Discovering Latin@s

Story by Story

BY JULIA ALVAREZ

Suddenly, it seems, the United States has discovered the Latin@s within its borders. With demographers predicting that by the year 2050 one out of every four Americans will be Latin@, the North Americans have decided to pay attention to the largest growing “minority” in the country. Being Latin is in!

It strikes me as ironic. Just as Columbus “discovered” America—already there and populated by native peoples—we, Latin@s, have suddenly been discovered—though we have also long been in las Américas and in North America for a long time.

In the 70s and 80s, I would send out my manuscripts, and they would come back with a note that the magazine in question was interested in fiction, not in work of sociological interest.
But suddenly in the early 90s, publishers and others realized that we Latin@s were a growing population with money to spend. Our books were published and became bestsellers. But what seemed like overnight success was really not so. We had been writing for decades in relative obscurity: Ana Castillo, Sandra Cisneros, Rudolfo Anaya, Cherrie Moraga. Now, however, we were the new sensation! Latin@ influence was everywhere—our music, our food, our films, our Generation.

The danger of this ‘discovery’ lies not only in the troublesome irony of our earlier invisibility, but also in the invisibility that comes from being lumped together into an ethnic uniformity that really does not exist. That assumption or demand that we be homogeneous denies us our variety, our full dignity as complex human beings. In fact, it is another kind of invisibility imposed on us.

This morning, I am reminded again of this danger when I look down at the calendar I recently bought my Nebraskan husband. It is one of those LEARN-SPANISH-WORD-A-DAY calendars now available everywhere. (Another sign of the boom, I suppose.) Today’s word is HISPANOS (esPAHnohs), with the definition, The United States government created the term Hispanic in order to count the increasing number of Spanish-speaking citizens in the country.

Perhaps, I tell my husband as we tear off the day—perhaps that is why there is such a big do-to about the word Hispanic—it’s a melt-down term, not allowing us the variety we represent, making us into a flat figure punita that politicians can play with. (I should add that the word Hispanos, in Spanish, still has viability—something that those who berate all usage of the term should bear in mind. The island I come from, for instance, is Hispaniola.)

But the definition again pinpoints the problem with the current attitude, if not the term: the commodification of ethnicity, the lumping together of everybody. This is precisely what this issue of DRCLAS newsletter seeks to address—our stories are individual, our multiplicities evident everywhere. It is by listening to these stories that we begin to really see each other in our full, rich complexity, not as invisible generic group whose music can be sold, whose stories can be put on the big screen, whose tastes or looks can be codified.

Of course, the danger to be reductive, to circumscribe identity into a facile Ethnic Type comes not just from outsiders. I’ve faced this reductiveness within my own Latin@ community. You’re not a real Dominican because you’re light-skinned or not part of la comunidad in Washington Heights or Lawrence, Massachusetts. My compañeras report similar ousters: You’re not one of us Chicanas puse you’ve crossed over to a mainstream publisher; you’re not one of us because you’ve joined all those white women and become a feminist instead of protecting your compañeras.

The minute I hear someone trying to coo us into a tight definition of authentic identity, I wince. Look at our own Latin@ identity: we’re a multicultural, multi-racial group, with roots in several continents: from natives people whose ancestors came from Asia to settle in the Western Hemi-

sphere several millennia ago, to people from Europe and the Middle East and Africa. We’re Roman Catholics, Protestants, Jews, people with deep connections to Mixtec, Nahua and other native American religious beliefs.

Who better than us Latin@s to teach others how to be a diverse and inclusive community?

This extremely important mission challenges us in the new millenium. With the vast migrations and mobility of the last 50 years, most of us no longer fit the tight definitions of identity we were born into. Last year in California I met an Afro-Dominican-American who had married a Japanese woman and had a little baby. Their son is an Afro-Dominican-Japanese-American. My Dominica

sister is married to a Danish man, her kids know Danish, English, and Spanish, and you know what they love to eat, arroz con habichuelas with pickled herring.

We are becoming a planet of racial and cultural hybrids. We need an open mind and a big heart and a compassionate imagination to allow for all the combinations we are becoming as a human family.

I would go even further and say, that to embrace our multicultural selves is to become fully human. Robert Desnos, the French poet who died in a Nazi concentration camp, once said that the challenge of being human was “not only to be oneself, but to become each one.” To embrace our selves in all our complexity and richness and also to embrace the multiplicity of selves out there— that is our challenge as human beings.

How to begin?

Story by story.
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Becoming Latin@s

BY MARCELO SUÁREZ-OROZCO AND DORIS SOMMER

IN CALIFORNIA HOSPITALS TODAY, the name most often given to baby boys is José. No wonder there is talk of México’s reconquista of that vast area of the Southwest that it had lost to the United States in 1848. The treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo that officially transferred the territory included what turned out to be precarious provisions of language and cultural rights for residents who changed nationality without moving from home. The difference between treaty and treatment was obvious very soon to all interested observers. Even before the Civil War put an end to Cuban schemes for annexation to the U.S., reformist José Antonio Saco warned that it would mean the end of Cuba as it had meant the end of autonomy for Texas and California, because the U.S. could not tolerate cultural differences.

A generation later, José Martí repeatedly warned about the perils of Anglo-only intolerance, which would plague Puerto Rico, where English was the mandatory language of instruction for 50 years after the island was annexed through the Spanish-(Cuban)-American War. Puerto Rico’s cultural victory was that it never adopted English (known as el difícil, while the U.S. flag was called la pana). And by now, Mexican Spanish is back in California and in Texas (traveling as far as Kansas, where nearly half the Dodge City school children come from Spanish speaking homes) as the result of unstoppable migrations. On the East Coast too, the earlier massive Puerto Rican immigration came to fill labor needs (paralleling the Mexican bracero program to supply workers in the West initiated in the 1940s) is now being matched by immigration from practically everywhere. (Of the top ten “sender” countries in the last decade, four are Latin American and Caribbean: Mexico, the Dominican Republic, Cuba and Jamaica; in the next 10 are Haití, El Salvador, Colombia, and Peru.)

Perhaps this time, our safely established country can recover some of the cultural flexibility it lost through homogenizing annexations and through the defensive patriotism that closed German publishing houses and interned Japanese-Americans during WWII. At the level of artistic production and media responses to dramatic demographic change, the U.S.—like other industrialized countries today—is again a land of immigrants eager to improve their lives. Unlike the European democracies facing the immigration dilemma (the Faustian bargain of needing and desiring foreign workers while sharing deep anxieties about the cultural implications of large scale immigration from North Africa, Turkey and Eastern Europe), this country needs not insist on a homogeneous heritage to inssure its future, but rather on the constitutional freedoms and responsibilities that have traditionally welcomed immigrants as full participants in national development.

During the last few decades, Latin@s (a gender-friendly shorthand) have become a powerful new political, cultural, and economic force. And Census projections now claim that by the year 2050 fully a quarter of the US population will be of Latin@ origin. By then the U.S. will be the only major post-industrial democracy in the world with ethnic minorities constituting...
nearly half the population. The change feels sudden in a country that, at the end of World War II was largely of European origin. The transformations brought by large-scale immigration, globalization, and transnationalism will require systematic research, policy analysis, and responsible public debate. They will also demand renovation of American Studies in general, and the articulation of a project or projects for Latin@ Studies in particular.

There is a symmetry—that gives some of us aesthetic pleasure—between European immigration in 1900s and Latin American immigration today. During the first decade of the Twentieth Century, 8 million of all immigrants were Europeans. During the decade of the 1980s, 8 million immigrants to the U.S. originated in Latin America. Indeed as the Century came to a close, there has been a complete transformation, a complete shift. Through 1965, 80 per cent of all immigrants in the United States were Canadians and Europeans. Now the vast majority of all new immigrants originate in Latin America, the Caribbean, and Asia.

We’re looking at a phenomenon that is very recent in terms of its main formations and the dynamics it has generated. Over 90 percent of all Central Americans and Dominicans living in the United States today are either immigrants or the children of immigrants. We may be used to thinking of former Mexican territories, or Caribbean Nueva York (the best thing about the city, so the joke goes, is that it’s so close to the United States), or Cuban Florida. But today, the new immigration is also changing the traditional South: half of all the children are Mexican in Dalton, Georgia schools, home of the carpet industry (which is in the hands of Latin@ workers). In Florida, the Latin@ population increased 42 percent from 1990 to 1998. But in Georgia, the Latin@ population increased by 102 percent, and in Arkansas by 148 percent. The South is being transformed by the Latin@ presence. There and elsewhere, it is structured through transnationalized networks of families and communities of origin.

Border controls seem to have more of a performance effect than a preventive function, since many of the apprehended border-crossers try again. They want to come and the U.S. economy continues to thrive on immigrant workers for agricultural, service, industrial, and post-industrial jobs. And though thousands of people are apprehended and deported every day, the stricter controls have a paradoxical effect: Latin@s decide to stay once they get here. Immigration flows today are driven by family reunification, labor recruiting networks, and wage differentials that are difficult if not outright impossible to contain via unilateral policy initiatives.

How do sending nations feel about the massive movements outward? Remittances in no small measure compensate the homelands for their loss of workers. In fact, loud protests against U.S. restrictions on immigration are often heard from Latin American heads of state. Central Americans, the largest number of asylum seekers in the United States in the last two decades, last year sent well over a billion dollars back home—the most important source of foreign exchange in the Salvadoran economy. That’s also true for the Dominican Republic—today roughly 1 of every 6 Dominicans lives in the U.S. In all, more than a hundred billion dollars a year cross boundaries in these international remittances.

Along with the massive immigration with an intent to stay is the intense circular migration driven by transnational circuits such as the Dominican experience in New York. This transnationality is unlike anything we have seen in previous waves of immigration. With the old pattern of immigration to the United States, a break was made with the country of origin. The Irish, the Eastern Europeans, the Italians either came forever or they went back. Fully a third of the Italians coming to the United States returned home. But they didn’t move back and forth, participating in two economies and two polities, the way many Latin@s do today. These transnational citizens are political and economic actors in more than one country simultaneously. Some observers have noted the outcome of the last Dominican presidential election was determined in New

---

Why Latin@s?
A Note from the Editor

As Doris Sommer and Marcelo-Suárez-Orozco explain in the introduction to this newsletter, Latin@s is meant to be a gender-friendly abbreviation. As in the early days of the women’s movement, when people were grappling with the usage of Mrs., Mr., and Ms., the use of the term Latin@s in DRCLAS NEWS encapsulates a similar social debate.

When we were putting together the newsletter in its initial stages, authors were divided on the use of Latino, Latino/a, or Latin@, Hispanic, and other terminology. After lengthy e-mail discussions, most decided to opt for Latin@, at least in part because “Latino” referred only to the masculine sex, and Latino/a or Latina/o seemed especially cumbersome.

The use of Latin@ in this newsletter is one of many questions about identity raised by the authors. The dialogue was interesting; while, in general, we have adopted Latin@ as the style of this newsletter, we also left room for preferred usage, whether, Latin@, Latino or Latina, Hispanic, or some other terminology. It’s important to note that many, if not most, authors identify themselves first as Mexicana or Dominican, Chicano or Salvadoran, and only at one level of abstraction as Latin@ or Hispanic.

Latin@ identity is a movement in process, as is the language used to talk about this experience in the United States. (Will one day soon computer spellcheck programs recognize “Latinat” as a word?)

The use of this terminology Latin@ is intentionally provocative in this forum, which seeks to stimulate debate about gender, race, and other identity issues. It is a conversation that is just beginning, and we hope that both the authors and readers of the newsletter will engage in it. It is not intended to be policy-setting. The debate is open at Harvard and beyond.

After all, in the 1960s, no one was sure about whether to use Ms. —Ms. June Carolyn Erlick
York City, where Dominicans are now the largest group of immigrants.

The U.S. is learning to anticipate cultural difference inside its borders; but just below the surface lay nativist anxieties about the country's coherence in light of this massive, unprecedented migratory flow—since the 1960s over 20 million new immigrants came to the US and since 1990s the pattern has intensified to nearly a million new arrivals per annum. And while transnationalism flourishes, make no mistake: the vast majority of Latin American immigrants are here to stay. They are arriving in the United States knowing that they want to live here and that they want to stay in the United States. The delicious paradox is that in the era of deep and dense transnational, globalized networks, Latin@ immigrants are establishing deeper roots on US soil than ever before.

Perhaps we can promote the argument that this country needs immigrants not so much for economic needs, but for psychological, symbolic, and cultural reasons. By carving out their own cultural space through Spanish-language media, at the same time that the pull of U.S. culture on the world is stronger than ever, immigrants can keep cultural pluralism in focus, so that political practices do not collapse into mean-spirited and monocultural intolerance.

At this moment in history, when the country is struggling with uncertainty about its ability to culturally withstand the latest wave of new immigrants, ironically American culture is arguably, for better or worse, at its most powerful and influential moment on the world-wide stage. Through new information technologies, the American ethos dominates youth culture, influencing language, street fashions and music throughout vast sectors of the world. From Paris to Katmandu to La Paz, youth are wearing hip-hop clothing, watching MTV, and standing in lines to see the same movies. Even prior to the American dominance of international youth culture, the children of immigrants have always tended to gravitate to the characteristics of the new culture. Children quickly acquire the new language skills and often become reluctant to speak their language in public. They desperately want to wear clothes that will let them be "cool" or, at the very least, do not draw attention to themselves as "different."

Children of immigrants become acutely aware of nuances of behaviors that while "normal" at home, will set them apart as "strange" and "foreign" in public.

While immigrant parents generally acquire some English skills, it is likely that they never really catch on to how different the rules are here. Children of immigrants, on the other hand, are likely to learn the "rules of the game" quickly and easily. There is a powerful centrifugal force drawing children into the dominant culture. The parents inevitably struggle with ambivalence. Immigrants are by definition in the margins of two cultures. Paradoxically, they can never truly belong either "here" nor "there."

In 1937, Stonequist astutely described the experiences commonly involved in social dislocations which is as useful today as it was then.

Cultural transitions, he argues, leave the immigrant "on the margin of each [culture] but a member of neither." An immigrant enters a new culture and no matter how hard she tries, will never completely belong; her accent will not be quite right and her experiences will always be filtered through the dual frame of reference. Nor will she "belong" in her old country; her new experiences change her, altering the filters through which she views the world. Stonequist contends that marginality is intensified when there are sharp ethnic contrasts and hostile social attitudes between the old and new cultures.

Immigrants, and most significantly, the children of immigrants—the new Latin@—respond in different ways. Some chose to mimic and identify with the dominant culture. Sometimes this identification with the mainstream culture results in weakening of the ties to members of their own ethnic group. These young people all too frequently are alienated from their less enculturated peers; they may have little in common or may even feel they are somewhat superior to them. While they may gain entry into privileged positions within mainstream culture, they will still have to deal with issues of marginalization and exclusion. Other children of immigrants develop an adversarial stance constructing identities around rejecting—after having been rejected by—the institutions of the dominant culture. Those who forge bicultural identities develop cultural competencies well suited to traverse cultural boundaries. These youth code-switch with ease in the linguistic, interpersonal, and cultural realms. They seem well posed to take advantage of today's globalized, internationalized economy and culture.

Latin@s today are making choices as never before. They are not only replicating lifestyles, but inventing new ones, which have an impact on the dominant culture. Instead of lamenting, with Nuyorican Sandra María Esteves, that her embattled boricua identity is "Neither Nor" as she describes herself in a poem, some contemporary transnationals experience by pushing English grammar into the "either and" possibilities. Esteves' compatriot, Tato Lavién called himself "AmeRican," syncopating the accent to favor Ricar, and performing an aplatcado version of America as an update for apple pie.

Marcelo Suárez-Orozco, a professor in the Harvard Graduate School of Education, and Doris Sommer, a professor in Harvard's Romance Languages and Literatures Department, co-teach the Latino Cultures course.
From “Cuentos” to “Ciencias”
Reconciling Stories and Science
BY SUSAN GONZÁLEZ-BAKER

I WAS RECENTLY GIVEN A CHOICE BY THE EDITORIAL staff of the David Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies to write a short essay for inclusion in DRCLAS NEWS. The choice was either to present an overview of my work on Mexican migration to the United States or to present a narrative about myself and how I came to be inspired to do that work. At the time, I thought writing about myself would be a more unusual, interesting (and less heavily footnoted) task. I realize now that it is also a much more intimate task, fraught with the danger that revealing my own background may compromise the objectivity with which I approach my work and expect others to approach it.

There’s the additional fear that my narrative will sound maudlin or romanticized. Perhaps so, but an essay of this type is not intended, to my way of thinking, to tell horror stories about myself. Rather, I approach this task with the conviction that I come from someplace special, even magical, if such a world is appropriate coming from an academic. I also come from some profoundly inspiring people, and those experiences have guided me down a research path that has been extraordinarily satisfying. This narrative, for me, renders transparent what is often opaque. Social scientists who study people, are, after all, people. In this brief narrative, my goal is to share some of the influences on my own work that derive from my background in the hopes that it might encourage all of us in the academy to share not only our research, but our humanity, with one another.

My colleague at the University of Texas at Austin, Vice President and Dean of the Graduate School Teresa Sullivan, once gave a talk to our graduate student cohort in which she pointed out that her introduction to sociology generated a profound personal discovery. She had always been a sociologist, even before she knew there was such a thing to be. This observation resonated for me as well. From the time that my parents divorced when I was a young girl, I began to become a sociologist.

Their divorce resulted in a move from the largely non-Hispanic white suburbs of western Chicago to my mother’s ancestral home of La Pryor, Texas 45 miles from the Mexican border (population 5000), where my grandfather was a foreman on a cattle ranch and my grandmother worked in the local public school cafeteria. For a short period of time, I remained the person I had been before these changes—a monolingual English speaker, an excellent student in school, a kid who rode bicycles, swam in city swimming pools, went to an Episcopal church, ate at McDonald’s.

But before long, everything began to change. My grandparents did not speak fluent English. So I learned Spanish, which was also the language of instruction in the public school I attended 15 miles away in Crystal City, Texas. Instead of bicycles, I rode the horses my grandfather broke to saddle for the ranch owner. Instead of pools, there was the Nueces River. Instead of the Episcopal Church, I spent my evenings in the bed I shared with my grandmother watching and listening closely as she lit her candles and said her nightly prayers in front of framed pictures of La Virgen de Guadalupe and Jesus Christ. There was no McDonald’s. Our meals were elaborate family get-togethers filled with jokes, songs, (a few fights over the size of the phone bill) and family stories, including some poignant ones. With great love in her voice, my grandmother would tell the story of her own youth, when she dressed her fatally ill 14 year old sister in a homemade wedding gown so that her sister could experience at least a part of something she would never come to know. My
grandfather strummed his guitar and sang "Cielito Lindo" whenever he was in a particularly good mood, a song I sang to him in the hospital in the last days of his life in 1998.

