THESIS
3
2002

This is to certify that the

dissertation entitled

Reconfiguring Dominicanness: Competing Discourses Surrounding Race, Nation, and Identity In The Dominican Republic

presented by

Kimberly Eison Simmons

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

Ph.D. degree in Anthropology

Major professor
Dr. Scott Whiteford

Date 5-3-02

MSU is an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Institution

O-12771

LIBRARY
Michigan State
University

PLACE IN RETURN BOX to remove this checkout from your record.
TO AVOID FINES return on or before date due.
MAY BE RECALLED with earlier due date if requested.

DATE DUE	DATE DUE	DATE DUE
Dec 13, 2003		
DEC 14 2004		
JUL 24 2005		

6/01 c:/CIRC/DateDue.p65-p.15

RECONFIGURING DOMINICANNESS: COMPETING DISCOURSES SURROUNDING RACE, NATION, AND IDENTITY IN THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

By

Kimberly Eison Simmons

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Anthropology

2002

ABSTRACT

RECONFIGURING DOMINICANNESS: COMPETING DISCOURSES
SURROUNDING RACE, NATION, AND IDENTITY
IN THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

By

Kimberly Eison Simmons

This dissertation maps the process of nationness -- a sense of national belonging -- which finds expression in discourses involving ideas of race and color in the construction of a "mixed-race" identity. How is this type of nationness created? How is mixedness articulated? What is the relationship between structure and agency in this process? What is the outcome in terms of the categories in circulation to define people? How do people define themselves? How does this change over time and space? What is accepted, negotiated, and rejected and under what circumstances? All of these inter-related questions facilitate the mapping of nationness here in the dissertation.

While nationness, race, nation, and identity are central themes explored here in the dissertation, it is through discourses -- what people say, what is expressed, and what is written and recorded -- that provides the context of the research. This dissertation offers a conceptual framework for understanding Dominicanness -- which I define as the "sense" of being Dominican in national and racial terms -- over time and space. The data reveal prevalent ideas surrounding race "mixture" in the formation of nation in the Dominican Republic. Importantly, mixture is a point of entry linking race, color, and nation in the articulation of Dominicanness, in similar yet competing ways. These competing

articulations find expression in discourses -- any thoughts/ideas, beliefs, words, and/or actions that have been/are expressed with regard to *being* Dominican. The discourses illuminate the changing importance of ancestry, history, place, and color as categories change and people make new claims about "who they are."

I define five discourses -- Gente de Color, Hispanidad, Mestizaje, Mulutaje, and Africanidad -- and assess how the nation defines itself during different sociohistorical periods by asking the following questions: 1) What are the current racial and color views/concepts, and why have they emerged? 2) How are racial and national identities defined and articulated within the racial discourse? 3) How are people defined by the state and how do they define themselves? and 4) What is the status of transnational migration to and from the Dominican Republic in terms of actual migration, ideas and relocalization? In the final analysis, I examine how Dominicanness has been reconfigured, how it articulates mixture, while offering a different way of conceptualizing such mixture (African/Black - European/White) in Latin America and the Hispanic Caribbean by way of Mulutaje.

DEDICATION

To David, my husband and colleague,
Asha and Aria, our daughters,
my parents, Wilson and Ludia Eison,
my sister, Kamika, and my extended family
for all of your endless love, support, and encouragement.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

There are a number of special people I would like to thank for helping to make this research and dissertation possible. I am especially grateful and indebted to my major professor, Dr. Scott Whiteford, for guidance, support, encouragement, and feedback throughout my doctoral program and dissertation research. I want to express my gratitude to the members of my doctoral guidance committee, Drs. Laurie Kroshus Medina, Ann Millard, Judy Pugh, and Ruth Simms Hamilton, for their overall support and time spent with me discussing ideas related to my research. All of your time and assistance throughout this process has been much appreciated.

Words cannot express my gratitude to David, my husband and colleague, for companionship, inspiration, and support. As special word of thanks is reserved for our wonderful daughters, Asha and Aria, for opening up a new world to me; my parents, Wilson and Ludia Eison, for believing in education and the pursuit of knowledge and for instilling these values in me; my sister, Kamika and her family; as well as my in-laws and extended family for moral support, prayers, and encouragement throughout my graduate program. For all that you have done to support me over the years, I want to convey my sincere appreciation.

Thanks to the faculty and staff in the Department of Anthropology, especially to Gail, Nancy, and Dr. Lynne Goldstein. Thanks to the staff in the African Diaspora Research Project (ADRP), especially to Dr. Ruth Hamilton, Joan, and Gloria. A special word of thanks is reserved for my fellow student colleagues in the Department of

Anthropology, ADRP, the Black Graduate Student Association (BGSA) and the African - Latino/a - Asian - Native American (ALANA) group at Michigan State University for the exchange of ideas and friendship. I would like to especially thank Noel, Eduardo, Raymond, Shu-yao, Vera, and Luiza.

Also, this on-going dissertation research would not have been possible without funding. I wish to acknowledge the following funding sources: Minority Competitive Doctoral Fellowship (MCDF), Summer Acceleration Research Fellowship, Social Science Research Council (SSRC) Summer Workshop and Fellowship for International Migration, and the Martin Luther King - Cesar Chavez - Rosa Parks (KCP) Future Faculty Fellowship. A special word of thanks is reserved for Drs. Maxie Jackson, Dozier Thornton, Dorothy Harper Jones, Evette Chavez, and Karen Klomparens, and their assistants, in conjunction with funding and ongoing support.

