and "transnationalisms" that can cause their validity as regions to be questioned from the outside. Some examples: the Latin American Studies Association long organized panels in relation to specific countries (Mexico, Peru, etc.), yet members pushed for sections organized around themes that cross national boundaries. The increasing diversity of Latin American immigration to the United States has forced Latina/o Studies to incorporate more national differences within what is labeled "Latina/o," to the chagrin of some nationalists. Thus both fields continue to deal with the issue of nationalism and national identity, despite the fact that population and cultural movements across regions and nations have muddled some nationalist categories. The nationalist tension within each field is further countered by "demographic shifts, diasporas, labor migrations, the movements of global capital and media, and processes of cultural circulation and hybridization that have brought into question the nature of areas' identities and composition" (Arias 2002:3).

This dual tension shared by Latina/o Studies and Latin American Studies has the further result