Even the tragedy of the passing of the man my three children call "Cowboy Grandpa" had a few moments that brought smiles to our faces. For the last few months of his life, he was bedridden at home. This was torture to a man who had to be pulled off a tractor by my grandmother to come to my wedding rehearsal ten years before. Knowing how much my grandfather had loved to hunt, my mother went to Wal-Mart and bought a large cotton sheet stamped with images of white-tailed deer, which she tacked up on the wall at the foot of his bed. As he stared at the deer, he asked my Uncle Peter, his only son, "Which one of those do you think is the biggest?" Peter's response was "I don't know Dad, it's a print. I think they're pretty much all the same size." My grandfather squinted closely at the sheet, raised his hand, and pointed to the one in the middle, muttering "Nope, I think that one's bigger." At which point, my beloved uncle said, "You know, Dad, I think you're right." This family taught me about family as everything from refuge to maelstrom of conflict, and their example makes me a better teacher and scholar, and evaluator of other researchers' scholarship about Mexican American families.

And there were Mexican immigrants in my life, always, passing through the back trails and brush country of the ranch, cautiously approaching the house and asking for food and water in exchange for work. Most were young men (what we demographers now define as labor-force-aged target earners) who stayed only a few days as they made their way 95 miles north to San Antonio. Some were pregnant women. One was a teenage boy named Gregorio, a name shared by my grandmother's own father, who lived with my family for the better part of a year, until an INS raid on the ranch took him away; and we never saw him again. When the immigrants were out with my grandfather doing the day's work on the ranch, I would sneak into the small bunk house where they slept and read the prayers and examine the drawings they had penciled onto the walls. Never was there profanity or pornography. Instead, there were prayers beneath which were listed full names of parents, children, wives. There was poetry; there were corrido lyrics. There was a sense of community foregone in the interest of a difficult purpose.

It was not until I attended college that I found a discipline that focused on all of the many themes that had been a part of my life up to that point. That discipline was sociology.

A three-day April conference "Latinos in the 21st Century: Mapping the Research Agenda" is expected to result in a definitive book on the subject to be published jointly by the University of California Press and DRCLAS.

Susan Gonzalez-Baker is an assistant professor in the Department of Sociology at the University of Texas, Austin. She is also a Faculty Affiliate at the University of Texas Population Research Center and a contributor to Crossings: Mexican Immigration in Interdisciplinary Perspectives, edited by Marcelo Suarez-Orozco (David Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies/Harvard University Press, 1998).
Nueva York, Diaspora City
Latin@s Between and Beyond
BY JUAN FLORES

NEW YORK MAGAZINE HAS BEEN renamed Nueva York, at least for a week. The Spanish word on the cover of the September 6, 1999 issue is an eye-catcher for readers of the popular weekly, and attests to the currency of things, and words, “Latin” among the contemporary public in the United States. Before you know it, all New Yorkers, and all America, will be “living la vida loca” on the streets of Nueva York!

At the beginning of the new millennium, Latin@ fever is gripping U.S. popular culture at a pitch unprecedented in the protracted history of that continental seduction. Hardly a week passes without still another media special, and hardly an area of entertainment and public life—sports, music, movies and television, advertising, fashion, food—is by now untouched by an emphatic Hispanic presence. Visibility is of course not new to the “Latin look” in American pop culture—think of Carmen Miranda, Ricardo Montalbán, or Desi Arnaz—but is the Latin “flavor,” the salsa y sabor, a new ingredient in the proverbial melting pot, be it musical, sexual, or culinary. But those passing crazes and that subliminal sense of otherness have become in the present generation a veritable saturation of the pop public sphere, the “Latin” way attaining to a ubiquity and prominence that has converted it into an active shaper of contemporary tastes and trends.

Underlying this spectacular cultural ascendancy are major demographic and economic changes, resulting in the incremental growth and enormous diversification of the Latin@ population in the U.S. The swelling influx of Dominicans, Mexicans, Colombians, Ecuadorians and numerous other Latin American nationalities has meant that “Latin New York,” for decades synonymous with Puerto Rican, has become pan-ethnic. Puerto Ricans, while still the most numerous group, now comprise less that half the aggregate. By 1999, then, it was high time that New York become Nueva York, and that its burgeoning population of Spanish-language background be given its day in the glitz.

Visibility, though, can do as much to obscure as to illuminate, particularly when it remains so preponderantly concentrated in the image-making of the commercial culture. In the case of U.S. Latin@s, celebrity status and ceremonial fanfare is clearly one of those mirages, serving effectively to camouflage the structured inequality and domination which accounts for their diasporic reality in the first place, and deflecting public attention from the decidedly unceremonious and unenviable social status of the majority of Latin@ peoples. The spectacular success stories of the few serve only to mask the ongoing reality of racism, economic misery, and political disenfranchisement endured by most Latin@s, who moved northward from their homelands only because of per-
istent inequalities at global and regional levels.

But the Latin@ avalanche has given birth to the “sleeping giant,” a demographic and cultural monster whose immense commercial and electoral potential has only begun to be tapped and who, if roused, could well upset some of the delicate balances necessary to the prolongation of the “American Century.” Typically, awe and fascination mingle with a sense of foreboding, an alarmism over the imminent threat Latin@s are perceived to present to the presumed unity of American culture, and to an unhampered control over the country’s destiny. An integral component of this nervous prognosis, repeated with mantra-like predictability when public discussion turns to the “browning of America,” is the identification of Latin@s as the country’s “fastest growing minority,” the group whose numbers are on pace to exceed that of African Americans as early as the first decade of the new millennium. The fear of an “alien nation”—the title of a recent xenophobic book on immigration—veils but thinly an even deeper phobia, the fear of a non-white majority.

Such calculations, however, beg more questions than they answer when it comes to assessing the cultural and political relations which prevail in contemporary society. Most obviously, they take for granted the sociological equivalence of the various “minority” groups, in this case Latin@s and African Americans, as though a diverse set of immigrant and colonially conquered populations occupy the same historical position, and constitute the same kind of collective association, as a group unified, within the United States, on the basis of their common African ancestry and history of enslavement. Of course African Americans like all other groups have long differed along class, gender, color, regional and other lines, but the seams in the Latin@ patchwork stand out as soon as we go beyond the media hype and wishful census counts and undertake comparative analysis of any rigor. Even the obvious commonalities like language and religion, for example, turn out to be deceptive at best in light of the millions of Latin@s who are neither Spanish-speaking nor of the Catholic faith.

But beyond that, it is certainly a spurious sociological exercise to conjoin in one unit of discourse Puerto Ricans and Mexican Americans on the one hand, whose position in U.S. society is fully conditioned by legacies of conquest and colonization, with on the other hand immigrant and exile nationalities of relatively recent arrival from varied national homelands in Latin America. Differences along the lines of economic class and educational and entrepreneurial capital are striking, as are those having to do with issues of race and national cultures.

At least one of the spokesmen cited in Nueva York voices a sensitivity to the pitfalls of this pan-ethnic labeling process. The Dominican writer Junot Díaz is skeptical about any and all ethnic generalizations, stating about “Latin@s” that “I’d rather have us start out as fractured so we don’t commit the bullshit and truisms that are falling under the banner of sameness entails.”

What is not mentioned in the pages of Nueva York, by Junot Díaz or any other commentator, is the most consequential of the “erasures” involved in pan-ethnic naming—the relation of Latin@s to blackness, and to African Americans in particular. While the Latin@ concept does generally indicate otherwise, “people of color” and non-white, the history of social categorization has selectively equivocated on the issue, and many media representations allow for, or foster, a sense of compatibility with whiteness; the Latin@ faces shown for broad public consumption, whether it is Daisy Fuentes, Keith Hernández or Chita Rivera, tend to be decidedly from the lighter end of the spectrum. The unspoken agenda of the new Latin@ visibility, and of the imminent sur-passing of African American as the largest minority, is the ascendancy of a non-black minority. To mollify the fears of an invasion from south of the border is the consolation that at least their presence does not involve dealings with more souls of more black folk.

Yet social experience tells us otherwise. The rampant “racial profiling” and waves of police brutality are directed against both African American and Latin@ victims, with no color distinctions of this kind playing a role. For the fact is that, in many inner-city situations, there is no such difference, and it is not possible to “tell them apart.” What the hegemonic, consumer version of Latin@ ethnicity obscures is that many Latin@s are black, especially according to the codes operative in the United States. And what is more, while this version tends to racialize Latin@s toward whiteness, much in tune with the racist baggage of Latin American and Caribbean home cultures, on the streets and in the dominant social institutions “brown” is close enough to black to be suspect.

In Nueva York in particular, where the prevalent Latin@ presence and sensibility remains Caribbean, this counter-position to blackness is often disconcerting at best, and among many Puerto Rican and Dominican youth the response has been to reaffirm a sense of belonging to an African diaspora. Indeed, in the case of Puerto Ricans this perspective entails not only an emphasis on Afro-Boricua heritage but, because of the decades-long experience of close interaction with African Americans in New York, an identification and solidarity with American Blacks perhaps unmatched by any other group in the history of the “nation of immigrants.” Cultural expression in all areas—from language and music to literature and the visual arts—typically illustrate fusions and crossovers, mutual fascinations and emulations, that have resulted in much of what we identify, for example in the field of popular music, as jazz, rock and roll, and hip-hop. Collectively, and as a reflex of broader social experiences, this demographically and culturally conjoined cultural history put the lie to any wedge driven between Latin@ and black life and representation.

For example, the spoken word artist “Mariposa” (María Fernández) objects to being called a “Latina writer,” as
present-day literary marketing would group her, reminding her audience that “I myself feel more in common with my sistahs [African American women writers] than with, say, Chicana poets like Sandra Cisneros or Lorna Dee Cervantes.”

Yet Mariposa does not consider this intense affiliation with African Americans to stand in any conflict with her Puerto Rican background. On the contrary, in her signature poem, “Ode to the DiaspoRican,” she signals her “pelo vivo” and her “manos trigueñas” as evidence of her national identity, and rails against those who would deny it:

Some people say that I am not the real thing
Boricua, that is
cuz I wasn’t born on the enchanted island
cuz I was born on the mainland.....
cuz my playground was a concrete jungle
cuz my Rio Grande de Loíza was the Bronx River
cuz my Fajardo was City Island
my Luquillo, Orchard Beach
and summer nights were filled with city noises instead of coquis
and Puerto Rico was just some paradise
That we only saw in pictures
What does it mean to live in between.....?

Mariposa thus gives voice to the sentiments of many young Puerto Ricans, and of many Latin@s in general, in their defiance of a territorially and socially confined understanding of cultural belonging. Place of birth and immediate lived experience are not wholly definitive of cultural identification, which in this view has more to do with political and social experience, and with personally chosen ascription. “No naci en Puerto Rico,” she exclaims in the poem’s refrain, “Puerto Rico nació en mí.”

As these instances show, present-day social identities press simultaneously in varied directions, linking individuals and groups along lines that would appear mutually exclusive according to their representation in commercially and ideologically oriented media. Nueva York, New York magazine’s momentary interlude as a Latin@-focused publication, dwarfs the cultural horizons of Latin@ experience by postulating its categorical differentiation from blackness, and also by disengaging Latin@ culture in the U.S. from its moorings in Latin American and Caribbean realities. Not only are the featured Latin@ celebrities treated as interchangeable in their collective background, but in the entire issue no mention is made of Mexico, Puerto Rico, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, or Colombia except as potential extensions of the U.S. market. What is more, there is no discussion of the massive migrations from those home countries, nor of the historical relations with the U.S. which have generated modern migratory movements, as the transnational origin and setting for the very presence and position of Latin@s in U.S. society.

Today’s global conditions impel us beyond these tidy, nationally constricted views of cultural identity, which might well be referred to as “consumer ethnicities.” The Latin@ community is if anything a process rather than a circumscribed social entity, and its formation entails complex and often converging interactions with other, purportedly “non-Latin@” groups such as African Americans and American Indians. But the idea of the pan-Latin@ necessarily implies the trans-Latin@, the engagement of U.S.-based Latin@s in the composition of cultural and political diasporas of regional and global proportions. The interdependence of old and new “homes,” the constant bearing of U.S. policies and practices on the life circumstances in Latin America and the Caribbean, propel more and more Latin@s across the hemispheric divide, and resonate loudly in the everyday lives of all Latin@s. But beyond those direct geopolitical ties, awakened cultural legacies and congruences also engage Latin@s in more abstract but no less pronounced diasporic affiliations, notably transnational indigenous and “Black Atlantic” trajectories of identity formation.

The “new Nueva York” is rich with these innovative cultural possibilities, and as the newfound home of so many people from so many Latin American countries it now serves as a seminal ground for the re-thinking and re-imagining of America. One hundred years after the prophetic ruminations of José Marti about the contours of “nuestra América,” we are now in a position to conceptualize “América” itself in its world context, and the multiple lines of an “American” identity as coordinates of radical transnational remappings. The “Latin explosion” receiving so much coverage in the U.S. today, the hyperboles and hypex generated by “la vida loca,” is but one index of a pervasive change in human affairs, leaving all of us asking, with Mariposa, “what does it mean to live in between?”

Juan Flores is a professor at Hunter College and the CUNY Graduate Center. His books include Divided Borders: Essays on Puerto Rican Identity, La venganza de Cortijo y otros ensayos, and From Bomba to Hip-Hop: Puerto Rican Culture and Latino Identity (Columbia University Press, 2000). During the Spring 2000 semester he is teaching a course, “Islands and Enclaves: Caribbean Latino Literature in the U.S.” in the Spanish Department at Harvard.
The Soulfulness of Black and Brown Folk

BY CHRIS TIRRES

And so, by faithful chance, the negro folksong—the rhythmic cry of the slave—stands to-day not simply as the sole American music, but as the most beautiful expression of human experience born this side the seas. It has been neglected, it has been, and is, half despised, and above-all it has been persistently mistaken and misunderstood; but notwithstanding, it still remains as the singular spiritual heritage of the nation and the greatest gift of the Negro people.


Corridor first became widely used along the South Texas/Mexican border during the early conflict between Chicanos and Anglos. The corridors are usually about Mexican heroes who do valiant deeds against the Anglo oppressors. . . . The everpresent corridors narrated one hundred years of border history, bringing news of events as well as entertaining. These folk musicians and folk songs are our chief cultural myth-makers, and they made our hard lives seem bearable.

—Gloria Anzaldúa, Borderlands/ La Frontera: The New Mestizas

As a Mexican-American from the Southwest, I will never forget my first encounter with George Clinton's unabashed and unapologetic "Chocolate City," a politically-minded milestone in the world of funk music. Well into my second semester at an elite, Ivy League university, I still felt like an outsider. The intricate and ornate architecture left me feeling cold; the foliage was lush and green, but the sky seemed small and sad. And although my immediate friendships were deep and growing, as I walked through a campus of thousands, I missed the presence of anonymous brown faces, such as were found in my Texas bordertown.

In my more escapist moments, I turned to music. It was George Clinton's Parliament/Funkadelic that took me farthest away from my lily-white Ivory Tower. "There's a lot of chocolate cities around," I would hear Clinton say. "We've got Newark, we've got Gary. Somebody told me we got L.A...But you're the capital, C.C." A sly euphemism for Washington, D.C., the "Chocolate City"—C.C.—represented the site, both figurative and geographic, of Clinton's alternative political and social order. I made many mental pilgrimages there, the place where "Ali is in the
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White House... Richard Pryor, Minister of Education; Stevie Wonder, Secretary of FINE arts; and Miss Aretha Franklin, the First Lady." "A chocolate city is no dream," Clinton would tell me. "It's my piece of the rock and I dig you, C.C. God bless Chocolate City and its vanilla suburbs."

As those familiar with the song know, Clinton lays special emphasis on the words "vaannilla suuuuburbs" in a way that hoots, "These poor white folk! They just don't see what's coming!" Sure enough, this underlying subtext is soon confirmed by a boisterous refrain. As if suddenly springing upon the unsuspecting listener, a multi-voiced chorus indignantly clamors "Gainin' on ya!," which is then contrasted by Clinton's matter-of-fact and ever-so-soothing "Get down."

The exchange continues:

Chorus: Gainin' on ya!
Clinton: Movin' in and on ya
Chorus: Gainin' on ya!
Clinton: Can't you feel my breath, heh
Chorus: Gainin' on ya!
Clinton: All up around your neck, heh heh

This image of blacks "gainin' on" the white establishment filled me with contradictory feelings. On the one hand, it gave me strength, for I saw myself as part of the larger everyday struggle against the legacy of white supremacy. With very few places to turn, I was ready to jump aboard Clinton's funked-up 'Mother Ship' and ride to the Chocolate City. On the other hand, there was a certain predatory quality to the chorus' "Gainin' on ya!" as it moved "in and on ya" and as it breathed "all up around" the establishment's neck. How would a white person react to this?, I thought. And was there a place for me, a Brown brother, in Clinton's Chocolate City? Was there a hint of canela in Clinton's chocolate recipe?

At about the same time that I was finding solace in Clinton's music, I was also discovering that I was not simply a Mexican-American or Chicano, but, more broadly, a "Latin@" (among my peers) or "Hispanic" (in the eyes of the university administration). I was learning the demographic mantra: "we Latin@s will soon become the largest minority group in the United States, surpassing African Americans." This is a prediction that Latin@s today often wear like a proud badge. Yet, this so-called objective statement of demographic fact carries with it the same ambiguities that I found in Clinton's "Chocolate City." I find troubling the image of Latin@'s "surpassing" and "outnumbering" Blacks. I worry about the implicit assumptions that this statement may carry. Often, I hear overtones of a cultural take-over, or the assumption that it is now "our turn" in the cultural limelight, or the belief that Latin@'s will simply overwhelm the nation, Blacks included, with their numbers. But is progress to be had at the expense of the surprised and overwhelmed other?

Two years ago, here at Harvard, David Carrasco, a Princeton professor, and Harvard's own Cornell West held a groundbreaking dialogue entitled: "Whose Eyes on What Prize?: A Black-Brown Discussion on Shades of Invisibility." Carrasco posed the question well: How can Blacks and Latin@'s turn demographics into democracy? Carrasco's appeal was, and still is, timely. In the last five years alone, riots broke out in Washington, D.C. when a black police officer shot a Latino man; Blacks and Latin@'s clashed over day labor in Los Angeles, Chicago, and Denver; and Dallas' largest school board nearly splintered over Black-Brown racial tensions. As a group, Latin@'s sense that their condition is improving, while Blacks often feel threatened by this "sleeping giant." Without a doubt, the stakes are high.

In his talk, Carrasco turned to the spirit of music as a way to demonstrate the possibilities of coalition-building between Blacks and Latin@'s. He played a bilingual version of "We Shall Overcome" called "Nosotros Venceremos." After a traditional close-harmony, a-cappella gospel-style entrance, the song bursted into a lively soca beat, complete with bilingual lyrics. Ingeniously, this rendition — by Dr. Loco and the Rockin' Jalepeño Band — paid homage to gospel, the song's original musical form; it retained the song's lyrics, broadening its scope through its bilingualism; and, perhaps most importantly, it reaffirmed the cathartic and emotional message of the song: as dispossessed peoples, we shall overcome our oppression!