Importantly, this dissertation would not have been possible without the kind help of a number of people in the Dominican Republic assisting with contacts, transportation, housing, childcare, and other research arrangements. A special word of thanks is reserved for them for helping to make the goal of dissertation research a reality by sharing their experiences and a part of themselves with me. I would especially like to thank all of the participants and following individuals, families, and institutions: Carmen "Lilly" González and family (Holly, Lilibeth, Laura, and Melba) for years of assistance, friendship and extended family; The Bisono Family (Nancy, Dionisio, Dionisio Alberto, and Leonardo Bisono) for their hospitality and cultural consulting during 1998; Cesar Franco, Rosa, and the staff at the Archivo Histórico de Santiago; Ochy, Wendy,

Benvienda at Identidad; the staff at CIPAF; Clara and the staff at the Junta Central Electoral in Santiago; Ana Rosa and Margarita at the Altagracia Church; the staff of Coordinadora de Cibao; the staff at the Nucleo de Apoyo a la Mujer; the Veras-Pola family, Mariana Moreno; Bruni Fernández and family; Janet Fernández; my colleagues at PUCMM in Applied Linguists and Spanish for Foreigners; my colleagues at the Council on International Educational Exchange (CIEE) in Santiago and New York; and Blas, Chiqui, Ligia Duarte, and everyone who participated in the dissertation research. Thank you for sharing your experiences and a part of yourselves with me and for extending a hand of hospitality and friendship, helping to make this dissertation possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables xi

I. Introduction 1
- Research Statement and Overview 1
  - Nationness and Mixedness 3
- Why an Anthropological Focus on Race? 7
- My "Identity" in the Field 11
- Dissertation Structure 14

II. Theoretical and Conceptual Framework 16
- Race and Nation 17
- Nationness in Latin America and the Caribbean 24
  - Identity Construction 25
  - Mestizaje 26
- Mixture, Status, and Peoplehood in the Americas 31
  - Venezuela 35
  - Belize 37
  - Ecuador 38
  - Puerto Rico 39
- Nationness, Race and Nation in the Dominican Republic: Exploring Dominicanness 42
- Arguments in the Dissertation Related to the Dominican Republic 43

III. Research Site, Methodology and Procedures 45
- The Caribbean as a Culture Area Within Anthropology 45
  - Caribbean as Open Frontier 45
  - Afro-American Anthropology 46
- A Caribbean Research Site: Santiago de los Caballeros, Dominican Republic 49
- The Research Setting in Santiago 52
  - Demographic Information 52
- Painting a Transnational Portrait 53
- Research Procedures 55
  - Participant Observation 56
  - Structured Interviews 58
  - Informal Interviews 59
  - Focus Groups 59
  - Archival Data 61
  - Data Analysis 61
  - Data Presented in the Dissertation 62

IV. Historical Construction of Dominicanness (1900-1930): *Gente de Color* 64
Gente de Color (People of Color): The "Colored" Discourse (1900-1930) 65
Racial Views and Concepts 65
Racial Discourse and the Articulation of Racial and National Identities 67
Individual Identities and State-Sanctioned Categories 67
Transnationalism: Migration, Ideas, and Relocalization 78

V. Hispanidad Discourse (1930-1961): Rafael Leonidas Trujillo and the Shift away from *de Color* 80
Racial Views and Concepts 80
Racial Discourse and the Articulation of Racial and National Identities 84
Individual Identities and State-Sanctioned Categories 88
Transnationalism: Migration, Ideas, and Relocalization 106
Three Memos 112

VI. Mestizaje: The Dominant Contemporary Discourse Surrounding Race and Racial Identity in the Dominican Republic (1961-1989) 127
Racial Views and Concepts 128
Racial Discourse and the Articulation of Racial and National Identities 130
Individual Identities and State-Sanctioned Categories 139
Interview with Celia 141
The Cedulazation Process 146
Interviews 156
Transnationalism: Migration, Ideas, and Relocalization 168

VII. Mulutaje and Africanidad: Emerging Discourses Surrounding Race, Racial Experiences and Ancestry in the Dominican Republic (1989 - Present) 175

A. Mulutaje
Racial Views and Concepts 175
Racial Discourse and the Articulation of Racial and National Identities 176
Individual Identities and State-Sanctioned Categories 181
Transnationalism: Migration, Ideas, and Relocalization 187

B. Africanidad 192
Racial Views and Concepts 193
Racial Discourse and the Articulation of Racial and National Identities 193

Individual Identities and State-Sanctioned Categories 196
La Casa por la Identidad de la Mujer Afro (Identidad) 196
Transnationalism: Migration, Ideas, and Relocalization 205

VIII. Conclusion 212
Dominicanness, Race and Nation 213
Racial and National Identities in the Dominican Republic on the 'Ground' 217

Endnotes 223

Appendix A Interview Schedule 231

Appendix B Informal Interview Schedule 237

List of References 239

LIST OF TABLES

Table I	Santiago Population Census by Gender, 1903	68
Table II	1916 Santiago Census Santiago de los Caballeros	69
Table III	Nationality of Resident Foreigners in the City of Santiago de los Caballeros in 1916	70
Table IV	Nationalities in Santiago, 1903 and 1916	72
Table V	Race in the First National Census, 1920	73
Table VI	Race According To Province, 1920	74
Table VII	Religion According to Province, 1920	75
Table VIII	Nationalities, 1920	77
Table IX	National Population Census May 13, 1935	89
Table X	Foreigners (All Races) by Province, 1935	90
Table XI	Dominicans: Racial Categories, 1935	91
Table XII	Foreigners: Racial Categories, 1935	92
Table XIII	Color of the Dominican Population, 1950 Census	95
Table XIV	Race and Color of the Dominican Population, 1935 Census	96
Table XV	Race and Color in Comparison, 1935 and 1950 Census	97
Table XVI	Race and Color of the Dominican Population, by Gender in Comparison, 1935 and 1950 Census	99
Table XVII	Nationality, 1950 Census	101
Table XVIII	Nationality by Comparison, 1920 and 1950 Census	103
Table XIX	Religion, 1935 and 1950 Census	104

Table XX First Language, 1950 Census 105

Table XXI Cédula Color Categories 155

I. Introduction

Research Statement and Overview

This dissertation maps the process of nationness -- a sense of national belonging -- which finds expression in discourses involving ideas of race and color in the construction of a "mixed-race" identity. How is this type of nationness created? How is mixedness articulated? What is the relationship between structure and agency in this process? What is the outcome in terms of the categories in circulation to define people? How do people define themselves? How does this change over time and space? What is accepted, negotiated, and rejected and under what circumstances? All of these inter-related questions facilitate the mapping of nationness here in the dissertation.

While nationness, race, nation, and identity are central themes explored here in the dissertation, it is through discourses -- what people say, what is expressed, and what is written and recorded -- that provides the context of the research. This is to say that I am not grappling with ideas of race, nation, and identity per se as much as how they are used in the construction and configuration of nationness, and I use discourses as a point of entry. Race, nation, and identity are not concepts that stand alone. This is to say that they always, and perhaps only, find articulation in relation to other ideas, peoples, and places. Thus migration and transnationalism play a part in either introducing, reinforcing, or challenging existing ideas about nationness.