Some readers may be wondering what this has to do with the concrete realities of Black people, Latin@'s, Black-
Latin@s, and the way that these folks get along with one another. Certainly, our interracial tensions will not be solved by listening to sócö-fied renditions of “We Shall Overcome.” But such cultural expressions do help us understand the depth of “the common struggle of the oppressed,” whether they be Black, Brown, Yellow, White, female, gay, poor, or a combination of these. Music and a host of other cultural forms open up new ways of imagining, acting in, and adapting to the world. They highlight what I will call the “soulfulness” of our struggle.

In order to get at this idea of soulfulness, it is momentarily worth thinking about the relationship between the content and form of our history. This relationship may be grasped on at least two levels. On the first level, the content of our history may be understood as the “raw data” of the past and present while the form of our history implies the way in which we interpret such data. The two are intimately interrelated. We know “things” (content) because of and through our interpretative frameworks (form). Form puts content in context, and thus, gives content its meaning. Historians have long known that it is impossible to write a purely objective account of the past, and today we generally acknowledge that our own subjective thoughts and way of framing the facts effect how the story is told.

Seen in this light, our storytelling is always a risky business. If our interpretations are, by nature, rooted in subjectivity, our knowledge is inescapably and inherently fallible and our experience always limited. For many, this is a scary proposition, for it seems to open the floodgates of relativism. Many will ask, Without a concrete and “true” place upon which to stand, how do we know what is right and wrong, good and bad, worth remembering and fighting for? The question is a fair and important one, for not only does it beg the question, What grounds us as human beings?, but also, it takes seriously the need to be able to assign value to our world.

It is precisely at this point that we must appeal to a second level of the content-form relationship—the interaction between history-as-content and response-as-form. In this model, history refers to the realities of the world that happen regardless of our interpretation, and response connotes not only our subjective interpretation of these realities, but, more profoundly, our existential engagement with them. Though it should be clear that no purely objective account of history can be given, it is also equally clear that history-as-reality still happens. It happened to the six million Jews who died in the Holocaust, it happened to my neighbor’s dog yesterday, and it happens to you, the reader, as you anticipate what I will say... next.

Part of our job as human beings is to assign meaning and significance to the multiplicitous events of reality. Marginalized communities enact this process valiantly and repeatedly. For Blacks and Latin@s, history happened to the 11 million slaves who crossed the Atlantic between 1520 and 1860; history happened to the more than 20 million indigenous peoples who died of slavery and disease, brought to this continent by the Spanish conquistadores, and history continues to happen to the one-in-three Latin@ and Black children who go to bed hungry at night. Such accounts of reality are deemed important by virtue of the fact that we dare to proffer and construct a narrative interpretation of the “raw facts.” In so many words, we “will” that our story be told. Too much suffering and pain, hope and gain — both past and present — are at stake not to do so.

When we will and construct our narrative histories we are, in the process, performing an act of resistance. By giving ourselves voice and asserting our agency in the world, we are resisting the dominant ways in which history has been or has not been told. Today, for example, we recognize that Columbus did not so much “discover” the “New World” as he happened to come upon an already inhabited and thriving part of the globe. Such a re-interpretation serves as an important reminder that, if we look close enough, the dominant story of “progress” almost always entails an underside. By willing forth and re-constructing these narratives, we re-insert our communities onto the face of history.

At the same time, in recognizing our narrative histories as willed and constructed, we are more apt to avoid our own dogmatism about the presumed veracity of our re-constructed past. History, whether told from the perspective of the oppressor or the oppressed, is never static. It is constantly open to and in need of re-interpretation. It continually forces us to question how we tell the story and whom we leave out. We learn to take seriously the fact, for example, that the voices of women and gays have seldom been heard in Black and Latin@ histories, though they have always been a part of our communities’ reality. When we accept that: our willed and constructed histories are never static notions of the past, self-critique and self-correction become integral attributes of our struggle.

All of these multiple shades of resistance point to what I would refer to as an underlying soulfulness within our two communities. Soulfulness is not a single cause or essence, nor is it an inherent marker of “our culture.” Rather, it is a form of resistance, gleaned from a sense of agency, style, and, at its best, self-critique and humility. Soulfulness is a form of reaction against oppression, and it gives the historical “facts” their edge.

The song “Chocolate City,” for example, is not only an attempt to recount some of the “facts” of Black history, but past ("We didn’t get our forty acres and a mule/ But we did get you, C.C."") and present ("Gainin’ on ya!") but also an effort to carve out a space for Black people in a predominantly white world. "You’re my piece of the rock/ And I love you, C.C."", intones Clinton. Chocolate City represents not so much the fact of geographical location as it represents all the sounds, sights, smells, and ways of being...
in-the-world that come with it. Clinton is in love with C.C. not so much as place, but rather, with C.C. as an embodiment of resistant soulfulness.

Much of our Black-Brown dialogue to date has neglected the powerful role of soulfulness in our common struggles for justice, instead honing in on the "facts" of history. We acknowledge that both Blacks and Latin@s share histories of racial and economic oppression, but we rarely inquire into the quality and depth of our cultural resistance. What gives us the wherewithal in the first place to even care about the facts? And what has sustained us in the past, enabling us to even confront oppression? Sadly, such questions are rarely asked in policy, business, and legal circles. Such compartmentalization misses the depth of our historical struggle. If struggle were a piece of music, it seems we have done well to take account of the formal characteristics of the song — its notes, words, instruments, players, and venue, for example — but have fallen short of appreciating the song as imaginative construction, group performance, and creative improvisation. We often short in other words, of taking account of the soulful form of our resistance.

"Tangible" political goals, such as better schools, fairer laws, and civic representation are certainly the "goods" to be gained through our struggle. Without them, our efforts are directionless. But to assume that the progress of the race rests solely on the attainment of these goals is both historically short-sighted as well as bereft of a larger sense of what "progress" is. In the face of great odds, our communities oftentimes had very little to fall back upon except their own imaginations and personal expressions, be they in the form of music, dance, poetry, dress, cuisine, language, humor, or other everyday forms of art. It was precisely construction, performance, and improvisation that sustained our forebears. In large part, these imaginative endeavors provided them with a sense of being self. As John Coltrane once said, "When I know a man's sound, well, to me that's him!" Similarly, the sound — or soulfulness — of our culture determines who we, at the depths of our existence, are. Furthermore, construction, performance, and improvisation are not only historically essential, but also, they give us a sense of what we should be progressing towards. They point to that which is not yet but could be. If nothing else, they underscore the fact that public policy, business, and law is done for a purpose, and that, by and large, it is up to us to determine what that purpose is.

As I mentioned before, soulfulness is not an innate characteristic of our cultures. It is not a ready-made resource that our communities can immediately pick-up and appropriate. Rather, it reflects the quality of our actions as we dare to recover the ugly past and as we will forth a better future. It must be continually fought for and enacted. Soulfulness reflects the depth of our responsibility to all oppressed others, and it forces us continually to ask, When we resist, what are we resisting to? Does justice mean more Latin@ visibility at the expense of other groups, or does it entail calling into question why marginalized groups must compete for such limited resources in the first place? At its core, soulfulness begs the larger question: How broad is our justice?

Chris Tirres is a doctoral candidate in Religion at Harvard University. He is the former Art Coordinator for the DRCLAS Latin American and Latino Art Forum and is an active member of Concilio Latino, the umbrella organization for all Latin@ groups at Harvard.
Latin@s in School
The Most Segregated ... Soon the Largest Minority
BY GARY ORFIELD

At the beginning of this new century, we have become a far more racially and ethnically mixed nation, but in our schools, the color lines of racial and ethnic separation are tightening. Latin@ students are rapidly becoming our largest minority group, but they have been even more segregated than African Americans for years. The trends are toward severe racial and ethnic separation in schools that are deeply unequal.

We already have five states where the majority of all public school students are from "minority" backgrounds and these include our two largest and most influential states, California and Texas, which have produced four of the last six candidates elected President. In California, the Latin@ student body already slightly exceeds the white total in a state where one in nine students is of Asian origin, and one in eleven is black. The state has many schools where the integration is primarily between Latin@s and Asians.

We find a rapid ongoing change in the racial composition of American schools and the emergence of many schools with three or more racial groups. All racial groups except whites experience considerable diversity in their schools. However, whites remain in overwhelmingly white schools even in regions with very large majorities of non-white enrollments. Latin@s and Blacks are located in schools strongly dominated by Latin@ and Black students, the two major groups with the lowest test scores.

Though we usually think of segregation in racial and ethnic terms, it's important to also realize that the spreading segregation has a strong class component. Latin@ and African American students segregated into predominantly non-white schools are very likely to find themselves in schools with a concentration of poverty. Schools that are more than nine-tenths Latin@ and/or African American are 11 times more likely than white schools to face concentrated poverty. Majority white schools, on the other hand, almost always enroll high proportions of students from the middle class. This is the root of a great deal of confusion about the segregation issue since many of the harms of segregation arise not from race itself but from the concentrated poverty that is so strongly linked to race and many of the advantages of desegregation relate to strengths of successful middle class schools.

Concentrated poverty is powerfully linked to lower educational achievement. Schools with children at the poverty level face serious challenges, such as lower parent education levels, less availability of advanced courses, teachers without credentials in the subject they are teaching, instability of enrollment, dropouts, untreated health problems, lower college-going rates, and negative peer group pressures. The nation's large program of compensatory education, Title I, has had great difficulty achieving gains in schools with highly concentrated poverty. Students receiving Title I aid in high poverty schools do worse than similarly poor students in less impoverished schools receiving no money. When school districts return to neighborhood schools, white students tend to sit next to middle class students but Latin@ and black students are likely to be next to impoverished students. Since Latin@s have the largest and the youngest families, their neighborhood schools are also much more likely to be seriously overcrowded.

Debates over the exact academic impact of desegregation continue. However, there's no question that Latin@ and black students in racially integrated schools are generally in schools with higher levels of average academic achievement than are their counterparts in segregated schools.
Desegregation does not assure that students will receive the better opportunities in those schools—that depends on how the interracial school is run—but it does usually put minority students in schools which have better opportunities and better prepared peer groups and better connections with colleges.

With the imposition of mandatory state tests for high school graduation, harmful consequences for students attending less competitive schools are steadily increasing. Chances for college also decrease as college admissions standards are rising and college remedial classes are cut. In addition, affirmative action has already been abolished in our two largest states, both of which will soon have majorities of Latin@ students. These two states, California and Texas, educate about three of every five U.S. Latin@ students.

We are clearly in a period when many policymakers, courts, and opinion makers assume that desegregation is no longer necessary. Polls show that most white Americans believe that equal educational opportunity is being provided. National political leaders have largely ignored the growth of segregation by race and income in the 1990s. Thus, knowledge of trends in segregation and its closely related inequalities are even more crucial now. For example, increased testing requirements for high school graduation, for passing from one grade to the next, and college entrance can only be fair if we offer equal preparation to children, regardless of skin color and language. Increasing segregation, however, pushes us in the opposite direction because it creates more unequal schools, particularly for low-income minority children, who most frequently receive low test scores. White and Asian students are much more likely to be in schools where the competition is much stronger, the teachers are teaching in their own field.

The issue has not even figured among the Clinton administration's priorities for education policy, despite the fact that the Clinton administration has seen the largest increases in segregation in the last half century. The Supreme Court, which opened the possibility of desegregated education in the 1950s has taken decisive steps to end desegregation plans in the 1990s and some lower courts are prohibiting even voluntary local plans. The Reagan and Bush Administrations stacked the courts with conservative judges opposed to minority rights and civil rights have been limited in areas ranging from voting to employment to schools to college admissions. Conservatives in California have succeeded in outlawing affirmative action and crippling bilingual education through referenda. The school desegregation rollback is part of a much larger reversal that is threatening the future of Latin@s.

A series of 1990s Supreme Court decisions helped push the country away from the civil rights ideal of integrated schools where all students got equal opportunity toward the old idea of "separate but equal," articulated in the 1896 Plessy v. Ferguson Supreme Court decision. Separate but equal was overturned six decades later by Brown's declaration that separate schools were inherently unequal. During the next 30 years the law developed in a series of decisions to require immediate and complete desegregation of blacks in states with a history of official discrimination, even when busing was required to overcome residential segregation. The decisive breakthrough against segregation of blacks came during the Johnson Administration when the President actively enforced the law and made the South the nation's most integrated region. During this period there was a sharp drop in the black-white test score gap in the South.

When the modern school desegregation battles took shape in the 1950s, the challenge was to open up a white school system to the one-tenth of students who were black; Latin@ students received very little attention nationally. In 1973, the Supreme Court in a case from Denver, Keyes, extended desegregation requirements to Northern and Western cities and recognized the right of Latin@ as well as African American students to desegregated education. The Nixon Administration, however, refused to implement the law in the nation's cities and its civil rights office proposed bilingual education rather than desegregation. The Reagan administration fought desegregation and also assailed bilingual education, in part because of claims that it was separatist. The administration rapidly dropped Justice Department efforts to open up suburban schools for Latin@ segregated in Phoenix and Houston and supported the California proposition that led to the end of Los Angeles desegregation.

A series of decisions by a Supreme Court reconstructed by the appointees of Presidents Reagan and Bush triggered piecemeal dismantling of desegregation plan where they had been attained. This particularly affects Latin@s, whose presence in the public school systems has tripled since the civil rights era. Since 1968, the enrollment of Hispanics has increased by 218% while African Americans have grown more than a fifth and the white enrollment is down by a sixth. In the 1996-97 school year, Latin@ enrollment accounted for 14%.

The school segregation statistics show that the next generation of Latin@s are experiencing significantly less contact with non-Latin@ whites. 45% of Latin@s were in majority white schools in 1968 but only 25% in 1996. Latin@ segregation has been increasing ever since data was first collected in the 1960s but the issue has never received much attention since the great increase came after the civil
The only state with a high level of Latin@ enrollment that did not show severe segregation in 1996 was Colorado. The Denver case was the one in which the right of Latin@s to desegregated education was recognized by the Supreme Court. In 1997, however, the Federal District Court approved permitting Denver to return to segregated neighborhood schools. That was done.

Those examining the increase in Latin@ segregation may well ask whether or not it is simply a reflection of the rising share of Latin@s in the school age population and the declining share of whites. The answer to this question is yes, a large share of the increase is demographic and full desegregation in majority white schools is no longer a possibility in some states. (Although there would also be advantages for Latin@ students in getting access to schools with many Asian students.) A new analysis for the U.S. National Center for Education Statistics shows that much of the decline in desegregation with whites could be accounted for by the growth of the Latin@ enrollment between 1987 and 1996, since there were few major desegregation plans to dismantle in the West. However, whites remain highly segregated in the regions of rapid Latin@ enrollment growth.

The public schools of the U.S. foreshadow the dramatic transformation of American society that will occur in the next generation. We are a society in which the school age population is much more diverse than the older population. The social reality in our schools is far removed from the reality in our politics, since voters are older and much more likely to be white.

Latin@s and blacks in the central cities of large metropolitan areas were by far the most segregated. More than a fifth of Latino students attended school in the 10 largest city districts compared to less than 2% of whites.

But the suburbs are also changing. In a society which is now dominated by the suburbs, it is extremely interesting that 30% of Latin@s and 20% of blacks are now enrolled in the suburban schools of large metropolitan areas, and another 6% attend school in the suburbs of smaller metropolitan areas, but serious segregation is emerging within these communities, particularly in the nation’s large metropolitan areas. Since trends suggest that we will face a vast increase in suburban diversity, this raises challenges for thousands of communities. The outcome will help determine whether or not the rising Latino middle class receives the access and opportunities accorded to earlier immigrant communities or faces isolation as do middle class blacks.

The population growth of minority students is going to be overwhelmingly suburban if the existing trends continue. One of the most important questions for the next generation will be whether or not the suburbs will repeat the experience of the central cities or learn how to operate stable integrated schools.

We are floating back toward an educational pattern that has never in the nation’s history produced equal and successful schools. There is no good evidence that this will work now. The 1990’s have actually seen the once shrinking racial achievement gaps begin to widen again on some tests. It is clear, then, that the Administration’s favored educational policies in place are not likely to produce equal segregated schools. The schools need many other things besides integration, but ethnic, linguistic, and economic isolation compound those problems. Reversing the trends of intensifying segregation and inequality will be difficult, but the costs of passively accepting them are likely to be immense.

Gary Orfield, a professor of Education and Social Policy at Harvard’s Graduate School of Education, also holds an appointment at the Kennedy School of Government. He is co-director of the Civil Rights Project at Harvard University with a special interest in the study of civil rights, education, urban policy, and minority opportunity. He is the co-author of the 1999 report, Resegregation in American Schools and the 1996 book, Dismantling Desegregation (New Press, New York, 1996).
Latin@ Education and Poverty

A Roundtable Discussion

Maria E. Barajas, once a Mexican immigrant child placed in remedial classes because of her "language problems," has focused her interest in bilingual policy through Harvard Graduate School of Education’s International Education Policy (IEP) program. "The IEP program allows me to conduct in-depth research on issues of power and ideology and how these elements connect or collide to form policy and pedagogy," she observes.

Nereyda Salinas, a Masters in Public Policy student at Harvard’s Kennedy School of Government, was born on the south side of Chicago to Mexican immigrants. She attended a Catholic grammar school in her community and a public magnet high school on the other side of Chicago, eventually graduating from Stanford University in International Relations. She worked two years in a Chicago based nonprofit, advising schools on leadership development and school reform before coming to Harvard.

Victor Pérez, a Mexican-American from Los Angeles and a graduate of the University of Southern California, is a Masters candidate in the Administration, Economy and Social Policy program in the Harvard Graduate School of Education. He is particularly interested in Latin@ politics, especially those issues related to California and stratification, inequality and schooling in higher education.

Nathalia Jaramillo, who began teaching elementary school in Riverside, California three years ago, found that the realities of teaching in a “barrio” with predominantly Mexican immigrant children quickly opened her eyes to the realities of social inequality in schooling. At Harvard’s International Education Policy Program, her interests have remained in civil rights with a distinct emphasis on Latin@s in California. The IEP program attracts both students interested in international issues and students interested in reform in the United States.

Manuel Carballo from Costa Rica is also in Harvard Graduate School of Education’s IEP Program; he hopes to go back and work with the issues of inequality in education and marginalized people, as well as peace issues. He has lived in Colombia and the Dominican Republic as well as a short stay in Japan. He came to the United States six years ago to attend Swarthmore College and stayed on after graduation as a college admissions counselor.

Stacy Edwards from Trinidad and Tobago, the mother of a two-year-old son, was a free-lance television producer for programs on the history and culture of the Caribbean islands before coming to the Harvard Graduate School of Education. She is currently studying Inter-
national Education with a particular interest in poverty and equality issues in education for the Caribbean region. She plans to return to Trinidad upon graduation and work for a local NGO (Servol) that is heavily involved in community education.

What these students have in common is a passion for the issues of education and poverty that grows out of their own personal experience. The students were chosen by Fernando Reimers, Associate Professor of Education at the Graduate School of Education, to participate in a roundtable on Latin@s, poverty, and education in late February. The following are excerpts from the taped recorded conversation. A fuller version can be found on the DRCLAS website, <http://www.fas.harvard.edu/~drclas>.

**DRCLAS:** From your point of view, what are the two most important challenges facing Latin@ Education in the year 2000?

**Stacey:** I think the issue of equality, equality of education, is one that Latin@s face here, as they do in their own countries. The lack of equality is tied not only to poverty, but to politics and to not having much of a voice. It’s also tied to race, which becomes more dynamic in the U.S. perhaps than in Latin America itself. My perspective is a Caribbean one, sort of marginalized. Latin@s are not seeing their culture reflected in the education they receive, either through monolingual programs, or multicultural programs.

**DRCLAS:** What do you mean by politics?

**Stacey:** What I mean by politics is that it’s only recently that immigrant groups are getting a voice. And I think because their voice is small, their issues aren’t being effectively addressed. I think their voice is small because they’re visitors in someone else’s land. Despite their numbers, I think their voices are so small because many of them speak a different language and that’s a significant barrier. If you’re either a different race or you speak a different language, it’s hard for you to have a big voice.

My family at home is somewhat middle class, but I remember coming to the States and my father instilling this fear about going through immigration and that I shouldn’t ask any questions, just be very quiet, and don’t say anything that may sort of get me any sort of trouble. Immigrants sort of have this slight fear of the United States: just go there and be very quiet, and get everything you can, and work really hard, and go to school and make money, or whatever, but try not to disrupt the system because it’s not really yours.

I live in a depressed part of Dorchester, and I see kids, mostly black and Latin@s, with this hopelessness about them. I think part of it is because they are pushed out. I don’t think they’re getting the same quality of education, the same physical conditions that suburban kids are getting. I have my brother-in-law who is thirteen—there is a big age difference between my husband and my brother in-law—and he goes to this mediocre middle school: it’s not enough. I don’t feel that extra push.

**Manuels:** I think part of it is getting to a place that is foreign to you and for the first time feeling like an outsider. In a sense it is what Stacy was saying, wanting to be in your own life and not really participating, but in another sense, it’s also not knowing what to expect if you are treated cruelly everywhere you go out to the store. You didn’t grow up knowing you were any different, that’s the experience you’d had since you’ve been in the U.S. You don’t know that you can fight, that you can protest. There is also the sense of fear with illegal immigrants, of not wanting to make too much noise.

So that’s what I wanted to say about the lack of voice. And there is also the other thing that I noticed. The big difference between the black movement and the Latin@ movement is the fact, that we all have to deal with the fact that we’re all so diverse. With the Black movement there is the diversity, but it goes back a lot longer, and there is the common history of struggle. The Latin@ immigration, though, is a little more recent and all of a sudden Costa Ricans, Cubans, and Argentinians, are all put in the same category, expected to get together and express one same voice. It is hard for many of us at first to relate our life commonalities, I think there is more that keeps us together than pulls us apart, but it’s hard at times to come out of that with one voice.

**Manuels:** One thing I’ve heard you say, is that immigrants don’t want to have a voice because they have a fear. And I think that’s a really scary distinction, because even though they may not be able to speak the language or they are new and they don’t know what to expect, the desire for a voice, a desire to be accepted, to have a place in society, is always there.

**Victors:** I think it’s different for communities. I’m particularly interested in California because I’m from there. And with the recent immigration policies that have come up, for example, 187, which created an intense and a highly number of immigrants applying for naturalization and citizens. I think there will be a new voice because these new immigrants are now becoming citizens, I think that politics will be impacted positively.

**Manuels:** Right now there are a lot of academics very interested in Latin@s, especially in the US. They are making a lot of decisions about Latin@ voices, maybe doing a little survey or something, and it’s probably totally con-
tried in saying, “this is what Latin@s think.” I think that’s really scary as well. I think that if Latin@s don’t rise up and say their voice, someone else is going to say it for them.

I’ve seen when they’re asking the wrong population, upper or middle class Latin@s who don’t have kids, or don’t have children in bilingual education and how they feel about that sort of thing. Or they’re asking questions like: “if you were to have the choice between giving your child bilingual English if it would hurt their English, would you do it?” No, of course not. I don’t want my kid to hurt their English. Things like that, and so, see they don’t want bilingual education, but it’s not the right question. And that particular survey is a big survey that is used in terms of support against shutting down bilingual education.

Nereyda: I was able to read as a child only because of the tenacity of my mother, who used our limited resources to buy second-hand books which she read to my sisters and I until the bindings broke and the words faded and tore. I worked hard to catch-up in all the other academic subjects, however, I never forgot this early experience and the injustice of a system that let me, my sisters and every Mexican-immigrant child in our local school district fall through the cracks.

I’m now really interested in the area of education reform and getting more students into college, more disadvantaged students into secondary education. I think an important challenge is organizing ourselves. In terms of education, there is this mentality of a lot of short term gratification and that has to change if we are going to. If you want to get somewhere in this country and you don’t have anything, you can’t be into short term gratification because education doesn’t work on a short term gratification level. I think education is the only way that Latin@s are ever going to get anywhere in this country.

You have to learn the language, you have to learn how society works, and the only way you’re going to do that is through entering into the educational system, and it has to be quality educational system.

Whether we like test scoring or not, we’re going to have to deal with that.

Nathalia: Teaching really is a calling. It’s a 14, 15, 16 hour day, especially when you’re working in a low income neighborhood where the resources are so limited. There’s so much accountability that you’re held to, and your principal isn’t the best, and other teachers often aren’t that great. You see all these policies implemented that you know will only serve to detract the detriment of your kids. You’re forced to put a little thing on the overhead and start training children to just fill in bubbles for multiple choice exams when you want to expand their minds and you want them to be creative and you want them to be independent thinkers and instead you’re training them to just sit there and fill in bubbles. It’s very frustrating and it’s really hard on your person, and what you hope for.

Nereyda: A cultural shift is also necessary. My parents always said we’re going to go back to Mexico. Finally, when I was in eighth grade and their oldest child was in college, they were like “oh, maybe we should stay here.” We must decide that we are really here. A lot of friends of mine observe that this mentality is very prevalent among Latin@s, especially among Mexican Americans, because Mexico is so close. This is home. If you want to keep your ties with Mexico, that’s fine, and if you want to identify with both cultures, that’s fine, but this is where you have to build your community and you have to change your community, and you have to feel entitled to what you see other people having around there.

We’re becoming a very powerful political force, if we use it, like Victor was mentioning, but we have to realize how to use that clout. We’re also becoming a very important marketing force; because of the short term gratification mentality, and because of our numbers too, we buy a lot of stuff. Coca Cola loves to air our family commercials and our family values, let’s see if they can donate, if they can donate a couple hundred thousand dollars to our community school.

Stacy: Nereyda spoke about the need to sort of see the US as home and to build a community here. That’s very difficult to do when you don’t feel accepted or when you feel like a visitor. It’s kind of something I’m going through...
because we're thinking of moving back home. You want to stay here and you want to see this as home and you want to build a community here, but you're constantly being told that this is not your home and you sort of don't belong. And then it's also a thin line I think in building a community and becoming segregated, as I think Victor was saying. It's a very tricky thing and it's difficult for immigrants to do.

**Nereyda:** It is difficult. But, Stacy, you have the option of maybe going back. I guess what gets me, is that if my parents had gone back to Mexico, I would have grown up in a small town with a population of a thousand people, there's no secondary education in the town, I think that's part of what kept them here. And you're right, I think you have to grow some real thick skin if you are going to stay here. Absolutely. My parents first moved to south Chicago when it was a predominantly Polish-American community and these people had created their own community and their own Catholic church. My mother, she's always been a devote Catholic, and she used to take us to church and sit in a pew with her three children and people around her would move if they were two pews away, they'd move to the other side of the church.

**Nathalia:** I've pretty much focused on K through 12 education, specifically in California. One of the most important challenges I see is the testing movement, and standards and accountability the key words for the year 2000. I think it can be really detrimental to the Latin@ community, specifically the Latin@ community that is in poverty. Latin@s are already overrepresented in dropout rates, and the repercussions of testing are drastic. In California, there is the whole retention movement. You know, Latin@s students that don't measure up to par can be retained in elementary school. That in itself can lead to higher drop out rates, and I worry.

**Manuel:** I worked for admissions for a year and a half. And I saw a lot of the problems, in terms of not getting enough applicants to even come to the schools, I got to visit a lot of the schools across the country, and definitely you see the problem with the quality of the schooling. The quality is very different. The schools that have already succeeded—schools with a large Latin@ population—are schools that really had the leaders, people who encourage them to go out and apply to schools all over the place, and then really followed up on the students.

There's also the problem of those who get in and then totally failing. Part of it was adjusting, getting to a place where you don't see anyone else like yourself, where the professors are not like you.

**Stacy:** I think, aside from providing role models, I'd like to think it would affect teacher expectations. I'd like to think that if you have a Latin@ teacher, if you have a African-American teacher, that they will have higher expectations of all of their students, especially those of color. That affects student performance and how students see themselves as well.

**Victor:** Another element is exposure. I know that I've worked in L.A. Unified school district as a consultant. I remember walking into a school in east Los Angeles, where the population was almost 100% Latin@ and the teacher and administration population was over 75% white. So me coming in, and actually exposing myself, and wearing a tie, and looking different, talking to them about what I'm doing, it was just amazing at the response that I got. All the teachers were telling me, oh I want you to come to my class, speak to my kids. That's where we begin to see the need and also the ability to have transformative practices.

I'm a product of L.A. unified and I'm proud to say that I come out of the 100 worst schools of Los Angeles which to anybody here at Harvard, would be like, wow, so what did you do different? I think that along the way, there were people that shared with me certain insights that are not going to be in the textbooks: this is how you apply to college, these are the certain steps you need to take, and that's also a part of exposure. I think that I and other Latin@s here at Harvard that have come out of LA unified—now that we're making it through—we also have the responsibility to go back and have these experiences be transformed into our communities.
The 'Return' of the State
Immigration, Transnationalism, and Dual Nationality
BY MICHAEL JONES-CORREA

The oath which immigrants are required to swear today on becoming naturalized citizens of the United States, reads, in rather archaic and high-sounding formal language: "I absolutely and entirely renounce and abjure all allegiance and fidelity to any foreign prince, potentate, state or sovereignty, of whom or which I have heretofore been a subject or citizen." At least in theory new citizens are meant to have one, and only one, loyalty of any kind—to the United States of America. Seemingly at odds with this oath, many immigrants today are taking on, even without any action on their part, dual or multiple loyalties.

Although some of these cases are the result of children born to parents of two different countries, or of children born in a country recognizing birthright citizenship to parents with other nationalities, an increasing number of cases are the result of countries allowing their immigrants abroad to take on additional nationalities without endangering their nationality at birth. In these instances, immigrants' countries of origin will not recognize the renunciation of loyalties pledged in the U.S. oath of citizenship—nationality in the country of origin is permanent and irrenunciable.

Ten Latin American countries—Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Mexico, Panama, Peru and Uruguay—recognize this form of dual nationality. Immigrants from these countries taking on U.S. citizenship do not lose their home country nationality. An additional number recognize a limited form of dual nationality shared only with treaty signatories—Guatemala, for instance, with other nations in Central America, and a number of countries with Spain. At least ten Caribbean basin nations—among them Antigua, Barbados, Belize, Dominica, Grenada, Jamaica, St. Kitts, St. Lucia, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, and Trinidad and Tobago—also recognize dual nationality, most of them since their independence.

Increasingly, both U.S. and international law have evolved in the direction of increased ambiguity or outright tolerance in favor of dual nationality. For example, while an American citizen cannot take on or claim a formal attachment to another country, a citizen from another country may, upon taking on American citizenship, passively retain citizenship rights in that country if that other country does not recognize, or is indifferent to, the new attachment formed in the United States. Formally, then, the United States discourages dual nationality, while in practice pursuing a "don’t ask, don’t tell" policy. The U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service doesn’t like dual nationality, or approve of it, but they recognize it.

Commentators on both the left and right have seen the increasing recognition of, and tolerance for, multiple national loyalties as a sign of the decline of the nation-state, and in particular, American citizenship. The numbers of people migrating, and the ways in which they form and maintain lines of communication, social networks, economic flows, and political interests across borders has led some scholars on the left to assert that we are moving into a post-national world. The argument here is that increasing global internationalization makes the notions of national citizenship seem increasingly archaic and obsolete, and turns to a notion of transnational citizenship instead. Proponents of this perspective stress the emergence of a new formulation for citizenship: a post-national, or transnational, citizenship, with its basis in international human rights regimes. Without individual rights disassociated from the state, the importance of national citizenship is fading away. Territorial boundaries are increasingly less relevant as an organizing principle of social interaction, and individuals' identities are increasingly characterized by fluid, multiple attachments that stretch across frontiers.

The views from the right are not dissimilar in their diagnoses: they too, see the flow of people and political interests as undermining the nation state, and in particular, the United States. But they see these developments as entirely negative. Dual
nationality, these critics assert, is like bigamy. Like a bigamous spouse, a person with divided loyalties and commitments is likely to have weaker ties to each. They will shirk their obligations to both objects of loyalty, cheating their fellow citizens in the process. Citizenship is left devoid of substance.

In truth, there is little evidence for either of these sets of observations and/or concerns. If we look at naturalization rates for immigrants in the United States, it is clear that immigrants today are opting to naturalize at rates equal to or higher than that of immigrants in the past. Naturalization rates in the United States tripled between 1993 and 1996. This was partly due to the introduction by the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) of the Green Card Replacement Program in 1992 and the 'Citizenship USA' program in 1995 may also have had an effect on naturalizations. The Green Card Replacement Program required that long-term permanent residents replace their resident cards with new cards; many immigrants chose to naturalize rather than apply for new cards. The Citizenship USA program was designed to encourage naturalization and reduce the backlog in the naturalization process. However, neither of these programs sufficiently explains the increase in naturalization among immigrants in the United States following 1994.

Increased naturalization is largely explained by the 1996 welfare reform legislation, which played a major role in nudging legal permanent residents to naturalize as U.S. citizens. This legislation was designed not only to keep undocumented immigrants from accessing federal public benefit programs, but more drastically, also barring permanent legal residents from participation in Social Security and food stamp programs, and in banning all new resident non-citizens from federal means-tested programs like AFDC (Aid for Dependent Children). Social services, the reasoning went, were not intended for non-citizens, even if these individuals resided permanently in the United States. The 1996 Welfare Reform Act raised the cost of *not* being a U.S. citizen for legal permanent residents in the United States. With rising costs to *not* being a citizen, many of these immigrants took the step of acquiring U.S. citizenship.

U.S. citizenship was arguably facilitated by the recognition of dual nationality by immigrants' sending countries. In a period from 1991 onwards, a number of major Latin American sending countries all recognized dual nationality. Colombia acknowledged the dual nationality of its citizens aboard in 1991, the Dominican Republic in 1994, Ecuador and Costa Rica in 1995, and Brazil in 1995. Mexico, the Latin American nation with the most immigrants in the United States, recognized dual nationality as of March 1998.

Clearly, from immigrants' point of view, the state still matters; state policies make a difference in the life-decisions immigrants make. Contrary to predictions on the left, immigrants are not floating in independent social and political spheres unaffected by state decisions. The reaction of immigrants to the passage of the 1996 Welfare Reform Act, as reflected in the dramatic jumps in U.S. naturalization rates, indicate that immigrants are well aware of the costs and benefits of state policies, and adjust their behaviors accordingly. Recognition of dual nationality also enters immigrants' calculations, but not necessarily in the manner predicted by more conservative commentators. Immigrants from countries recognizing dual nationality are more, not less, likely to take on U.S. citizenship.

Latin American immigrants increased their naturalization as U.S. citizens an average of 105% in the aftermath of the recognition of dual nationality by the sending country. Even taking into account the impact that events like the 1996 Welfare Reform Act had on all naturalization rates, the recognition of dual nationality by Latin American sending countries still gave their immigrants in the United States an edge in nat-
The increasing numbers of immigrants in the United States, money sent back from immigrants abroad are today are almost eight times what they were in 1980. These remittance flows increased from under $1 billion in 1980, to $4 billion in 1994, to over $6 billion in 1999.

As a result, the Mexican government has developed programs encouraging Mexican immigrants to form associations, and prompting the membership of these organizations to remit funds and invest in their local communities of origin. Programs at the federal level include the Paisano program and the Program for Mexican Communities Living Abroad (PCLMA). The Paisano program is designed to improve the treatment that the returning migrants receive at the hands of Mexican officials by reducing corruption and abuse. The PCLMA, established in 1990, provides a wide range of services to Mexican immigrants in the United States through the Mexican consular network and first-generation immigrant organizations sponsored by the consulates, as well as channeling remittances toward local development projects. Hometown associations have served as platforms for matching fund schemes that pool remittance monies with government funds and expertise, and occasionally with private sector contributions, for locally focused economic development projects. Pursuing ties with its immigrants abroad, the Mexican government has extended its presence in the United States. Through its 42 consulates in this country, Mexico has sought to protect the interests of its nationals abroad, to foster their ties to Mexico, and to encourage their active participation in U.S. politics as a friendly lobby for Mexican concerns.

The case of Mexicans in the United States, illustrates that the state (either the sending country's or the receiving country's) is in no danger of disappearing as a major actor in immigrants' lives, setting many of the boundaries and conditions for their participation in various social, economic, and political arenas. However, the case of Mexicans in the U.S. also underlines the fact that if the state is not losing its sovereignty, its sovereignty is becoming, for the lack of a better word, more porous. Where once state sovereignty might have been thought of as total and complete, each state occupying a unique and mutually exclusive political and territorial space, that is, I would argue, increasingly not the case. Instead we would be better served by seeing the relations between immigrants and states as a system of overlapping sovereignties (which is perhaps an oxymoron), where the politics of states, and the politics of immigrants themselves, exercise greater or lesser degrees of freedom, but which are never absolute. The de-territorialized state is not a new phenomenon. Powerful states have always had commitments and made claims that transcended their borders. What's new, I think, is not that these states' power has declined absolutely in the international system, but that it has declined relatively. That is to say, the organizational and administrative resources of other states, like Mexico, has increased to the point where they, too, can extend their influence across political boundaries into what would once have been considered the sovereign domain of other states, even powerful hegemonic states like the United States.

Michael Jones-Correa is Associate Professor of Government at Harvard University. His research and teaching interests include immigrant politics and immigration policy, issues of ethnicity and ethnic politics in the United States, urban politics and social movements. He is the author of Between Two Nations: The Political Predicament of Latinos in New York City (Cornell, 1998), as well as various articles on, among other things, Latino identity and politics, religion and political participation, the role of gender in shaping immigrant politics, and Hispanics as a foreign policy lobby.
Costilla County, Colorado
Contested Landscapes

BY ARNOLD VALDEZ AND MARÍA MONDRAGÓN-VALDEZ

A N ENDURING LEGACY OF THE SOUTHWEST IS ITS diversity of urban and rural landscapes. Albuquerque, San Antonio, and Tucson are symbolic of the evolution of rural spaces engulfed by growth; hyperdevelopment and sprawl are blurring their cultural landscapes. The emerging ultramodern mega-cities are gentrifying historic streetscapes and in the process of museumizing barrio enclaves. To obtain a micro-view of influence of population growth and unsustainable development on culturally influenced landscapes, one must look to rural areas. The ranching and agricultural centers near the Mexican border are among those most influenced by this trend. This discussion will refocus on contemporary impacts to the cultural landscape in the less populated historic zone of residence in the Southwest.