What does the migration of people and goods, of ideas and information, between and across national borders reveal, and simultaneously conceal, about the nature of the relationships between nation, race, and identity? This question has become central as the nation has emerged as a central analytic focus due to the massive movement of people across borders and as nations struggle to (re)imagine themselves in the face of such migrations, particularly where certain immigrants are viewed with suspicion and contempt.

In the social science literature, it is assumed as people move across national boundaries they leave and enter places with different histories and racial, ethnic, and national systems that shape identities (Basch *et. al* 1994). Given this type of movement across racial systems, racial identities may change since racial and national identities are mediated by time, place, and space. One of the major thrusts of my research was to find out if racial identities change in the sending country as a result of ideas in motion about racial systems. In this vein, I questioned the assumption that national and racial systems are self-contained in an era of heightened levels of bipolar migration and new forms of communication. So, I sought to examine the mutual influencing relationship between systems, and among actors, focusing on the sending country, with a primary receiving country as a backdrop.

Underpinning the theoretical assertions expressed here is an implicit assumption about the nature of identities; namely that they are not static or bounded, but rather are socially and historically contextualized constructs that give meaning to interpersonal and translocal systems of power (Kahn 2001). My research shows that new forms of

identity can and do emerge not only in the host country as we know, but also in the sending country, having an impact not only on how actors define themselves but also on how the state defines its "members" in racial and national terms. This leads to the configuration of nationness.

Nationness and Mixedness

In introductory anthropology classes, students often learn that people are products of their environments in terms of their cultural practices, religious expressions, and ways of defining themselves. Being a "product of a particular environment" suggests that there are forces at play that seek to shape the ideas and actions of people and that people themselves are interacting with these force. Becoming a product is a process involving place-specific histories and social relationships over time within different environments (e.g. family, school, church, etc.). This is to say that people come to have a sense of "who they are" based on different sets of relationships in different environments.

In particular, I examine the emergence of nationness in terms of "mixedness" in the case of the Dominican Republic and show that despite waves of immigration to the Dominican Republic, efforts were made to describe the majority of the population in mixed-race terms that continue today. To capture the essence of nationness, and in this case, Dominicanness, I use the idea of discourse in order to frame the idea and usage of mixedness. Discourses contain ideas of race and nation -- often defining Dominicanness in the newspapers, in conversations, in textbooks, in speeches, etc.

Specifically, I focus on how Dominicans (in the Dominican Republic) configure their racial identities and have configured them over time. I examine how the Dominican state has defined Dominicans and Dominicanness, [1] and how Dominicans, in turn, have defined themselves in relation to the state, each other and the United States. I underscore the relationship between race and nation, and structure and agency, in an attempt to examine the "relocalization" (Long 1996) of socioracial[2] identities due to transnational forces. I also examine the impact that transnational migration and other transnational projects (e.g. cable television, print media, and music, etc.) have on ideas of race in the Dominican Republic with respect to newly created categories and ways of describing "mixture" and *Dominicanidad* (Dominicanness). What emerges is a complex and sometimes contradictory labeling system with layers of meaning all contained within the competing discourses outlined here in the dissertation.

It is important to mention here that my point of entry was, and is, the ongoing construction and configuration of racial identities in the Dominican Republic, within historical and contemporary socio-cultural contexts, not transnational migration per se.[3] Nonetheless, such transnational migration experiences serve as a backdrop to explore how discourses have been created to address 1) how particular identities may change outside the Dominican Republic, and moreover, 2) the impact that such experiences have on "local" constructions and conceptions of racial and national identities in the Dominican Republic.

My data suggest that experiences in the United States, with respect to the U.S. racial system and its racial categories, are conveyed to relatives in the Dominican Republic

(e.g. through telephone conversations, television, and print media). In other words, like remittances, ideas about race are in transit, having an impact on "local" people's conceptions of themselves, one another, and the wider world.

In this vein, this dissertation offers a conceptual framework for understanding Dominicanness -- which I define as the "sense" of being Dominican in national and racial terms -- over time and space.[4] Until now, such a framework has not been proposed in social science literature. The conceptual framework stems from the data -- I moved from the data "up" to some of the larger conceptual and theoretical ideas and assertions. At the heart of the data are prevalent ideas surrounding race "mixture" in the formation of nation in the Dominican Republic. Importantly, mixture is a point of entry linking race, color, and nation in the articulation of Dominicanness, in similar yet competing ways.[5] These competing articulations find expression in discourses -- any thoughts/ideas, beliefs, words, and/or actions that have been/are expressed with regard to *being* Dominican. The discourses illuminate the changing importance of ancestry, history, place, and color as categories change and people make new claims about "who they are."

Based on my data analysis, I have created and named discourses that represent different periods -- all of the discourses define Dominicanness and contain ideas about race, nation, and mixture.[6] The discourses are presented and defined based on ethnographic and archival research in Santiago de los Caballeros, Dominican Republic.[7] Gente de Color (People of Color) and Hispanidad (Spanishness) are historical discourses which serve as the backdrop for the ideological construction period when ideas of race and nation were firmly planted from 1900-1961 (see below). The three contemporary

discourses, Mestizaje,[8] Mulutaje,[9] and Africanidad,[10] follow the historical discourses and detail how, and for what reasons, views of race and nation are changing.

Mestizaje has emerged within a "generational"[11] "mixed-race" discourse, with *indio*[12] as its primary race/color[13] category, and is coterminous with the historical discourse of Hispanidad. Mulutaje and Africanidad developed as "corrective" and oppositional discourses and often overlap in their articulation and categories. Conceptually, however, Mulutaje developed as a result of increased transnational migration of Dominicans and their racialized experiences in the United States -- *mulato/a* (mulatto) is its primary race/color category. Similarly, Africanidad developed due to increased transnational migration in combination with a "conscious" acceptance and articulation of African ancestry and alliances with other peoples of African "descent"-- *Afro-Dominicano/a* (Afro-Dominican) is its primary race/color category. This suggests that *indio*, *mulato/a*, and Afro-Dominican are competing racial/color identities in the Dominican Republic and are in circulation because of agentive forces -- increased migration, reflection, new forms of communication, and organization -- that call into question historical views and concepts of Dominicanness.