The upper reaches of the Rio Grande del Norte, or the Rio Arriba, extends from northern New Mexico into Colorado’s San Luis Valley. Geopolitically, the Rio Grande Bioregion is composed of seven counties in New Mexico and two in the San Luis Valley of south-central Colorado. Three of the New Mexican counties have Pueblos with Hispano villages sited in close proximity. One of the counties has Pueblos and the Jicarilla Apache Reservation within its boundary. Together Rio Arriba, Sandoval, Santa Fe, and Taos Counties form the old Hispanic settlement core of the Rio Arriba. Costilla and Conejos County in Colorado and Mora and San Miguel far eastern edge of New Mexico represent later established traditional Hispanic enclaves. Costilla County, Colorado, is the only county in the Rio Arriba without public lands.

It is not difficult to understand why Amerindians and Hispanics (as Latin@s are known in this part of the country) of the Rio Arriba sited their communities along riparian floodplains near upland watershed areas. Aptly described as a wooded upland peninsula with semi-arid lowlands, the Rio Arriba depends on snowmelt and rainwater draining from the mountain ranges into the Rio Grande. The Rio Arriba ecosystem through which river flows varies from desert to alpine and arctic at the peaks. Composed of mountain ranges, foothills, rangelands, mesas, and flatlands, the Rio Arriba was ideal for the agropastoral subsistence-based Pueblo and Hispano settlements.

The processes of Spanish Colonization of the Rio Arriba began in 1598. To retain their autonomy the Pueblos fiercely defended their boundaries from encroachers and often revolted against colonial domination. Boundary maintenance protected homes, fields, water systems, and ritual spaces from adverse changes. Today while changed by gaming, Pueblo landscapes continue to be unique culturally influenced spaces.

In contrast, to the Pueblos (whose ancestors emerged in the region by 10,000 BC), Hispanics settled under the auspices of Spanish and later Mexican land grants. While land grants lured Old World immigrants into the New World (to establish frontier-outposts like the Rio Arriba) colonization commenced badly. To control the process and to ensure uniformity of its colonies, the Spanish Crown issued the “Law of the Indies” to regulate sitting, orientation of settlements, and construction of plazas. Royal provisions also acknowledged the need to keep colonists out of native spaces to maintain a semblance of moral order. Often Colonists in the isolated periphery ignored the “Laws” which led to clashes with the Pueblos. Eventually, both groups co-existed by maintaining distinct boundaries. By the Mexican Era (1821-1846),
the interplay between Pueblos and Hispanics became one of accommodation and trade. By this period the typical Rio Arriba villager was a mestizo, or of mixed-blood ancestry. Most villagers lived in an extended family, farmed a small plot, and shared livestock in particio with wealthier stockholders.

In the Mexican Period the cultural landscapes of the Rio Arriba contained Pueblo influence features, with Iberian-Moorish overtones. In part this was related to the construction of Pueblo Missions. However, because the Pueblos and Hispano villages of the Rio Arriba required proximity to water their landscapes were similar. Both had a self-contained water network with distinct field patterns, garden spaces, and pasture lands. In Hispano villages, the division of fields correspond to the construction of the Moorish-influenced irrigation systems, or acequias. Formation of long lot patterns, or extensiones, created parallel strips running between and at right angles to acequias.

This scene changed after the occupation of the region by the United States Army of the West in 1846. In return for seceding California, New Mexico, and Texas to the United States for 15 million dollars (or 529,017 square miles for 48 cents an acre), Mexico insisted that the Americans sign the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. Among other things the treaty protected property and common lands of the sedentary Pueblos and Mexican citizens. Although the Pueblos became wards of the Federal Government, their lands were granted sovereign status. In contrast, Spanish and Mexican land grants and communal spaces diminished through a protracted adjudication process operating under the direction of land rings. Once dislocated from their holdings the self-reliant village economy plummeted. After the common lands were enclosed, the Rio Arriba became a peripheral resource colony with its residents functioning as low-paid wage laborers.

The trends setting at the onset of the American Period established real estate speculation and the current mode of exploitation of the natural environment. Today the working landscapes of rural Rio Arriba have fallen into the orbit of a political economy controlled by multinational corporations and amenity tourism. This metamorphosis did not occur overnight. Long before the testing of the first atomic bomb in the New Mexican desert in 1944, life in the Rio Arriba was difficult for villagers who received little economic support from the state and federal government. Not only were the schools impoverished, health services were limited. After World War II into the 1960s, the Rio Arriba lost a significant portion of its population because of land losses. In the 1960s, the Rio Arriba erupted! To quiet the anger over loss of the land grants and as a "Band-Aid" over the cancer of displacement, War on Poverty Programs pumped millions of dollars into the Rio Arriba to alleviate its social and economic problems.

Throughout the 20th century, a vanguard of intellectuals residing at Taos and Santa Fe reinvented the region from a plundered colony into a romantic hide-away. By popularizing the vast open spaces and romanticizing the regional cultures, artists and novelists helped to establish the gentrification process. The current rush to purchase farmland, adobe homes in core villages, and the trend to remodel plaza streetscapes into Disneyland replicates the remaking of Jackson Hole, Wyoming, Aspen, Colorado, and Sun Valley Idaho. In combination with unsustainable corporate schemes, the cultural landscapes of the Rio Arriba are at the crossroads. It is up to those most impacted and most bonded to the landscape to mediate the powerful dynamics of over-development and the negative outcome on the landscape.

**THE CONTEMPORARY DILEMMA: COSTILLA COUNTY AT THE CROSSROADS**

Costilla County, Colorado, epitomizes the tension experienced by rural communities in the Rio Arriba. Located in south-central borderlands between Colorado and New Mexico, Costilla County is an egomania of unsustainable land and resource use. This area illustrates ongoing conflicts between Hispanics, who view community landscapes as a part of their heritage, and real estate developers and extractive industries who exert their private property rights to the detriment of the environment. As the ascending forces of tourism commodify the culture villages move towards a tourist economy and gentrification.

Situated on the eastern margins of nearly enclosed alpine uplands known as El Valle de San Luis, or the San Luis Valley, are the Rio Culebra villages of Costilla County. The Rio Culebra villages are a variation of settlements established in the Taos Valley, New Mexico. The county emerged from a million-acre Mexican Era land grant known as the Sangre de Cristo. The Sangre de Cristo was one of two of the largest Mexican Era land grants owned by a French Canadian merchant living at Taos. However, as he was unable to colonize the land, the grantee offered New Mexican settlers, or pobladores, rights to access to the uplands to hunt, gather wood, and pasture animals. Arriving in the 1851, agropastoralists built plazas, grew subsistence crops, and pastured their animals in several river valleys. By 1861, the entire San Luis Valley became a part of Colorado Territory. Regardless of politically imposed boundary lines, the pobladores replicated settlement patterns that their ancestors established in northern New Mexico since the eighteenth century. Elements of their working landscape include domestic, religious, and agricultural buildings; extensiones and acequias; and, la Vega, Colorado's only historic commons. Taken together these features reflect the evolution of His-
pano vernacular architecture and cultural landscape in southern Colorado.

In the 1960s, land speculators descended on Costilla County. Most devastating, was the sale of a 77,000-acre uplands known as La Sierra. Purchased with a "cloud over the title," for $7.00 an acre, La Sierra contained usufructuary rights to hunt, fish, and gather wood. Eventually in a long and often tainted legal process, the owner enclosed the uplands. The economy sank and the county experienced the highest out-migration in the state. Speculators continued to purchased smaller tracts at tax auctions ultimately accumulating mesas and desert lands. Early in the early 1970’s, publishing tycoon, Malcolm Forbes purchased the mountainous uplands at the north. Speculators and Forbes extensively subdivided the landscape and carved flatlands and mountains with roads. Of the 75,000 square miles in Costilla County 33% of the land has been subdivided into residential lots. Currently there are over 43,000 absentee landowners, claiming 50,000 parcels, in 30 subdivisions. This record gives Costilla County the distinction of being Colorado’s most subdivided rural landscapes.

While there is yet no consensus among Hispanics on how to mediate critical issues, there is a growing awareness of uncontrolled growth and development. In the past decade Colorado was a Western epicenter of growth. Likewise, Costilla County became a popular destination. In the past decade, the old village populations have faced an amalgam of newcomers who are politically conservative, middle-class, retired or anti-government "hard scrabble" types. newcomers resist land use planning by Hispanics, as they view the county as the Wild West, because real estate brokers promoted the lack of restrictions and low-taxation to sell property.

Low-income buyers purchase land in the unregulated subdivision. Most purchase five acres, sight unseen. The majority are self-employed service workers, disabled, or retired. All newcomers want open space, fresh air, and good schools. However, when they arrive they find no water, utilities, over-whelmed schools, and one clinic. A few of the corporate-based subdivisions, such as Forbes, have high-end gated communities with protective covenants and access to utilities in many areas. Collectively all subdivisions are rapidly transforming the agricultural landscape into rural suburbia filled with manufactured homes, second homes, and hobby ranches. The county is forced to build more roads and provide emergency, police, and fire service in exchange for very modest property taxation from landowners and no support from brokers.

Large portions of the mountainous uplands are in the hands of absentee corporate owners. The Sangre de Cristo Mountains were extensively logged and mined since 1899. Much of the range is now owned by three corporations under the control of a single investor. The owner, CEO of a subsidiary of one of the world's fastest growing multi-utilities, posts armed guards around La Sierra to keep Hispanics out. Adding insult to injury he is micromanaging the watershed by creating ponds and waterfalls midstream, straightening the river, and destroying the riparian habitat. By deliberately refusing to divulge plans and ignoring landuse regulations, this approach is antithetical to their claims of wanting to be a "Good Neighbor."

**SOLUTIONS AND PLANNING TOOLS**

In a last ditch effort to balance growth, to control unsustainable development, and to protect the village landscape, Hispanics found pro bono attorneys to help the county enact state approved land use regulations. In 1998, Costilla County was one of the last Colorado counties to establish a Planning and Zoning Office, create a zoning district plan, and implement a comprehensive land use plan. Sophisticated tools such as a Geographic Information System (GIS) were introduced to track and document land use activity. Although there was opposition from developers and private homeowners, a framework for providing some semblance of control emerged.

Even after all of the years of public input and work to set-up the planning infrastructure, problems continue. It is clear that corporate landowners are destabilizing the process. Now, newcomers and developers feel that if the rich are exempt from the code, they also can disregard regulations. The challenge remains to see if community tenacity can prevail despite rapid change.

Arnold Valdez is a Loeb Fellow at the Harvard Graduate School of Design, and the founder of the Costilla County Planning and Zoning Office. Maria Montaño-Valdez is a doctoral student at the University of New Mexico, Department of American Studies, Albuquerque, NM. The husband-wife team work from Valdez & Associates in San Luis, Colorado, and can be reached at <valdez@amigo.net>.
Connecting with U.S. Hispanics

Understanding Hispanic Identity and the Importance of Culturally Relevant Media

BY LISA QUIROZ AND ROAN KANG

ICKY MARTIN AND JENNIFER Lopez at the Grammy Awards. Sammy Sosa in another home run race. George W. Bush and Al Gore giving campaign speeches in Spanish. The Taco Bell Chihuahua. The influence of Hispanics can be seen and felt everywhere in the United States. The numbers are extraordinary—according to the U.S. Census Bureau, there are currently 31 million Hispanics in the U.S. Moreover, this group already has an estimated spending power of more than $383 billion. Hispanics are emerging as the single most important cultural and socioeconomic force since the Baby Boomers revolutionized society in post-war America.

Hispanics now have an unprecedented level of influence on the music we listen to, the sports we watch and the food we eat. By the year 2020, the Hispanic population in the U.S. is projected to reach 53 million and its spending power is expected to exceed the $1 trillion. The Latin Wave is here and it is not surprising that everyone—from politicians to educators to business people—is trying to find ways to connect with this group effectively.

Since *People en Español*’s launch, we have been dedicated to researching and documenting the Hispanic market. Through this process, we have learned that the keys to connecting successfully with Hispanics in the U.S. are the following:

Use good research to understand Hispanic identity and values.

Make sure that your message is on target by being culturally relevant—often specifically in Spanish.

Reach all Hispanics by using the right media vehicles.

To understand this market further, *People en Español* has launched the Hispanic Opinion Tracker, or HOT Study. We wanted to know who Hispanics were, how they viewed themselves, what media they consume, what their consumer preferences were and what lifestyle choices they make.

The first wave of this annual study was fielded by an independent research vendor from May-August 1999. We constructed the sample design so that it would be representative of all Hispanics in the U.S.—geographically and demographically. We are pleased to share some of the top-line results with you.

**CONNECTING TO HISPANIC IDENTITY**

The key to reaching the U.S. Hispanic is understanding his or her self-identity and values. In order to do that better, we devoted part of the HOT Study to answering these questions. The conclusion: Hispanics are eminently Hispanic across gender, age and ethnic and national background.

Hispanics clearly retain a strong sense of pride in their heritage. In fact, an overwhelming majority considers themselves to be "more Hispanic or Hispanic and American equally"—84% to be exact. Those who assume that the strength of this identity is only prevalent among recent immigrants might be in for a surprise. Even a vast majority of Hispanics that were born and raised in this country feel a strong attachment to their roots, with 68% saying that they feel more Hispanic or Hispanic and American equally.

In terms of nomenclature, we found that 57% of Hispanics in the U.S. prefer to use "Hispanic" or "Hispano/a" as the pan-ethnic term when identifying themselves, with another 8% preferring "Hispanic American." Only 23% of respondents prefer the term Latino/a. Following the preferences of the majority of Hispanics in the U.S., we have adopted "Hispanic" as the pan-ethnic term throughout our materials.

So how do you best reach these individuals with a unique identity? Connecting with Hispanics is best done through culturally relevant messages—with the right combination of language and culture. Aida Levitan, executive vice president of Sanzche & Levitan, a Miami-based advertising agency, recently said that, "...advertisers shouldn't assume they can win the hearts and pocketbooks of Hispanics with the same messages and techniques they use to woo the general market. Hispanics are not Anglos who happen to speak Spanish."

In order for a campaign to be successful in the Hispanic market, it must be culturally relevant.

**THE RIGHT MESSAGE—CULTURAL RELEVANCE**

The success of *People en Español* has taught us an important lesson about the power of cultural relevance. The magazine was first conceived in 1995 as a Spanish-language version of PEOPLE Weekly, with the majority of articles consisting of PEOPLE articles translated into Spanish—a "People in Spanish."

We soon discovered that in order for the magazine to appeal to the hearts and minds of Hispanics, it would need original editorial content—content that reflects the values and contributions of U.S. Hispanics today. It would have to contain stories about Hispanic stars and profile ordinary Hispanics doing extraordinary things. As the focus changed, it was clear that we would have to become "Hispanic People"—a publication reflecting the optimism of U.S. Hispanics and celebrating their culture.

Perhaps the principal function of cultural relevance is language—specif-
ically, Spanish. English-language media options outnumber Spanish ones more than 10 to 1 in the United States, and yet 95% of Hispanics consume some form of Spanish-language media—be it print, television or radio. This phenomenon demonstrates that Hispanics actively seek out Spanish-language media. And this does not just apply to editorial content, the HOT Study shows that 64% of Hispanics prefer advertising in Spanish as well.

Seeking out Spanish-language media is not merely a function of comprehension for Hispanics. The HOT Study shows that a majority of Hispanics in the U.S. are effectively bilingual—85% speak English at work while 87% speak Spanish at home. In fact, a majority of Hispanics can and do consume English media on a regular basis. This means that Hispanics are gravitating towards Spanish-language media for reasons beyond comprehensibility—they are consuming Spanish-language media because it is more relevant to their identity and lives as Hispanics.

Our public relations intern at People en Español, Karla Martinez, is a vivid example of the importance of cultural relevance. Currently a student at Columbia University, she is perfectly fluent in both Spanish and English. Karla rushes home each night to watch her telenovelas (extremely popular Spanish-language soap operas); yet she does not watch English-language soap operas. When you ask Karla why she prefers Spanish-language to English-language soaps, she will tell you that the English-language soaps “just don’t speak to me. The novelas are about things that are closer to my family and my culture.” Thus cultural relevance drives media consumption for the U.S. Hispanic.

So cultural relevance requires more than just producing content in Spanish. Priscila Aviles, Vice President and Creative Director for Leo Burnett’s Hispanic unit, says that many corporations have made the mistake of translating English-language campaigns that were successful in the general market into Spanish for test audiences. These efforts, however, rarely connect. Aviles stresses that companies were “reaching [Hispanics] with something that was adapted, but you’re not talking to their heart... It is not a language barrier. It is a cultural and lifestyle barrier.”

Besides the Spanish language, what is culturally relevant? Well, according to HOT, it is family. The strength of family and community bonds reinforce attachment to Hispanic culture. Seventy-five percent of Hispanics marry other Hispanics and 63% say that their five best friends are also Hispanic. In addition, when asked what they would do with two extra hours in the day, 55% would want to spend it with their families. This is in stark contrast to the “me” generation of Baby Boomers who often say that their children interfere with leisure time. Politicians should note that Hispanics top five social concerns—education, crime, health care, jobs and the economy, and social security—are all family-centered. Education is about my family’s future; crime is about keeping my family safe; health care about preserving my family’s wellbeing; jobs about keeping my family fed; and social security about ensuring my family’s financial stability.

REACH HISPANICS THROUGH A MIX OF MEDIA

One of the most important findings of the HOT Study is that U.S. Hispanics read magazines and other print vehicles with regularity. The HOT Study, the first to analyze and document Hispanic readership of both Spanish and English-language magazines, shows that 78% of Hispanics read magazines in Spanish, while 83% read them in English. These readership levels are roughly equivalent to magazine consumption levels in the general market.

Moreover, HOT demonstrates that—similar to trends in the general market—Hispanics who read magazines frequently are more likely to be better educated and more affluent than the average Hispanic consumer. Not surprisingly, this trend affects numerous other consumer and lifestyle behaviors. For example, Hispanic magazine readers are much more likely to have Internet access, buy a new car, and own mutual funds. HOT shows that companies which hope to reach Hispanics with premium products such as these will have greater success if they utilize the print medium.

CONCLUSIONS

At 31 million strong, Hispanics have already established themselves as a social, cultural, political and economic force. They are embarking on a key life-stage: establishing careers, having families, buying homes and making large scale purchases.

Those who will most effectively reach this community will acknowledge the Hispanic identity and allow culturally relevant—and they will often do it in Spanish. Ultimately, it is essential that all Hispanics get the message—employ a variety of media vehicles and reach the whole market, not just a fraction of it.

More significantly, those who want to make that emotional connection will invest time in acquiring strong, viable research, as we have done at PEOPLE EN ESPAÑOL. Projects such as the HOT Study will be an invaluable tool to our magazine and our marketing partners by providing insight and information on a variety of topics and categories.