Each of the racial discourses is framed with references to ideas of race and nation and their interrelationship in the co-construction of racial/color identities especially in the construction of being a "mixed race people."[14] Thus, the larger anthropological, or social science issue, addresses the ways in which racial and color identities are then linked to nation during a time when there is increased migration across national borders and new forms of communication between people across borders. How are racial identities

redefined in the nation when people emigrate? How are they redefined when people immigrate and reside within its borders? What is the changing significance of nationness then over time and space, along the lines of race and color, and what contributes to this change?

In order to answer these broader questions, I examine the historical and contemporary situation in the Dominican Republic along these same lines. In each of the five discourses mentioned above, I ask the following questions to assess how the nation defines itself during different sociohistorical periods[15]: 1) What are the current racial and color views/concepts, and why have they emerged? 2) How are racial and national identities defined and articulated within the racial discourse? 3) How are people defined by the state and how do they define themselves? and 4) What is the status of transnational migration to and from the Dominican Republic in terms of actual migration, ideas and relocalization? In the final analysis, I examine the changing nature of these racial discourses and their confluence with a national imaginary.

Why an Anthropological Focus on Race?

In the April (1997) issue of the *Anthropology Newsletter*, race is raised as a topic of importance on the front page. In an effort to discuss race throughout the discipline, the editor is encouraging submissions for the upcoming academic year. Given the various definitions of race used by multicultural educators, journalists, and others, the editor is asking for the voices of anthropologists, who could bring their knowledge and expertise to

a variety of topics such as the implementation of a multiracial category on the U.S. Census in the year 2000, the racial labeling of remains during forensic cases, and the relationship between social race and racism, etc. At the end of the article, the editor claims that the discipline, as a whole, is ambivalent towards race, thus explaining the "silence" not only in terms of the literature but also in public discourse surrounding issues of race.

This silence is also reflected in anthropology departments around the country with regard to the canon. When the findings from the recent survey of anthropology departments were published, race was not mentioned as a topic to be explored as we enter the 21st century, ethnicity was.[16] Thus, I feel the need to address my interest in race given the recent debates surrounding race vs. ethnicity in the discipline.

By way of review, anthropologists have long been interested in human diversity (biological, cultural, and material) on a global scale (Baker and Patterson 1994; Harrison 1995; Blakey 1987; McKee 1993). At the turn of the 20th century, anthropologists made assumptions about race and racial groups as being biological, and the idea of race was used in anthropological theory and research.[17] Anthropologists stood firmly on the foundation that early biological scientists and evolutionists had created about race (Baker 1998).

Along these same lines, ideas had emerged in the 18th and 19th centuries about biological races which led (either consciously or unconsciously) to the justification of slavery, expansion, and colonization by those who exercised power over *Others* they sought to enslave and colonize. In fact, the making of the modern world cannot be fully explained without discussing the practice and application of ideas of biological race, with

regard to the various plantation economies that depended on such distinctions for division of labor, and its relationship to the subsequent racial hierarchies and racial structures that emerged in the New World. In other words, race became more salient during slavery throughout the Americas (Smedley 1993).

At end of the 20th century, and looking back in retrospect, we see that race was central to the founding of anthropology at the turn of the 20th century (Harrison 1995; Blakey 1987):

> The relationship between the anthropological discourse on race and the prevailing racial construct has been close and often reciprocal. The processes that construct race have also helped to shape the field of anthropology; anthropology, in turn, has helped to shape various racial constructs. The social context from which turn-of-the-century constructs of race emerged -- industrialization, poll taxes, public lynchings, unsafe working conditions, and Jim Crow segregation -- at the same time gave rise to a professional anthropology that espoused racial inferiority and, as a consequence, supported and validated the status quo (Baker 1998: 3).

Race was based on ideas of biological difference and was viewed as natural. However, as mentioned above, anthropologists have recently become ambivalent towards race and "silent" not only in terms of the literature but also in public discourse surrounding racial topics.[18] Clearly, there has been a paradigm shift during this century to replace race with ethnicity; the implication is that they are the same (or represent the same ideas) and that the processes of racial and ethnic formation follow the same trajectories. While some anthropologists of color continue to advance ideas about the importance of race (Harrison 1995; Blakey 1994, 1987; Baker and Patterson 1994; Gregory 1994), the discipline as a whole has embraced ideas of ethnicity (e.g. Eriksen 1993) as a way of describing cultural differences and group affiliation.[19]

For the purposes of the dissertation, I define race as a relational[20] sociocultural construct based on ideas of biological differences of both individuals and groups involving power, access to resources, and labeling practices within social and historical contexts. It is my position that, as a concept, race is not only necessary to examine the ways in which people have come to define themselves individually and collectively, but also in terms of understanding the past, inequality and differential access to resources, representation, and power relationships. While race still tends to encompass ideas of biological difference (e.g. skin color, hair texture, etc.), it also relates to people's everyday lives in terms of how others see them, how they see themselves, and the positive/negative experiences they have based on this perceived difference (e.g. racial profiling, occupational discrimination, etc.). In this way, people are socially marked -- in positive, negative, and neutral ways -- because of their different phenotypic characteristics. In other words, phenotypic differences have a social reality -- from the creation of categories describing certain mixtures, to structural inequality and unequal access, to information and resources.

While individuals and groups are socially marked and have different social realities, the recognition of such differences by the actors themselves often varies. In other words, those who are racially marked and named often "know" it because of the social realities they face as a result of such naming, whereas those who mark and name others do not always see themselves as being "raced" because of their vantagepoint. Frankenberg (1993), provides an example of this in her book on the social construction of whiteness when she reveals that Whites often don't see themselves as being raced; other people are raced.[21] She illustrates how race has shaped the lives of women in her sample in terms of

their social geography (e.g. neighborhoods, schools, churches, etc.) She provides an example of racial boundary maintenance when a White woman goes to a Black neighbor's house and does not sit down or does not drink from a Black person's glass. One point she raises in the book is that race shapes White women's lives and that whiteness is a position of structural advantage and a standpoint from which Whites view themselves and Others.