As the next millennium approaches, it is undeniable that the Hispanic consumer market will play a crucial role in the cultural, economic, and political landscape of the United States in the years to come. It will be a lost opportunity to those who do not catch the Latin wave now.

Lisa Quiroz (’83, HBS ’90) is the publisher of People en Español. She serves on the board of directors of the Hispanic Federation of New York and was the 1997 recipient of the ¡Si, Se Puede! Award from the National Puerto Rican Forum in honor of her business achievements in the Hispanic print market. Roam Kang (’96) is the research manager at People en Español.
The Border
Crossing to New Lives

PHOTOS BY LILIANA NIETO DEL RÍO • TEXT BY PATRICK MCDONNELL

As a reporter documenting the tumult of the U.S.-Mexico border, I logged many hours in conversation with people en route north. These discussions, held during lulls in the tedious passage, took place in scattered venues like el bordo, a grimy strip at the edge of the Tijuana River; the soccer field, a debris-strewn basin just north of the line; and in the swamps, beaches, freeway medians, alleys and other sites traversed by these masses on the move. Those interviewed ranged from octogenarian grandparents on their first visits to savvy young coyotes who knew every “safe house” from Chula Vista to L.A. One of my more memorable experiences was accompanying a border-jumping mariachi band headed for a gig in San Diego.

The sheer numbers of people astonished me—hundreds, sometimes thousands gathered at major crossing zones—and the significant presence of women and children, of professionals and city-dwellers,
belied conventional wisdom about the preponderance of young campesinos up for brief sojourns. Migrants often spoke longingly of joining spouses and children already on the other side, of reuniting families divided by national boundaries. Their destinations were inevitably specific, often surprising. While California topped the list, many spoke of friends and relatives awaiting them in distant locales like New York, Alaska and North Carolina, the Pacific Northwest, New England and the Midwest. It soon became clear that these multitudes represented the vanguard in a movement that was inexorably reshaping the nation's ethnic and cultural composition—and even, potentially, its politics.

As a journalist, I endeavored to make some sense of the disparate ramifications of this extraordinary migration, to report on its myriad impacts from the international line to individual U.S. communities. Complicated concepts like amnesty, political asylum, citizenship and bilingualism became daily news fodder, phrases freighted with polemics. The seminal Proposition 187 campaign in California, coinciding with a statewide recession, recalled an epoch when immigrant-bashing was a staple of U.S. politics. Congress followed suit in 1996 with new laws cutting non-citizens' access to public benefits and speeding deportations, among other things. Washington dispatched legions of new guards to an increasingly militarized border, while erecting more fences and installing high-tech gadgetry. These legal and enforcement strategies may not have kept many people out, but the polarized atmosphere did have an unexpected, and transcendent, outcome: A fierce backlash against the backlash. Latin@s
in California and elsewhere went to the polls in record numbers. Citizenship signup rates hit unprecedented heights, challenging stereotypes about newcomers' political apathy and supposed unwillingness to "assimilate."

The immigrant influx of the past two decades has multiple roots, economic and political, historical and cultural. Indeed, it is part of a global phenomenon also remaking Western Europe and other regions. Most U.S. Latin@'s have probably never set foot in the borderlands. Yet the border remains a vivid symbol of the seismic demographic shifts that are transforming the United States, slowly creating a national consciousness about Latin@'s. For many individuals, especially those who arrived as children, the clandestine crossing also stands as a traumatic event, one that has marked them. Nonetheless, so many who took the time to share their thoughts as they embarked on new lives are now productive citizens, throwbacks to the earlier waves of settlers against whom they were often compared unfavorably. I feel fortunate, and privileged, to have witnessed up close this singular chapter in the history of a country whose image as a "nation of immigrants" has been emphatically, if not smoothly, reinforced.


Liliana Nieto del Rio, a former Knight Fellow at Stanford University, is a Mexican-born photojournalist and photo editor based in Los Angeles. She can be reached at delrioli@gse.harvard.edu.
Being Latina at Harvard
... and Beyond

BY JULISSA REYNOSO

I came to Harvard in 1993. I guess I wasn't the traditional student, if such a thing exists. I was born in a rural village in the Dominican Republic and immigrated to the South Bronx, New York City in 1982. In the South Bronx, I walked the streets for pleasure and insight, attended Catholic schools where I learned of the English language, met and dismissed the "American dream", and witnessed and experienced the devastation of poverty. I was not Latina then. I was 'Julissa' and 'Shortie' and, sometimes, 'Dominican.'

To Harvard I went without a clue of its history or prominence. My guidance counselors had warned me of the legend, but to me it was all heresy. My mother, aunt, two second cousins, and a friend of a friend escorted me to Cambridge, Massachusetts, that lovely September day. We drove a blue van - getting lost several times - from the Bronx to Harvard. Early that Saturday, I moved into Strauss 2-B, to a four-person share with sisters from all over the country: Florida, New York and Indiana; African-American, Asian-American and Jewish.

I spent my first year at Harvard observing others. For the life of me, I could not understand why folks needed to find out what I was and where I came from. Most wondered: 'You must be Puertorican'; 'Are you Latina?'; and most commonly, 'So how is the Bronx, anyway?' My responses varied from 'No, I'm Dominican, you know, from the Dominican Republic' to 'I guess' to 'Yeah, asshole, we all carry guns'. I did not understand these matters so I went forth and examined the Harvard life. And I quickly realized that many Harvardian colleagues were obsessed with portrayals and images and assumptions.

Really I did not miss my Dominica
canness, nor did I miss the Bronx. They both went with me to Strauss, Widener, Adams, Emerson. Having a Dominican/Bronx identity was not a choice; it was the way I ate, walked, laughed, spoke, smelled, and thought. Y la música!—as if I could block the noise of guira and tambora from my ears.

As time progressed, I became more acquainted with the dynamics of being Latin@. I realized that that category that included myself was used by a very limited number of people at Harvard. And many of us had Dominican-sounding last names and stories of struggle stained with terms like "spic". And, at the end of the day, to the eye of the beholder many of us also looked the same—with black, Indian and Spanish chemicals all over our systems. And university officials of all forms mentioned the Latin@ numbers as with pride but I always wondered: if they were so happy with Latin@s why didn't they just come back to the ghetto and get some more—they were tons of us in the Bronx. I guess the intrigue of this new race and the undeniable familiarity with all its features drew me to it.

Organizations promoting Latin@
culture sprouted left and right during my undergraduate years. The small Dominican-within-the-Latin@-community group even started our own thing—Fuerza Quisqueyanana. The mission, not surprisingly, was to promote Dominicanness in all its forms, from arroz con guandules to Juan Luis Guerra to bachata mix. And I must tell you that actively promoting Dominicanness—i.e. promoting myself—was the most natural of extracurriculars.

My years at Harvard were indeed unforgettable. I met beautifully brilliant people with dreams of conquest and lucha. Many classmates shared their hopes of changing the world and their ideas for mastering life. And I took them all seriously. When solutions to inner-city crime were discussed, I registered them; when stories of travels through Africa and Europe were shared, I dreamed them. So, I went and tried to master the world—taking my fellow Harvardians’ ideas to heart—and believing that all those plans were to be tested. So I spent many nights at Harvard trying to figure out how to master life and experiment with ideas. My years at Harvard were spent exploring the world, traveling through Asia, Africa, Latin America and Europe—all in search of understanding and laboratories of experiment.

That habit did not change. Upon graduating from Harvard, I went to the University of Cambridge in England to study Development Studies in a Masters of Philosophy program. There, I met dreamers from other worlds. And found that Latin@ and, even less so, Dominicans were ever a rarer breed than at Harvard. But I found my tribe—another Dominican woman, a French-Puerto Rican New Yorker and couple of Mexicans. And in Cambridge, England miles away from the cradle of the new race, I understood Latin@ness.

After England, New York awaited. And it embraced me as if it would its prodigal daughter. Columbia Law School was my next haven; and Washington Heights, New York City's predominantly Dominican New York City neighborhood where I live, serves as the new fountain of ideas, as a playground to experiment with problems and solutions. In New York, I have found a home for my ideas of bettering life and giving voice to the silenced. I study law at an outstanding institution, and organize and share with my communities—all in the same pulse.

In New York City, I see myself in every corner—there’s no explaining required. I walk and talk like a Puerto Rican; I eat and laugh like a Mexican; I smell and think like a Dominican. Y la música!

In New York, I am Julissa again.

Julissa Reynoso graduated from Harvard College in 1997 and completed her MPhil from the University of Cambridge in 1998. She is presently a student at Columbia Law School. Julissa is one of the coordinators of Dominicans 2000, a community-based movement, that, not surprisingly, focuses on Latin@ issues.

---

Harvard Homecoming
Another Shade of Crimson

BY RUBEN NAVARRETTE, JR.

I don’t do sequels. In ten years as a writer, I’ve published more than 400 articles, essays, and op-eds. I’ve written a book, and contributed to others. I’ve done a newspaper column and magazine features. But, as I trudge along, I try to never retell a story that’s already been told.

That’s just as well, since one of my favorite stories would be hard to revisit.

The storyline is different. The circumstances that fed its drama have changed. The setting, while familiar in some respects, is, in others, barely recognizable.

Ten years ago this June, I stood in Harvard Yard in a cap and gown, a cigar in one hand and a champagne bottle in the other. A few months later, I set out to write about my experience as a Mexican-American student at Harvard. That experience, while among the most enriching in my life, was taxing at times. The challenges weren’t academic, but cultural.

I was alienated from my surroundings, and that alienation colored much—too much—of my Harvard education.

In the late 1980’s, Mexican-Americans made up just 2.5% of Harvard College’s 6,000 undergraduates. Despite demands by Latin@ students that Harvard keep pace with innovations at competitor schools like Yale and Stanford, there were no Latin@ professors, no courses in Latin@ studies, and no real support system for those Chicano students whom the Admissions Office was so aggressively recruiting out of warm and nurturing towns in the Southwest.

Part of the problem was geographic. Harvard is in Massachusetts—a state where there were, just ten years
ago, few Latin@’s of any sort and virtually no Mexicans, where Spanish was rarely if ever heard on street corners, and where the Mexican food should have come with a warning label.

The rest of the problem was the nature of Harvard itself. My left-leaning classmates and I were, at the time, inclined toward the conventional view that Harvard was "too conservative" to come to grips with what was, even then, foreseeable demographic changes and the coming "Latinization" of the United States. We were convinced that Harvard was failing its students by failing to adequately prepare them for the changes ahead, and that the most prestigious educational institution in the country was preparing the "best and brightest" to succeed in a new century alright—the 19th Century.

We were wrong. As I realized only years later, the problem wasn’t that Harvard was too conservative, but that it was too liberal.

There are at least three things that liberals do poorly: put aside their arrogance long enough to take criticism; absorb an alternative view that conflicts with their own; and question the fruits of their good intentions. And there’s at least one tenet of American liberalism that has caused more confusion, more contortions, and more contradictions on the part of its proponents than could have ever been imagined when the concept was originally conceived.

The ideal of “colorblindness” makes liberals’ heads spin. Always has.

Back then, liberal Harvard administrators freely acknowledged that they had, during the admissions process, taken into account the ethnicity of Mexican-American, and other minority, students. They almost bragged about it, apparently considering such color-consciousness to be an enlightened and necessary part of admissions. But once the students arrived on campus, those same administrators suddenly decided that being enlightened meant being colorblind and paying no heed to ethnic differences that might complicate students’ transition to university life.

In fact, they ignored those cultural distinctions as if they were an infliction of some sort. And given their arrogant resistance to criticism—especially from the people (in this case, students) who they were trying to help—there was just no getting through to them.

What did get eventually through, what did sneak past the threshold of Johnston Gate late one night several years later and jump into John Harvard’s lap, are the very demographic changes that Harvard had refused to recognize.

Harvard would change. Massachusetts would change. All of New England would change. It would all change. And fittingly, the changes would come not because of demands from a bunch of assimilated, elite, Chicano students with good grades and bad Spanish, but because of Mexican immigrants.

Last fall, ten years after popping the cork on that champagne bottle, I came back to Harvard to complete a one-year Masters’ program in Public Administration at the John F. Kennedy School of Government.

For a moment, I thought I’d taken a wrong turn at New Haven.

Massachusetts has become more Latin@. Population figures don’t tell the whole story. In 1998, Latin@’s made up just over five percent of Boston’s population. But the numbers are growing, and they’ll soon eclipse those of African-Americans. Besides, no matter what their number, Latin@’s tend to stand out in any population by retaining, and displaying, their culture.

On subway trains, Spanish words pepper the chatter of commuters. The street vendor selling mitrines in Downtown Crossing says he’s from Honduras. Brazilian nannies sitting in a Somerville park gossip about the families that employ them as their young charges run and play. The storefront in Maverick that housed a Greek restaurant now hosts an always-crowded Mexican taqueria.

There are political changes as well. Mexican, and Central American, immigrant parents whose children attend a Boston school district have united in an association to advocate for a better education. The first three Latin@ members of the Massachusetts state legislature have taken their oaths. Among the contentious issues on the state’s political horizon is reform of the state’s bilingual education system, in which immigrant parents complain their children are trapped.

And Harvard, once behind the times, is trying to get ahead of the curve. Last fall, the Kennedy School of Government held a forum intended to give a peak at a group of voters who might decide the 2000 election. The perfectly-timed event took place the same week that the Wall Street Journal astutely proclaimed Latin@ voters the “soccer moms” of this election, sure to be courted by both major parties, and as Gov. George W. Bush and Vice President Al Gore had begun to trot out their best Spanish in stump speeches.

There are now Latin@ studies courses in the Harvard catalog, Latin@-themed events on campus, and even a handful of Latin@ surnames in the faculty directory—though mainly at the graduate level.

Then there’s the David Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies, which Harvard created in 1994. Its mission statement describes the endeavor as seeking to “expand research and teaching about Latin America and related fields” at the University and “strengthen ties between Harvard and institutions throughout Latin America.”
There are taco shacks on Massachusetts Avenue where a more edible form of Mexican food is cooked up by real Mexicans. Go into a celebrated pizza parlor in Harvard Square, the one with the Italian flags and the postcards from Sicily, and you'll find Mexican immigrants twirling pies as the Italian owner issues commands in Spanish. In the belly of the Kennedy School, I practice my Spanish with janitors from El Salvador who perform all types of labor in all sorts of weather while, a few doors down, the only Latin@ professor on staff cluelessly lectures about how "unskilled" Latin@ immigrants are clanging to welfare.

To the degree that my book was inspired by alienation to my surroundings, I'm not sure I could write it now. That is, I'm not sure — if I could relieve my undergraduate experience in these new surroundings — that the alienation would be as strong as it was back then.

Of course, not everyone is happy about these changes.

Last summer, when a small Texas town on the Mexican border declared Spanish its official language, the hosts of a Boston radio show howled in protest as their callers let loose with nativist hysteria. The callers didn't hesitate to tell the cultural subversives to "go back to Mexico," ignoring the fact that Texans have especially deep roots and that some of the Tejanos embracing Spanish have been on this side of the border longer than the New Englanders' ancestors have been on this side of the Atlantic.

I prefer to think of Massachusetts' new arrivals as more blessing than burden. With a strong work ethic and an optimism about the future, these immigrants will revitalize neighborhoods in Boston and Cambridge, reopen abandoned businesses, earn money and pay taxes, and restore the luster of the American dream. They'll change, and they'll change us.

I've long ago made my peace with Harvard, and I now feel only enormous gratitude for all it's given me. This magnificent institution has, time and again, been invented, and re-invented, by castaways and misfits of all colors and cultures. And it has only been enriched in the process.

Already the Mexican food has gotten better.

Ruben Navarrette, Jr. '90, a former Los Angeles radio talk show host and political columnist for the Arizona Republic, is a student of public administration at Harvard's John F. Kennedy School of Government and the author of A Darker Shade of Crimson: Odyssey of a Harvard Chicano (Bantam). He was also, most recently, chosen to contribute to the latest installment in the best-selling Chicken Soup for the Soul book series; Chicken Soup for the Writer's Soul is due out in June 2000. He can be reached at <www.navarrette.com>.

What Should Be On Everyone's Agenda
Honoring Humanity
AN "INTERVIEW" WITH RICHARD MORA, HARVARD '99

Mauricio Barragán Barajas: Why don't we begin by having you introduce yourself?  
RM: Alright. I was born in East Los Angeles, and grew up in Cypress Park, a barrio in Northeast Los Angeles or "NELA." In 1995, I graduated from Benjamin Franklin High School, and then attended Harvard College. A large part of those four years at Harvard were somewhat of a culture shock. It was the first time I lived outside of L.A., other than visiting family in Mexico. Now I'm studying for my Master's of Arts in Education at the University of Michigan. Teaching is of great interest to me, which is why I chose Michigan's program because I will receive my teaching certification in secondary education in the areas of Social Studies and Sociology from the State of Michigan upon completing the program in June.

MBB: Could you comment on your experience at Harvard?  
RM: Sure. I left Los Angeles somewhat reluctantly. I was afraid that during the time I was away at Harvard something would happen to my brother. Part of me wanted to stay and take care of him. I worried everyday I was at Harvard, especially when people from back home would call and tell me that someone I knew had been seriously injured or killed. I arranged with my friends to watch out for my brother; to keep him
away from gangs. They insisted that I needed to go to Harvard for my family and for community. (pause) I had to learn to pay my respects to the deceased from afar. I took all this with me to Harvard.

**MBB:** You mentioned your experience at Harvard as being a kind of culture shock. Can you expound on that?

**RM:** Well, it was a culture shock in two ways. First, there was the issue of race or ethnicity. I came from an area that is predominantly Latin@. My high school was easily over 80% Latin@. So, I had to adapt to the fact that at Harvard the Latin@ presence was less than 10%. Then, there was class. Many of the people I met did not come from a working class background. However, like the issue of race and ethnicity, this also provided me the opportunity to learn from others. This is what I found to be the best part of being at Harvard, interacting with people with lived experiences vastly different from mine. I met people from all over the country, from all over the world. I learned so much from them. For example, my roommates: one was from the Dominican Republic, another from North Carolina, and the third was born in Italy and raised in Massachusetts. Exchanging ideas with others is an invaluable experience. It has helped me relate to others better.

**MBB:** Would you say that is what you miss the most about Harvard?

**RM:** Yeah, that and all the libraries and bookstores. (smiling)

**MBB:** With your background, do you find yourself “connecting” with the people you interview for your research?

**RM:** Definitely. When I was a senior, I wrote an honors thesis entitled *Smile Now, Cry Later.* I interviewed mothers residing in Northeast Los Angeles who lost one or more children in gang-related homicides. More than once, I cried with a mother, or cried later as I re-lived the moment while transcribing our conversations. Although, it was very emotionally and psychologically taxing, it helped me because it led me to seriously reflect upon my commitment to work with young men and women. Many of the mothers I spoke with impressed upon me the importance of my continuing to work with young people and my continuing to share my ideas with others. I have not forgotten their words, and their desire to save the lives of young people has strengthened my commitment to do the same. While they have not formed an organization, their passion and determination reminds me of *Las Madres de la Plaza de Mayo* in Argentina.

A good example of this is how one of the mothers, who I call Martha, brought the issue of humanity to the center of our dialogue. She rather eloquently stated that she works to help gang members because “if those young men were given birth to by a woman, those young men are human beings.” *All* children are human beings, yet, many—especially children of color and children who are poor—are demonized by some social scientists and journalists who refer to them with labels such as “super predators.” It saddens me tremendously that people respond to the epidemic of youth violence by supporting repressive measures that are born out of political expediency, especially when there exists research that speaks to the issues our children are contending with and that offers more concrete solutions. For example, the works *Lost Boys* and *Youth in Prison.*

**MBB:** You say that you make yourself “vulnerable,” and that your “spirit is re-nourished” when you speak to high school students. What do you mean exactly?

**RM:** I mean that I feel spiritually and psychologically whenever I speak to young people about the things that have weighed on my heart and psyche for years. For example, I mention to them that I have known countless people—young and old, gang members and non-gang members—who have been killed in gang-related homicides. I tell them about people I know who have been maimed and crippled, both physically and/or spiritually, by such violence. I describe to them how someone can be pushed to embrace gradual suicide, like using drugs or involving themselves in activities that may expose them to death and/or violence. I reveal to them that I was a very fatalistic teenager as a result of the death and violence that surrounded me.

**MBB:** So, speaking with young people is sort of like therapy?

**RM:** Exactly. I don’t think many people understand the impact that such violence can have on the development of children and young people. I remember that growing up I was full of stress—always on edge—and very fatalistic, though you wouldn’t have known it if you interacted with me. But, I felt it inside, and unfortunately I lashed out. It is the one thing that I am most ashamed of but it’s true—growing up I used to fight with my younger brother, my only sibling, quite often. I had very little patience for him. If he got me upset or angry,
I reacted with violence. So, here I was inflicting pain on my brother, whose birth is by far the most joyous moment of my life. Where did this violence come from? Our parents never fought. We were fortunate that we didn’t experience abuse in our home. However, there was violence all around us—in the streets—which our parents couldn’t always protect us from.

**MBB:** How did you address your own stress and violence?

**RM:** It’s quite interesting because once I came to terms with death and my fear of dying, my fatalism began to fade. I became a much happier person—on the inside. Not surprisingly, it was also about this time that the confrontations between my brother and I began to diminish. I was no longer as haunted by an overwhelming sadness, similar to what I have read that war veterans’ experience. So, I began to read more to understand what I was going through, and by the time I went to Harvard, I was even more prepared to learn.

**MBB:** You are currently teaching as part of your Master’s work?

**RM:** Yes. Right now I am student-teaching Social Studies classes full-time at an alternative high school in Ann Arbor by the name of Community High, or as the students like to refer to it, “Commie High.”

**MBB:** (grinning) How’s that going?

**RM:** Overall, it’s great. You have your good days and your not-so-good days. That’s what excites me about the teaching profession—the fact that no two days; no two classes are going to be alike. You’re always learning.

**MBB:** Tell me about your pedagogical philosophy.

**RM:** Well, my pedagogical philosophy is composed of two major beliefs. The first is that lived experience holds a wealth of knowledge. Whether respected or not, lo personal—stories, anecdotes, etc.—is very powerful. It is there that one oftentimes finds la esperanza (hope), el cariño (affection/love), el coraje (rage/anger), y las ganas para seguir adelante; para seguir luchando (and the desire to continue forward, to continue struggling). In order to find this in one’s lived experience, one must engage in the practice of critical reflection.

The second belief is that we all embody much potential, which can manifest as either spiritual beauty or atrocious deeds. That is the individual’s choice. But, as the late Paulo Freire states in Pedagogy of the Oppressed: “while both humanization and dehumanization are real alternatives, only the first is the people’s vocation.”

I want to be there working with students as they seek out their individual and communal dreams and to remind them that they should not forget to care after their elders and protect the world for the unborn generations, while affirming their own self-worth and the humanity of others. I want students to take to heart the words of César Chávez, who said that “we cannot seek achievement for ourselves and forget about progress and prospects for our community,” and that “our ambition must be broad enough to include the aspirations and needs of others for their sakes and for our own.” This is a life-long mission. It is a process that requires time, commitment, unselfishness, and responsibility from everyone.

**MBB:** So, what you are speaking about appears to be, more than anything, a way of life?

**RM:** Exactly. We must keep in mind that just because time marches on does not mean we are progressing. I believe you must strive everyday to make yourself more human; to honor yourself by addressing your wounds; and to work outwards by helping other people and preparing the world for the unborn generations. For me this struggle is part of who I am. It is part of my identity. When I refer to myself as a Chicano, in many ways, this is what I mean.

**MBB:** That’s interesting. For you, Chicano is not reducible to a national identity? You don’t simply equate it to being a Mexican-American or to Mexican heritage?

**RM:** That’s correct. I am the son of Mexicanos. I consider myself Mexicano de corazón (to the core), but when I say, “Yo soy Chico,” I am putting forth my politics as well as my cultura and bilingualism. What I mean by this is that I am verbalizing the process of conscientización that I am conscientiously undergoing on a daily basis. Conscientización, as defined by Freire, “refers to learning to perceive social, political, and economic contradictions, and to take action against the oppressive elements of reality.”

**MBB:** One final question. What do you see as your greatest accomplishment?

**RM:** Years ago I answered a similar question by stating, the fact that I have managed to stay alive. Now, after much introspection, I would qualify this response and say, the fact that I have not lost my humanity, the fact that I did not become desensitized while struggling to stay alive.

Mauricio Barragán Barajas is a writer of children’s stories. He is in the process of completing a bilingual children’s book entitled Los Sueños de Mi Angelita/ The Dreams of My Little Angel. Barajas currently resides in Richard Mora’s thoughts, and plans to soon exist independently.
Elena and Ela
Two Generations of (Bilingual) Sisters
BY ELENA C. CHAVEZ

Over the summer I had a mission. I was going to speak Spanish with Ela, my then five-month-old sister. I'm 19 and speak choppy Spanish, the language of my grandparents, with a horrible accent. I was brought up speaking English. Perhaps my parents were afraid that Spanish might limit my options or cloud my assimilation, (though I never officially assimilated from one culture to another). Selfishly, this summer, I could practice my accent and Ela's sweet smile would continue shining back at me, regardless of my funny accent.

It was also an opportunity for me to bring the language back into the house. Spanish has never been dead in our house. It never ceases to float in and out of our daily lives. But over the summer, Spanish began to linger around for longer periods of time, transferring from just Spanish "baby talk" to everyday conversation. I wonder what role language will play in Ela's life. Perhaps, and ironically so, bringing Ela up in a predominantly white neighborhood, will actually encourage us to speak to her in Spanish more. She will also be growing up in a time when our society celebrates bilingualism and culture, rather than vanilla assimilation.

My first childhood experience was in Culver City in Los Angeles. We formed an eclectic community and were involved with each other's lives on a daily basis. Later, after a move to San Diego, we made the transition to a white upper class neighborhood. And both types of neighborhoods seemed comfortable to me. I could survive in both worlds.

Ela, on the other hand, has been born into an elitist Southern California lifestyle. Language included, Ela is bound to grow up very differently than my brother, Esteban, and I have. Over the summer, Ela "helped" me write e-mail, and now that I'm back at school, she actually "writes" (or pounds incessantly) e-mail to me. Ela even has a Turkish nanny, an amazingly well traveled European woman who speaks five different languages. Ela actually responds the fastest to "musey" (French for "mouse"). Ela will grow up with manicured lawns, shiny sport utility vehicles, bottled water, veggie-burgers, smoothies, preschools for the "gifted," and Baby Mozart music.

I think my parents are counting on my brother and I to serve as their generational link to Ela. I know that I'm looking forward to having Ela be my link to her generation. Speaking for myself, while taking care of Ela, never have I been so exhausted, nor have I felt so energized, alive, aware, and awake. She has already positively changed the environment that she has been born into, though her hometown of Solana Beach, California, will ultimately shape her.

Ela will never experience my Nana's tiny house in Calexico the way I once experienced it. I remember my Nana's house filled and bustling with my Tios and Tias during the holidays, and my brother and I running around in the dirt, playing hide and go seek in her rose garden, filling up the plastic pool on a scorching summer afternoon, walking down the street to the local panadería to buy fresh pan dulce, watching old telenovelas and falling asleep on the living room floor to the musical sound of the adults quietly speaking in the kitchen with their soft soothing Spanish sounds.

Times have changed. Calexico is booming: Wal-Mart has arrived. My Nana is on the run; even though up until very recently she used to work out in the fields in Northern California every summer, she now is an entrepreneur in her own right. We never spend Christmas, Easter, or Thanksgiving together as an extended family though we don't live that far apart.

Times have changed. Yet, now when we do get together as a family, it's because we want to. Today, Ela will be able to learn from our Nana in a way that I am just barely able to. Ela might be more expressive in so many more ways than I was, because she will be more comfortable with her surroundings. And if my parents are still as endearingly "nerdy" as when I was growing up, Ela might be my bilingual (or even trilingual) sister who can partake in fun luxuries, see the value of education, and be an energetic, dynamic force in our community.

Elena C. Chavez '02 creates DRCLAS DATES, for the David Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies, under the direction of June Carolyn Erliek. She is a Social Studies concentrator and is interested in a myriad of subjects ranging from human rights, Latin@ identities, Latin American politics and her sister Ela's sweet smile.
En La Lucha y ‘Palante’
Speaking About Latin@ Studies at Harvard

By Miguel Segovia

As members of the Harvard community of student learners, we have realized that in order to get the administration at Harvard to listen to the concerns Latin@s are raising, students must come together to develop and propose an agenda that outlines a well-crafted call for change. This pending proposal, already under way, needs to get the support and financial backing from students, allied faculty, Harvard alumni as well as generous organizations and donors. Institutions such as Cornell have instituted Latino studies programs, with top-notch faculty and resources. What must students and faculty do to make Latin@ studies vital at Harvard? Can Harvard survive if it continues to neglect an increasingly growing sector of the United States population? How can a Latin@ mobilization campaign hold the University accountable to Latin@ communities, students and alumni?

In this article, we provide a glimpse of some of the efforts underway for making Latin@ studies a central issue on campus as debates continue to be heard everywhere around us discussing the struggle for adequate representation and recognition. Has there really been a “Latin” explosion as Nueva York magazine recently proposed with the brown and golden cover displaying the beautiful Jennifer Lopez? Have Latin@s really “made it” in this country? What about the “brown” men and women that continue to serve students’ meals on campus, the janitors who clean after us, and the people who manicure the lawns?

This struggle to be recognized has been a driving force behind most Latin@ campus organizations. In fact, the issue has been haunting the University since the late 70s; the myriad voices from various ethnic groups at Harvard have become increasingly audible in the last 10 years, but will the University listen? It is also important to examine exactly what it is the administration hears, because “the Master” often tends to hear what it is convenient, denying any kind of real engagement with “others.” This is another way in which such systems of power silence, erase and cover over important issues. Listening can sometimes be easily mistaken for genuine and accepting gestures of “diversity,” accountability and responsibility. It can mask deep-rooted racisms and a long history of devaluation.

With invigorating urgency, both Latin@ and non-Latin@ students are realizing that their concerns can no longer be dismissed. The Kennedy School of Government’s Latino Caucus and the Divinity School’s Nueva Generación are two groups that have persistently attempted to foment institutional changes in their respective faculties, as well as at Harvard in general. Through Concilio Latino, undergraduate and graduate Latin@ groups across the University united under an ethnic label for the sake of coalition and solidarity. While “ethnic” groups continue to cluster and organize under common ethnic labels such as “Latin@,” they increasingly demand representation and elaboration; they require that their cultural and social productions be recognized for their specificity and complexity within the rubric, “Latin@.” This has often been one of the common topics of conversation regarding ethnic organizations on the Harvard campus. In order for la lucha to survive, we must continue to dialogue across difference, across spaces, and disciplines. But beyond the discursive and descriptive level of “solidarity,” we need practical mobilization, supporting letter writing, media exposure and coverage, monthly meetings and generous donations to bring about real change. The issue at stake is not just about inclusion, but about real recognition.

Ethnic organizations are demanding recruitment of Latin@ students, faculty and resources. This discourse challenges the university on an institutional level. The other more local grass-roots effort centers on creating institutional memory. The diversity of conferences at Harvard dealing with Latin@ issues such as bilingualism, immigration, comparative economies and social productions attest to a positive, yet slow, pull in the right direction. A major April 2000 conference on “Latino Cultures in the 21st Century,” under the leadership of Marcelo Suárez-Orozco is an excellent example of the supportive and tireless efforts of active faculty at Harvard, as was Doris Sommer’s conference on “Bilingual Aesthetics,” (see page 43) and her April symposium on Latin@ cultural productions.

Collaborative efforts between faculty and graduate students are another important part of “the agenda.” The issues which are staged in each of the aforementioned events cut across the theory/material divide and affect real people, real lives in the world. The numerous scholars from across the country bring a wealth of perspectives that continue to make important interventions in Latin@ lives and discourses.

En la lucha for educational and historical change, in 1996 the members of Nueva Generación, the Latin@ student organization at HDS, devised a plan for action based on the scarcity of Latin@ students, faculty and staff. Signs such as “Latino Religions/Not Offered” and “The population in the United States is rapidly becoming Latino: Who will minister to them?” filled the ivy-covered walls, the classrooms, the floors, and restrooms of HDS. This effort opened discussion between the
administration and the organization. The mobilization made HDS aware of its blind spots—its deficiencies in the areas relating to Latin@ religions, theologies and lives on campus and in the country. This campaign culminated in the appointments of visiting Latin@ scholars with the efforts of the Women’s Studies in Religion Program, the Center for the Study of World Religions and the HDS Dean’s Office. The other component of the Nueva Generación initiative continues to be the need to establish tenure track positions for scholars working with Latin@ theologies and communities. Also, the struggle for institutionalizing a Latin@ memory is a working project. The dialogue between the students and the administration established a promise of support and action; this has included an annual conference dealing with Latin@ studies since the signing of an agreement with Dean Ronald Thelma, the previous Dean of HDS.

Interestingly, students across Harvard continually argue that a common trend and parallel phenomenon runs through Harvard University vis-à-vis the David Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies and HDS vis-à-vis the Center for the Study of World Religions. It is a fact that both Centers support, encourage and fund work dealing with Latin@’s, but their earnest efforts may divert any real engagement with diversity, i.e. hiring tenured Latin@ faculty. The support of research Centers as important and necessary as the Center for the Study of World Religions and the David Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies are important. The burning question that numerous students think and share among themselves but are afraid to ask in public, however, is what does it mean that one can attain the money to organize and to plan an event such as a symposium or a conference, but with no substantive faculty attendance? Can this be construed as a way in which “Harvard” gets away with ignoring the real engagement with difference as well as the sensitive concerns, the articulate issues and questions raised at such events? If such Centers recognize the crucial need and identify the merit in Latin@ scholarship, why does “Harvard” continue to turn a deaf ear to the voices that keep sounding out across campus? It has been recently voiced by students that part of the way Harvard evades such real engagements with difference is by “graduating” its “problematic” students.

One of the main challenges plaguing Latin@ student groups is the real fear of disintegration and collapse of student leadership and participation. The common concern revolves around the lack of a central area of shared-space, or a center for housing and fostering campus-wide inter-action and collaboration across campus organizations. Leaders from various organizations are concerned with the lack of institutional memory. Hence, the Latin@ studies initiative seeks to obtain and maintain institutional resources to have access to office space and monies for materials—phones, computers, typewriters, copy machines, etc. Part of what these groups have attempted to accomplish is the establishment of an institutional memory of Latin@ events, social functions and activities. Events such as the “Latino Welcome Day,” sponsored by Concilio and its affiliates, the Cinco de Mayo Celebration organized by the Latino Caucus at the Kenedy School of Government, as well as the Dia De Los Muertos Celebration hosted by Nueva Generación at HDS are some of these efforts. Latina/os Unidas/os at the Graduate School of Education has facilitated the very successful “Latino Graduation” for two consecutive years. While these events have been initiated by particular Latin@ organizations they have worked in collaboration through Concilio Latino, as well as other networks, and this has strengthened the dialogue, as well as the mutual support of organizations across Harvard.

Our aim, then, is to continue the call for coalitions with faculty, with other leading student and professional organizations.

Miguel Segovia is a graduate student at the Harvard Divinity School working on the intersection between women’s studies, Latin@ cultures and postcolonial theory. Miguel is working with Doris Sommer as a Teaching Fellow for Spanish 194: Latino Cultures. He is also an elected Representative in the Student Association Executive Committee, the HDS student government and is co-Chair of Concilio Latino and Nueva Generación. Carolina Recio, the recipient of a fellowship from the Real Colegio Complutense at Harvard, contributed to this article.
Harvard Latin@s
Sign the Alumni Pledge for Action!

BY EDDIE M. DUQUE

Would you agree with Harvard President Neil L. Rudenstine in his 1996 report when he stated while referring to diversity, "It is the substance from which much human learning, understanding, and wisdom derive. It offers one of the most powerful ways of creating the intellectual energy and robustness that lead to greater knowledge, as well as the tolerance and mutual respect that are so essential to the maintenance of our civic society."?

Did you have any Latin@ professors while at Harvard University? Do you think Harvard should strengthen its effort to recruit tenured faculty from traditionally underrepresented minority groups in the United States? Are you willing to pledge your support for such efforts?

In April 1996, Latin@ students organized the first Harvard-wide conference to create an action agenda and prioritize community goals for U.S. Latin@ students at Harvard on the premise that, "La Union Hace La Fuerza." Approximately 275 undergraduate and graduate students participated in the conference held at the JFK School of Government.

The resulting mandate from this conference was the formation of a national Latin@ alumni association that would strengthen and complement student efforts to advocate specific community objectives and the unique interests of U.S. Latin@ students at Harvard. The Latin@ Mobilization Team has set out, for the past three years, to faithfully meet that charge by collecting alumni, and student home and e-mail addresses through informal networks and mailing lists. In addition, the Team sent a one-time mailing to those listed in a compiled database of more than 2,500 identified Latin@ graduates. No Harvard funds were used to pursue our efforts.

In less than three weeks after our mailing we received over 200 pledges to support the outlined goals and overall strategy. Each pledge asserts agreement to become a member and support our vision to make Harvard a warmer, more receptive and welcoming University for future generations of U.S. Latin@ students.

Upon reaching a critical mass of support, the Mobilization Team will request an appointment with the University President: with an invitation to the Board of Overseers to introduce our proposed vision, mission, and goals and ultimate objective—to increase the recruitment of tenured faculty from dramatically under-represented Latin@ minority groups in this country.