In the same way then, Black, White, *mulato, negro,* and *indio* are all different vantagepoints and positions of relative advantage and disadvantage at different points in time. Moreover, these represent different standpoints from which there are varying worldviews and experiences. Such differences are rooted in historical processes and circumstances, sometimes not directly involving the present-day actors. The relationships, categories, and distribution of wealth and resources, have their roots in long-standing ideas and interactions between actors who have preceded us in time (e.g. grandparents, great-grandparents, etc.). It is in this vein that I explore how ideas of Dominicanness emerged along with ideas of race and nation and how identities were constructed and articulated over time, in a homogenizing manner, leveling out differences in the Dominican Republic while simultaneously erasing similarities with Haiti.

My "Identity" in the Field[22]

The relative advantages and disadvantages of particular identities were more than academic or theoretical interests of mine. Indeed, how people in the field defined and identified me came to shape not only my research but who I understood myself to be on a

daily basis in a context that was so similar, and yet so different, than the one I came from in the United States. Therefore, before introducing the theoretical and conceptual ideas that frame the dissertation, I find it necessary to position myself and describe my experiences in the field as an African American woman and the ways in which I was defined by subjects:

> My greatest personal benefit came from a sense of belonging, a sense of place. People often insisted that I must have a Belizean ancestor somewhere in my past; when I denied this, they settled upon the idea that our ancestors must have come from the same area in Africa but ended up on ships with different destinations. Most ethnographers yearn for some degree of acceptance by those they study. Like them I too had hoped to become well regarded by my consultants, but I experienced more. I found an extension of solidarity based on color, common roots of oppression, and often gender (McClaurin 1996:16).

The experience that Irma McClaurin describes here is very similar to my own experience in the Dominican Republic where I found myself being absorbed into the collective Dominican body, often being referred to in terms that Dominicans use to describe themselves such as *la clarita* or *india clara* (light-skinned). Such terms stand in stark contrast to the terms typically used to describe Americans of European descent -- *gringo/a* or *Norte Americano/a* (North American) -- terms which automatically mark them as outsiders. To me these terms -*la clarita, india clara*- signify an acceptance of my phenotypic similarity which, for many Dominicans, means that I have to *be* Dominican. Importantly, these words are used by Dominicans in reference to Dominicans and, among other things, serve to reinscribe who a Dominican *is* and what they *look like*. Such terms

are seldom, if ever, used to describe White Americans, and this labeling process has important implications for the degree of access to Dominicans' inner lives.

My incorporation into Dominican society was neither seamless nor complete, of course, and my experiences speak to the complexity of Dominicans' notions of themselves. Because of my U.S.-Spanish accent, for example, people usually asked me if I was *de aquí o de allá* " from here or from there" (meaning the United States).[23] The construction of *here* and *there* is a way of conceptualizing a Dominican diaspora and relationships between Dominicans on the island and Dominicans in the United States. This construction may also be viewed as a narrative of authenticity, of who is Dominican and who is a *Dominican.*[24] Often Dominicans born *allá* are thought of as less Dominican, and this had important implications for me.

Because I was viewed as being a *Dominican* from "there" -- the U.S. was a place known locally for its racist practices -- many Dominicans who had never traveled there would ask me about my experiences as a Dominican woman with racism. Consequently, and interestingly, during the research experience, I realized that there was a mutual positioning taking place -- I was positioning Dominicans within the context of the "African Diaspora" while they were positioning me within a "Dominican Diaspora" -- recognizing both similarities and differences. Thus, while I was an African American woman in the field, I also *became* and accepted *india clara* and *mulata* identities in the Dominican Republic as this is how others defined me in like-relation to themselves.[25] The next chapter illustrates how I collected data and shows which data are presented here in the dissertation supporting the main arguments.

Dissertation Structure

The dissertation is divided into eight chapters. Both archival and ethnographic data will be presented throughout the dissertation in order to illustrate how these discourses have been shaped and how the relationship between race and nation actually worked in sync to shape identities over time. Following this introductory chapter, I link the research to larger theoretical issues involving the relationship between race and nation and the co-construction of racial and national identities within the realm of nationness. The chapter on methodology and procedures follows the theoretical chapter and outlines how the research site was selected along with background information about Santiago and the Dominican Republic, as well as stressing the methods that were used to collect data.

The rest of the dissertation analyzes the different racial discourses beginning with the historical chapter which sets the stage to further explore the three contemporary discourses in the context of race and nation. The chapters, Historical Construction of Dominicanness (Gente de Color) and Hispanidad (Spanishness), contain relevant archival and census data and indicate that Dominicanness encompasses ideas of mixture and long-standing generational history in the Dominican Republic -- Catholicism and Spanish language are also tied into Dominicanness where ideas of mixture are expressed. These historical chapters are then followed by two chapters exploring the contemporary competing discourses surrounding Dominicanness (Mestizaje, Mulutaje and Africanidad) using ethnographic and archival data.

Chapter eight, the final chapter, is the conclusion and pays particular attention to the complexities presented in the previous chapters and offers an overall summary and analysis. In the end, I offer another concept to consider mixture in Latin America and the Hispanic Caribbean -- Mulutaje -- as a more historically "accurate" way of describing African/Black and European/White mixture that we find in the Dominican Republic, for example. This would serve as a parallel concept to Mestizaje. Mulutaje offers a way to conceptualize mixture in the Dominican Republic in a way that Mestizaje cannot. Mulutaje gives meaning to *mulato* within particular historical and social contexts. If *mestizo* is the primary category within Mestizaje, then *mulato* is the primary category within Mulutaje. In the case of the Dominican Republic and other countries with similar histories with people of African descent, Mulutaje takes that history and experience into account.

II. Theoretical and Conceptual Framework

How to analytically capture and classify the very complex mixtures of peoples in the Americas has long challenged scholars. This becomes more complicated when there are different types of mixtures involved and competing claims about who people are. How do scholars classify mixture in a particular place? How do particular governments (the state) classify people? How do people classify themselves? And finally, how do we, as researchers and scholars, address all of these complimentary and sometimes competing classifications of people? This is the task at hand.

My research yields one thing in common -- that scholars, the state, and people themselves agree on one thing -- that they are "mixed." Scholars have at times defined Dominicans as *mulato*; the Dominican state has defined the majority of the population as *mestizo*; and Dominicans, most often, use the term *indio* to define themselves. Throughout the research, the most commonly expressed statement was "we are a mixed people." So, I begin with the idea of mixture, of being mixed race. This means that race is a part of the equation -- the belief in distinct biological groups -- making the idea of "mixed race" possible.