Those who have already pledged also support the creation of:

- Harvard administrative position with the assistant staff necessary to oversee the logistical operations to implement our vision and mission including Latin@ student recruitment
- Harvard-affiliated Latin@ Alumni Association
- Latin@ Alumni Advisory Board elected by the alumni association's membership that provides input on issues important to Latin@ students and alumni
- Database of Latin@ alumni and graduating students from all schools and units
- Database of Latin@ Ph.D.s and other academic instructors from the United States and Puerto Rico to expand the pool of Latin@ candidates.
- National Latin@ alumni newsletter with articles submitted to the Latin@ Alumni Advisory Board from the membership
- Endowment fund for U.S. Latin@ faculty

Armando Ramirez is Communications Coordinator and Russ Calleros is the Executive Director of the Mobilization Project until December 2000. We hope that Board elections can be organized and will take place by that date. We would like to thank the men and women of the team who have given their labor and financial support to our effort over the past four years. La Union Hace La Fuerza.”

Eddie M. Duque was a Master in Public Policy '96 at Harvard's Kennedy School of Government.

Bilingual Aesthetics
Distancing the Monolingual Majority

BY MONICA M. RAMIREZ

HOW DOES ONE LANGUAGE interrupt another? How do different languages simultaneously inhabit the same space? How do language games threaten monolingualism? More than a hundred students, professors, and community members gathered to identify and investigate the “bilingual question” that affects the United States today. Harvard Professor of Romance Languages and Literatures Doris Sommer, the main conference organizer, said that the one-day conference entitled “Bilingual Aesthetics” sought to pose the “bilingual question” to fields that have somehow remained indifferent to it, including politics, aesthetics, psychoanalysis, humor, and linguistics. The conference aimed to investigate pertinent work where politics and poetics meet—where languages, especially Spanish and English, grapple with one another.

The first panel of the December 4 conference joined three academics from three different disciplines: Ana Celia Zentella (Hunter College), Robert Schwartzwald (University of Massachusetts, Amherst), and Yunte Huang (Harvard University). Zentella, author of Growing Up Bilingual, studies the role of bilingualism in New York City’s Puerto Rican community. Her book addresses the complex nature of growing up speaking English and Spanish, and, consequently, Spanglish. The title of her presentation, “Jose, Can You See,” a bilingual play on words, alludes to the U.S. national anthem, but replacing “Oh say,” with “José.” In other words, the Spanish interrupts the English in this context. Schwartzwald, a scholar of Canadian francophone literature, titled his presentation, “Devenir-mineur/ Devenir minoritaire?” looking at the relationship between language and identity. Professor Huang, a leader in Chinese-Ameri-
and politics evolved as an important theme in this particular discussion. Bensmaïa discussed the strategy of translation as a strategy in aesthetics that acknowledges the tensions between languages. Translation serves as a “space of production.” Cruz Malave also touched upon this theme of translation, but focused more on the idea of mobilizing power relations in contextually specific social spaces through translational strategies. According to Cruz Malave, Puerto Rican cultural practices have “determinantal colonialism” by not accepting obligatory or hegemonic routes to achieve assimilation, but by creating “counter hegemonic routes.” Speaking Spanish or Spanglish represents one of these routes. Thus, assimilation becomes less conventional and more diverse, like bilingualism.

Joaquin Torres, a graduate student in the Romance Languages and Literatures Department, observed, “Gustavo Perez Firmat gives us an exceptional close reading with a decided poetic register of a Calvert Casey short story. Reda Bensmaïa filtered Maghreb’s dense political situation through a highly nuanced theoretical frame, and Arnaldo Cruz Malave produced an organically articulated panoramic view of US Puerto Rican literature.”

The last panel of the evening followed a brief wine break, in which people were able to talk to one another about the day’s profound dialogue. Visiting Harvard Professor Juan Bruce-Novoa, a scholar in the field of Chicano/Latino history and literature, moderated this subsequent panel that included Tino Villanueva (Boston University), Ramón Saldívar (Stanford University), and Ilan Stavans (Amherst College) as speakers.

Villanueva read bilingual English-Spanish poems to the audience and analyzed how certain Spanish words and concepts are untranslatable in English. For instance, there is no direct translation in English for Spanish diminutives. In Spanish, according to Villanueva, there exist the “diminutivo gustativo,” which means the tasteful or attractive diminutive, but not in English. Villanueva also explained how bilingual writing, like Alurista’s poems, does not constitute a modernist or postmodernist way of writing. Rather bilingual writing is simply a “bisensitive” writing that maintains the tone and connotative effort of each word in its most natural or home-like language.

Saldívar also discussed bilingual poetry, but related poetry to the Mexican tradition of corridos, folk ballads that narrate a story. Saldívar explained how one particular corrido influenced American Paredes’ poetry written in English. Thus, the Spanish ballad affects the English language in Paredes’ poems. Stavans’ anecdotal presentation recounted how one Chicano student at Amherst College entered Professor Stavans’ office speaking Spanglish to him. Stavans, a Jewish-Mexican who grew up speaking Yiddish and Spanish, confessed he was shocked to hear a student speak Spanglish to him without hesitation or deliberateness. Stavans explained how he could not help but envy the young man’s courage and freedom to use his “private” language in the context of a public and academic setting in such a natural manner.

The conference concluded with a poetry reading that featured well-recognized poets in Chicano/Latino literature and, more revealingly, in the field of bilingual poetic expression: Tino Villanueva, Evangelina Vigil-Pinon, and Giannina Braschi. After so much talk of bilingualism, it made sense to hear from those that capture the bilingual esthetic in their own art. Chicana poet Evangelina Vigil-Pinon, author of Thirty and Some A Lot, not only read some of her most intriguing bilingual poems, but also serenaded the audience with her guitar strokes and wonderful singing. Giannina Braschi, a celebrated member of the Nuyorican Poets group, read an excerpt from her book Yo-Yo Boing! Her ability to fuse English, Spanish, and Spanglish in her writing and presentation of her text is an awing and invaluable experience, students said. Braschi did not take time to breathe, or so it appeared, in her reading, pronouncing every tone and utterance with poetic and political thrust. Villanueva, the last poet of the evening, read a number of bilingual poems that mainly intimated something personal about his childhood growing up in Southern Texas, speaking Spanish at home and incorporating English and even Spanglish into his life. The poems manipulated English, Spanish, and Spanglish, demonstrating the relationship between biculturalism and bilingualism as well.

Salvador Espinosa, a Harvard College sophomore, noted that “for [him] as an undergraduate, [the conference] was a great opportunity to learn about the exciting fields of study that graduate students and professors throughout the United States are conducting in relation to bilingualism.”

Espinosa also expressed that “it was great to hear the three different poets recite their own bilingual poetry.”

“Bilingual Esthetics” served to highlight the provocations that bilingualism produce today in the United States. Doris Sommer, the main event organizer, explains today’s bilingualism as a period and space in which “Spanish is an out of its univocal complicity, while elsewhere in the Americas, indigenous languages are changing the sound of Spanish in public spheres.” Languages are therefore being stretched by unconventional practices towards borders that expand artistic expression and challenge the narrowness of a single tradition. As Sommer intimated to me one day, “idiota” is what the dignified Adam Bede called the single-language speaker in ninth-century England. In the midst of the conference, this description still sustained a provocative ring.

Monica M. Ramirez is currently a junior at Harvard College, concentrating in Literature. Monica comes from a bilingual and bicultural community in Southeast Los Angeles and hopes to write a thesis next year addressing bilingualism in Chicano/Latino literature.
Proceed with Caution

Proceed With Caution, When Engaged by Minority Writing in the Americas, by Doris Sommer.

Harvard University Press, 1999

A REVIEW BY JOAQUIN TERRONES

HIGHLY SPECIALIZED, UNINSPIRED, AND REPETITIVE, most literary criticism today has very little to offer readers outside of its discipline. Doris Sommer's latest book, however, speaks to readers well beyond the usual community of scholars and academics. Witty, urgent, and accessible, *Proceed with Caution* steers away from the trite conventions of contemporary criticism and engages its audiences not only on an intellectual plane but an ethical one as well. Rejecting jargon without sacrificing conceptual sophistication, the book focuses on the different strategies and resistances employed by minority writers when faced with audiences all too eager to devour their stories. Rather than performing empty-handed theoretical maneuvers, Sommer solidly and unambiguously challenges our idea of reading as a form of escape. As I followed each of the book's committed readings, I was struck by their clean elegance: Sommer displays a nitid virtuosity.

All this said, *Proceed with Caution* is still a demanding book. Demanding not because it requires mastery over a large body of criticism, but because it demands an ethical commitment from its audience. Each of the chapters consistently asked me to reevaluate my role and expectations as a reader. Books are not transparent, Sommer warns. Authors may cheat, lie, refuse, demand. I found it impossible to think of reading as a one-sided exchange—to think of myself as detached and removed from what is happening on the page—after following Sommer's argument.

Focusing on literature from the entire continent, this book is a prime example of the impact American Studies can have as a discipline. What might at first seem like an eclectic reading list—El Inca Garcilaso, Walt Whitman, Cirilo Villaverde, and Toni Morrison, for example—comes together smoothly, providing the reader with a web of interacting interpretations: gestures, moves, resistances mirrored across space. Sommer employs a new understanding of “America,” a continent with shifting borders and constantly migrating populations, making us realize, for example, that Black people in this country are not the only African-Americans and that these days the United States is as much a part of Latin America as Mexico or Puerto Rico. With all the current talk about globalization and post-nationalism, Sommer's book reminds us that the real challenge is to acknowledge the nation’s still tangible influence without letting its borders restrict us.

*Proceed with Caution* is also, in many ways, a direct response to the United States' increasingly diverse population. By paying attention to accentuated voices, lips that refuse to mouth words properly, that bend and distort language, making it their own, Sommer confronts models of democracy that demand assimilation and conformity from their citizens. As a person of color and a relatively new immigrant, I was struck by the relevance that a book putatively about literature had to current political and social debates. Continued assaults on Black and Latin@ communities—whether through educational, migratory or, penal legislation—serve as a reminder that projects like Sommer's are not only intellectual exercises but timely interventions. Ultimately, her “particularism” reminds us that: democracy can negotiate difference without having to erase it.

Joaquin Terrones is a graduate student in the Spanish section of the Romance Languages and Literatures Department. His areas of interest include the Caribbean and the Baroque.

---

Diversity Archive

*Latin@ Study Holdings*

BY COPELAND H. YOUNG

SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH ON Latin@s has often perpetuated and emphasized negative stereotypes, and myths. At the Henry A. Murray Research Center, a national repository of behavioral and social science data focusing on the multi-disciplinary study of lives through time, we have been able to identify positive, insightful, and culturally sensitive research studies, for permanent preservation.

Once archived, we make available each of these studies to researchers to use these data for new research. The range of uses of archival data is broad, from a course project to intensive scholarly analyses. All of these new research efforts are referred to as secondary analyses. Through promoting secondary
analysis of such archival data, we enable researchers to ask new questions of already existing data and thus ensure the highest productivity of those data sets. In 1995, the Murray Center received more than a million dollars in funding from the National Science Foundation and the National Institute of Mental Health to acquire data sets with racially and ethnically diverse samples, and to create a Diversity Archive—a clearinghouse for research on diverse populations.

A significant portion of the studies acquired through the Diversity Archive initiative have focused on the lives of Latin@s. Acquisitions included studies of couples and families such as Scott Coltrane’s and Elsa Valdez’ *Work-Family Role Allocation In Dual-Earner Chicano Families, 1987-1992*; Lea Ybarra’s *Chicano Families & Women’s Roles, 1977*; and Lloyd H. Rogler’s *Intergenerational Study of Puerto Rican Families in New York City, 1976-1978*, and the Better Homes Fund’s *Worcester Family Research Project, 1992-1995* which examined a multi-ethnic sample of homeless Latin@ and White families. For example, Lea Ybarra’s 1977 study of *Chicano Families & Women’s Roles* places marital relationships within the economic, social, educational, and cultural context of mid-1970s California to explore the changing family structures resulting from Chicanas’ entering the paid labor force. Through this effort, Dr. Ybarra was able to create a constructive framework of the Chicana@ family, drawing on positive aspects of Chicana@ culture.

Another group of studies provided accounts of life experiences, and political involvement such as the study by Leo Grebler, Joan W. Moore, and Ralph C. Guzman, entitled *Mexican-American Study Project, 1965-1966*, and Carol Hardy-Fanta’s more recent *Gender & Latina Politics in Boston, 1988-1991*. Carol Hardy-Fanta’s important local study of *Gender & Latina Politics in Boston* illustrates the active role of Latinas in politics which exposes and contrasts traditional political science assumptions. The study also provides a rare first person account of Latin@ political interests, drawing on viewpoints from Latin@ immigrants from Central and South America, as well as Puerto Rican Americans. Using in-depth qualitative interviews, the study examined differing ways that “common folk,” and professionals, women and men, define “What is political?” Research which chronicles educational and developmental progress have been the most intracately designed studies among our Latin@ Diversity archive holdings.

A third set of studies investigated educational and developmental experiences and academic achievement such as the work of Marcelo and Carola Suárez-Orozco’s *Immigration, Family Life & Achievement: Motivation Among Latino Adolescents, 1991-1992*; and Wayne Holtzman’s *School of the Future Project, 1990-1994*. The latter study represented a large-scale, five-year demonstration project involving more than 7,000 elementary and middle school youth living in four cities in Texas. Most (two-thirds of the pupils) were Chican@ or Central American. Drawing from methods established through community psychology, the project sought to demonstrate the beneficial impact of “full-service” schools which incorporate health and social services, and provide such specialized child and family services as family crisis intervention to social skills training with a focus on the local community, and the involvement of parents and teachers in decision-making.

Recurrent across most of the studies mentioned are the themes of the personal and collective impact of immigration, and the structuring of gender roles predominantly in the lives of Chicano and Puerto Rican Americans from childhood through mid-life. Our holdings also span nearly four decades from the 1960s to present, and they also draw on a variety of scientific perspectives including women’s studies, psychological anthropology, sociology, education, psychology, human development, and political science. Users of these very important and precious materials are welcome at the center.

Taken together, these studies reflect not only a diversity of Latin@ ethnic perspectives, but also a wide range of viewpoints within each ethnic group. The collection of studies on Latin@-American lives represents socioeconomic, geographic, and ethnic diversity, including participants from homeless, low-income, working, middle, and upper class backgrounds; suburban and urban residents of Eastern, Midwestern, and Western states; and of U.S.-born, Central and South American, and Carribean birth origin. Each study uniquely embodies an emphasis on personal strengths and resilience under challenging circumstances, and on aspects of competence and human growth. Research on families illustrates these important qualities.

Copeland H. Young is a Senior Research Assistant at the Henry A. Murray Research Center at the Radcliffe Institute of Advanced Study. He is working on the Diversity Archive project, and also worked on the Mental Health Archive project. Young is currently enrolled in the Masters program at the Graduate School of Library Information Science of Simmons College with a concentration on Archives Management.
Cuba Study Tour

Looking back

By Esther Whitfield

Waiting at José Martí International Airport for the first Harvard students to arrive for January's DRCLAS Cuba Study Tour, my companion, a theater critic at Casa de las Américas, commented to me, half-amused and half cynical, "Just why do these airport floors have to shine so much brightly?" Student of performance that she is, she had tapped into what would be some of the defining elements of the ten days the Harvard group spent in Havana last January: contrasts, contradictions and the uneasy tensions between outside and in. On the drive from the airport to the Malecón these contrasts rose up before us quite physically: billboards announcing "socialism or death" next to others for sports utility vehicles, and both, now, jostling for attention with the newer, brighter message. "¿Qué devuelvan a Elías a la patria?" Precisely because Elián González, rescued off the coast of Florida on November 25th, was not there in Cuba, he was everywhere. His pensive portrait was on new billboards, on the walls of work centers, on the T-shirts that tourists cajoled from the hocks of organized demonstrators at a starting price of $10.00. His story was on the radio, and on the television: all-day interviews, talk-shows and continuous reruns of the most poignant moments in the drama. At first the group listened with attention, trying to discern the facts from the fanfare. Then, as we ate breakfast after breakfast to the tune of party officials, psychologists and six-year-old orators pledging their allegiances to socialism, the story began to dim into the background.

This was background din, though, that made us very aware of the specifics of this moment, of the differences between the noise made in public and the murmurings at home; of the contrasts, that is, between politics and personal realities, which we observed at almost every juncture. We were part of the first DRCLAS "Havana in Literature" Cuba Study Tour, hosted by the cultural institution Casa de las Américas for 10 days in late January, to coincide with the annual Casa awards for Latin American literature. We noted the contrast between the officialdom of our host institution, with its grand prize ceremony attended by numerous Cuban and foreign dignitaries, among them former Nicaraguan Vice-President and author Sergio Ramírez, and the intimacy and kindness offered by those same hosts, who spent time talking with us, accompanied us on excursions and invited us to the "fiesta de santo" of one of them who is a Babalao priest. We felt, too, the contradictions presented by current readings of earlier Cuban literature. The first part of our "Havana in Literature" course, taught by a Cuban professor, focused on Cirilo Villaverde's novel "Cecilia Valdés", written more than a hundred years ago. Walking through old Havana we saw how the elegant houses where the novel unfolds have become multi-family homes, and how the streets have borne the passage of socialism. We could not help noticing, too, how some questions of race and identity raised in "Cecilia Valdés" still await resolution; how issues conspicuously unspoken in the novel are not entirely in the open even today. Reading Havana through its literature was a moving experience, not least because it made us feel the depth of these contrasts.

Of the group of 16 Harvard students and three faculty members on the tour, four had visited on previous occasions. Several, too, had personal connections to Cuba; and others are engaged in thesis research on the country. These differences could not but affect the expectations with which each of us approached the trip to Havana, and our experiences whilst there. All, though, were deeply interested to witness Revolutionary Cuba at this complicated moment in its history, and most came away with correspondingly unresolved views. As Caroline Perkins, a Junior concentrator in History and Literature of Latin America, puts it: "It was a phenomenal experience. It was emotionally draining and very confusing, but I'm so happy that I did it." Rochelle Mackey, a Junior in Government, comments: "Above all, Cuba was intense, complicated, and thought provoking." She adds, "the landscape was beautiful but dilapidated, the people warmly welcoming but usually harboring a 'double consciousness', referring to the contrast between public behavior and private speech. Back at Harvard the discussions continue, as we look back upon our time in Cuba and ahead to what the future might hold for the country; and as we realize—although we might have known before—how challenging it is to be to be left with as many questions as answers."

Esther Whitfield, a graduate student in Romance Languages and Literatures at Harvard, coordinated the Havana in Literature Cuba Study Tour. She spent a semester in Santiago de Cuba as an undergraduate in 1992 and has returned to Cuba several times since. She is writing her dissertation on language and economics in contemporary Cuban narrative published in Cuba, Spain and the United States.

Forum on U.S. Hispanics in Madrid

The Trans-Atlantic Project, an academic initiative to study the cultural interactions between Europe, the U.S. and Latin America has been invited by Casa de América, Madrid, to present a May 3 forum on "Spanish in the United States: The Cultural Practices of the Hispanic Migration." An open dialogue between American and Spanish professors will take place the following day at the same research center.

Harvard's Doris Sommer is expected to participate, together with Carlos Fuentes, Julio Ortega, and Enric Bou, from Brown's Hispanic Studies, Beatriz Pastor and Dwight Lahr from Dartmouth College, Alicia Borinsky from Boston University, and Juan Luis Cebrián from the Royal Spanish Academy.
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