Five discourses frame the dissertation -- Gente de Color, Hispanidad, Mestizaje, Mulutaje, and Africanidad -- as a way of examining what people say about themselves, how the state writes about and records such information, and what is expressed in television and print media about Dominicanness and mixedness. In this way, discourse captures how people see themselves, what they know, and what they and others say

about them (Foucault 1979). From this vantagepoint, within the context of discourses, ideas of race, nation, and identity are all expressed. What comes together here in the discourses is how mixed race is tied to being and feeling Dominican -- bringing together racial and national identities. Again, what I offer in the end, is a concept that reconceptualizing race mixture in Latin America and the Hispanic Caribbean - the concept of Mulutaje.

Race and Nation

> To talk about nation, therefore, is to talk about race. We are coming to understand that concepts of nation and race can be usefully understood to be two poles of a single historical discourse. If at its core the concept of nation is oppositional and hierarchical, the nation stands in opposition to those defined as biologically different only by envisioning the nation as composed of those who are biologically similar (Basch, Schiller and Blanc 1994:37).

> World history has, arguably, been racialized at least since the rise of the modern world system; racial hierarchy remains global even in the postcolonial present; and popular concepts of race, however variegated, remain in general everyday use almost everywhere. Thus, any effective sociological theory of race seems to require, at a minimum, comparative historical and political components, some sort of sociology of culture or knowledge, and an adequate microsociological account (Winant 2000:170).

The 20th century represents a period of many transitions and shifts in which race and nation[26] have become more salient not only in the United States but in other countries as well.[27] There have been significant movements of ideas and people -- internal, regional, and international migration -- especially during the turn of the century as people crossed

borders in large numbers and entered new territories (Appadurai 1991, 1990; Basch et al 1994; Gilroy 1993; Kearney 1995; Long 1996). As a result of such peopled movements, nations have had to redefine themselves in terms of membership (e.g. citizenship), national belonging, and race -- in this way, the nation becomes analogous to the "people" of that territory (Wallerstein 1991).

I suggest here in the dissertation that the nation emerges as an important concern in the 20th century due to the massive movement of people across borders as it weds people in the formation of race and nation and co-constructs racial and national identities in the process of defining "nationness" (Medina 1997; Williams 1989). In other words, nationness is expressed along racial and national terms as lines are drawn and distinctions are made about a sense of belonging to a particular place or community within or across borders as research on transnational migration suggests (Duany 1996, 1994; Oboler 1995; Foster 1991; Georges 1991; Gold 1996; Grasmuck and Pessar 1991; Kearney 1995; and Basch et al 1994). In either way, a sense of belonging is established within or across borders.

Transnationalism may suggest a type of "in-betweenness" in that actors are between places and have competing responsibilities in different places. This in-betweenness also translates into competing, or at least multiple, identities people (re)cross borders and (re)define themselves (and are defined) in new ways. As Oboler (1995) suggests, state imposed classifications of immigrants to the United States often conflict with self and group definitions. She asserts that the ethnic designator "Hispanic" is often rejected by those who are classified as such for governmental purposes. The term

"Hispanic" was created after 1970 (after Puerto Ricans and Mexicans had already established their presence in the United States as "Puerto Ricans" and "Mexicans"). As immigration from Latin American countries increased, the United States found it necessary to classify this "group" of people. All of a sudden there was a flattening out of national differences in an effort to homogenize people from Latin America and the Spanish-speaking Caribbean.

While "Hispanic" as a category was (and is) contested, and while country of origin, "Latino/a" or other identity labels are preferred, Oboler suggests that actors use the "Hispanic" category in order to have access to state resources (e.g. housing, education, etc.). In this case, we see that actors position and define themselves due to varied social and economic circumstances.

Austerlitz (1997) provides another example of the nation in a transnational sense with respect to the transnational identity of Dominicans in New York City. One way in which a "Dominican" identity is articulated in New York is through the merengue (the national dance in Dominican Republic). The majority of Dominicans in the United States live in the Washington Heights section of New York. Given this clustering, Dominicans have long been defined as a transnational community (Austerlitz 1997; Grasmuck and Pessar 1991; Hendricks 1974). The statement "more 'Dominican' than Dominicans on the island" emerges from the literature as a way to describe the actions and practices of Dominicans in the United States (e.g. Dominican foods, music, dance, dress, etc.). Austerlitz illustrates how Dominicans use their social and cultural capital to (re)create spaces for identity "expression" in New York.

Whether nations are viewed as bounded or unbounded in not the main issue here because regardless of whether people are "within" borders or across borders, there are articulations of being a member of a community -- a community with certain "shared" characteristics. In other words, people define themselves and are defined as belonging (or not belonging) to a particular community across geographical spaces. In this way, the unbounded or bounded nation is "imagined" as Anderson (1991:6) posits in that "the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion." If this is the case, there have to be means of communicating or expressing this communion on a larger scale (e.g. national anthems, pledge of allegiance, holidays and other days of national reflection and remembrance, etc.). One of the ways that such ideas are communicated is through very public and ongoing discourses which can articulate the relationship between race and nation is a webbed one, linking biology, "culture," and peoplehood.

In this way, the imagined nation is simultaneously defined in racial terms in defining the nation. As Medina (1997) notes, "in linking territory with a sense of peoplehood, nationalist projects[28] homogenize difference by defining shared characteristics which mark the persons who inhabit that territory as the same "kind" of people (Medina 1997: 760). This suggests that when differences exist, they are actually homogenized in the formation of nationness and peoplehood. Foster (1991) asserts this type of homogenization takes place in the form of historical memory and the creation of a "we" as products and achievements of history.

I agree here inasmuch as homogenization takes place to create common history, like people and characteristics, however, it also appears that homogenization only encompasses certain "traits," histories, and "types" of people in the formation of peoplehood. Consequently, with the increased movement of people across borders, we find the articulation of a homogenized "we" in relation to a not-yet homogenized "they."[29] As mentioned above, as groups enter new territories, they often find themselves defined in new ways or attention given to their "place" of origin. The politics of naming is important as the nation redefines itself and as well as the people who enter and reside in its borders and identifies and labels the "friends" and "strangers" (Simmel 1950).

Brackette Williams (1989) examines the naming process and asserts that the dominant group always starts with itself and names everyone else from their vantagepoint. For example, in the United States, White Anglo-Saxon Protestants (the dominant group) names racial and ethnic groups in relation to themselves (the normative group which is both unnamed and unmarked). In this way then, the dominant group has the charge of homogenizing the nation and labeling *Others*. This is what happened in the United States and also in the Dominican Republic where a "light-skinned" elite named others in relation to themselves.

Ong (1996) offers another example. She posits that immigrants undergo either a whitening or blackening process when entering the United States and are treated differently based on their human capital (money, education, etc.) and social capital (family and other networks). To illustrate this, she uses the example of Asian refugees

and wealthy Chinese immigrants. Whereas the refugees were subjected to the "blackening" process, the wealthy Chinese immigrants were "whitened" due to their resources, education, and networks; in this way, they were not a "liability" like the refugees. The whitening and blackening process also points to social class and the status that immigrants are assigned based on their capital. In a similar way, in the Dominican Republic, Haitian immigrants are subjected to the blackening process while European immigrants are subjected to the whitening process.

This discussion is not to suggest that nation, or that the idea of the nation, is not contested by the actors themselves because there can be competing notions of nation. However, this discussion does suggest that while competing notions may exist, and while the ideas may be contested, that there are often forces in operation (e.g. the state)[30] seeking to create and define what the nation is. In so doing, the state can, through unifying methods (anthems, pledges of allegiance) create one idea of the nation that permeates society in schools and other institutions.

Returning to race, both Williams and Ong highlight the importance of race and a positioning that results from a recognition of difference. Social class and gender interact with race in this process of marking difference. As Higginbotham (1992) states "[l]ike gender and class, then, race must be seen as a social construction predicated upon the recognition of difference and signifying the simultaneous distinguishing and positioning of groups vis-à-vis one another. More than this, race is a highly contested representation of relations of power between social categories by which individuals are identified and identify themselves" (253).[31] Without doubt, there is a relationship between race and

social class in the above examples that show that some groups are first "raced" then "classed" while others are "classed" then "raced." I assert that one has to enter at a particular point, however, in order to make sense of such experiences and to see how these inequalities are related.

I enter at the point of race in the dissertation to illustrate what the discourses reveal about race (an in some cases, social class and gender as these are also integral parts of a person's lived experiences). It is not my intention, however, to rank systems of inequality such as race, gender, and class because they are all important -- I emphasize the importance of race along with other anthropologists who believe, because of history and social realities, that we need to reconsider race and the ideas that have shaped categories and lived circumstances. I also examine the anthropology of race in that race has been constructed differently in various parts of the world based on history, social circumstances, relationships of power and the people who define and create categories.

The United States is a backdrop in the dissertation as I present some of ways in which ideas of race in the United States are expressed in the Dominican Republic through cable television, print media, letters, etc. In comparison, the racial system in the United States has a different history than that of the Dominican Republic. In the United States, the idea of race is often viewed as a bi-polar racial construct in its definition and articulation (Davis 1991; Smedley 1993). Omi and Winant (1994) suggest that "[racial formation is] the sociohistorical process by which racial categories are created, inhabited, transformed, and destroyed (55)." This of course, is tied to historical events over time linking Blacks and Whites in the United States in a particular way, in a particular

relationship of power and resources (e.g. slavery, segregation, Civil Rights Movement, etc.).

This type of formation relates to the discussion of homogenization and imagination in that despite the presence and struggles of other groups in the United States, racial dynamics and identities are often homogenized and imagined as Black and White. Latinos in the United States often find themselves homogenized as "Hispanic" (Oboler 1995) and outside of the Black - White discourse on race. Although with more Afro-Latinos entering the United States, namely Dominicans, who are simultaneously defined as both Black and Latino, Afro-Latinos enter the bi-polar discourse on race in the United States (Torres-Saillant and Hernández 1998). In contrast, in the Caribbean, it has been argued, race is more fluid and not as rigid as we find in the United States (Rodríguez 1994; Safa 1998; Martínez-Echazábal 1998). However, as we will see among the complexities, while there are some differences, there are also similarities.

Nationness in Latin America and the Caribbean

The idea of nationness, a type of national belonging, that links people with a particular history, "culture," identity, and practice is changing in Latin America and the Caribbean due to transnational forces that serve as an impetus for new ideas, increased flow of people, technology, goods, and new forms of identities and alliances. In particular, the ways in which people are defined and define themselves are changing. Throughout the Americas, various categories were created during colonization to describe

the "newness" as a result of mixtures between European colonizers, enslaved Africans, and indigenous peoples (among others). This idea of mixture is a long-standing one and is based on ideas of biological difference (as discussed earlier with regard to race). Racial categories resulting from such mixtures have a corresponding social status[32] -- inferior or superior -- associated with them (Wade 1997; Baker 1998).

The early formation of nationness was rooted in a racial system that attached meaning to phenotypic differences as well as social class status[33] that has lingering effects today. I suggest, because of the history of slavery and plantation societies in the Americas, that nationness webs race with nation (the people), and is being reconfigured due to the interaction between external and internal forces as evidenced by changing racial and color categories and the articulation of "new" identities. In other words, defining the nation is an ongoing process depending on who is entering and leaving national borders, prompting redefinitions, changing categories and new identities.

Identity Construction

> [Identities] are relationships that are forged at particular loci where power, history, and sociocultural models merge with people and practice (Kahn 2001:2-3).

Identities are more than sociocultural constructions. Identities are created within certain and particular contexts and histories, involving inter-relationships and power. While people are defined by others as well as the state, they also define themselves (in similar or different ways) as identities are relational. Relational categories can emerge in

the form of binary oppositions such as Black and White (in the United States) or in the form of gradations of color as in Brazil, Venezuela, and the Dominican Republic for example.

Identity construction is an ongoing process by which "I" and "we" are understood, defined, contested, and possibly redefined. Such processes can be mapped by exploring how actors define themselves (and under which circumstances) and how they are defined by other actors as well as the state. This is done while contextualizing their experiences in order to understand how they, as individuals and/or a group, have been defined and situated over time while defining and situating themselves. By considering the situated/situating relationship, we begin to better understand contestation, struggle, power relations, and individual and collective action.

Mestizaje

A primary characteristic of race and nation in Latin America and the "Hispanic" Caribbean is *mestizaje*, or race mixing, which has long been associated with Latin America since colonization pointing to the encounters between Spaniards, indigenous peoples, and enslaved Africans. Martínez-Echazábal (1998) writes that *mestizaje* is a process of interracial and or intercultural mixing and is the "foundational theme in the Americas" (1998: 21). For her, *mestizaje* is tied to national identity and defining characteristics of nations in Latin America (e.g. *lo cubano*/the Cuban, *lo mexicano*/the Mexican, etc.) as well as cultural identities that are emerging throughout the region (e.g. Japanese Brazilians, Mexican Lebanese, Argentine Jews, etc.). I agree with Martínez-Echazábal here in the

sense that mestizaje is linked to national identity. I would add, however, that *mestizaje* also creates a particular racial type, or racial types, that are then associated with the nation and are defined according to the "type" of mixture.

As Safa (1998: 3) states "the Americas have long been an arena for extraordinary mixtures of cultures and peoples born of diasporas from Africa, Asia, and Europe. These mixtures have given rise to different racial constructions, known in the Caribbean as *creolization* and in Latin America as *mestizaje*, that have been used to syncretize and refashion race and ethnic mixture into distinct forms of national identity." By refashioning race and ethnic mixture, the nation itself is reconfigured. Safa continues:

> Latin American and Caribbean countries distinguished themselves from their European colonizers on the basis of their mulatto, mestizo, or creole identity, that is, as "new" and culturally and biologically mixed peoples (Safa 1998: 4).

The part that I want to underscore here is the idea of "newness" and mixed categories that represent different "types" of mixture. Both Martínez-Echazábal (1998) and Safa (1998) juxtapose *mestizaje* with the racial binarism of the United States where the bipolar black-white racial construct, and its relationship to hypo-descent (commonly referred to as the "one drop rule") that defines anyone with "one drop" of African "blood" as Black (e.g. Davis 1991).

Davis (1991) asserts that the Black category and position is "...the one [that is] occupied in the United States by all persons with any black ancestry. The one-drop, or hypo-descent, rule assigns all such persons to the status of the subordinate group, which

in this case means blacks" (Davis 1991:113). Offering an explanation for why this racial system was established, he continues by saying that "American slave owners wanted to keep all racially mixed children born to slave women under their control, for economic and sexual gains, and that to define such children as anything other than black became a major threat to the entire system" (Davis 1991: 113-14). I return to this point when discussing some of the differences during the slavery period in the Americas with respect to intermediate racial categories.

Using the United States as a backdrop to examine *mestizaje* in Latin America, Martínez-Echazábal (1998) and Safa (1998) suggest that *mestizaje* is more fluid while hypodescent is more rigid. It should be mentioned that the United States did not always have a bi-polar racial system. In fact, at different points in time, the system was more similar to Latin America in terms of racial classifications until the turn of the 20th century. According to Lee (1993), the Black population in the United States was divided into four categories on the 1890 census (Black, Mulatto, Quadroon, and Octoroon) until there was concern over the status of mixed race people in the south (Lee 1993; Williamson 1980; Davis 1991). Enumerators for the 1890 census were given the following instructions and definitions (Lee p. 77):

> "black" should be used to describe those persons who have three-forths or more black blood; "mulatto" those persons who have from three-eighths to five-eighths black blood; "quadroon" those persons who have one-eighth or any trace of black blood (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1989, p. 36).

Thus, before the turn of the 20th century, the U.S. had a more "fluid" racial system in terms of the categories that "traced" African ancestry and "blood." In 1900, however, the racial classifications dropped from eight categories (with half of them classifying the Black population), to five -- mulatto, quadroon, and octoroon were eliminated. Mulatto was reintroduced for two more census years, in 1910 and 1920; 1920 was the last time mulatto was recorded on the census (Lee 1993). However, fluid "folk" categories remained in the United States within the Black community as a way of describing color even though official intermediate categories have been dropped.[34] Hypo-descent developed during slavery and became more firm in a post-emancipation, Jim Crow segregation period where access was permitted or denied and housing and education were restricted based on White or Black status -- cementing the bi-polar white-black racial construction we have and experience today in the United States to a large extent (Davis 1991).

While the intermediate category of mulatto ceased to be an official category after 1920 in the United States, intermediate categories remained, and grew in number, in Latin America and the Caribbean -- the number of categories contribute to the idea of fluidity in the region compared to rigidity in the U.S. However, some similarities remain. In theory and practice, both *mestizaje* and hypo-descent contain ideas about blood in terms of race being passed down through blood lines, creating "mixed-blooded" individuals. "Purity" of blood is equated with a pure "un-mixed" race; thus, "mixed-blooded people" were considered to be "less pure" (Wade 1997). Here, blood is used as a symbol and to symbolically represent *mestizaje* (Smith 1997).

In Latin America and the Caribbean, Blacks (Africans) and Indians were considered inferior to Whites (Europeans), and one strategy used to physically erase their presence was to incorporate their offspring into a larger group of "new" people (Wade 1993). Often referred to as *mestizo* or *mulato*, these new groups were seen as different from both Whites and Blacks and occupied a different social status somewhere betwixt and between the two bipolar groups. In effect, the practice of whitening, *blanqueamiento*, in a larger context, sought to erase the Black presence (Wade 1993: 298) in the creation of a new people.

I suggest then, in terms of nationness, that the process of *mestizaje* creates a "new" people who are then associated with a particular place (e.g. Colombia, Venezuela, Brazil, the Dominican Republic, etc.). Thus, the formation of a national identity depended on the success of *mestizaje* in a biological and cultural sense. In some countries, *mestizaje* implied racial democracy, or racial equality, in the absence of "pure" or distinct races. Brazil and Venezuela are two countries that are said to have racial democracies in social science literature -- Venezuelans have been described as "cafe con leche" (coffee with milk) (Wright 1990). Along with mixture brought new social definitions to describe such mixture -- thus, new social groups emerged. These groups have names, historically, largely due to biological characteristics -- thereby becoming racialized groups.

Therefore, the process of *mestizaje* is distinctly linked to race and nation in the formation of a "new" race of people who then represent the nation itself. Importantly, while *mestizaje* produces a "new" people, along with new racial categories and ideas of mixture, it does not have a complete homogenizing effect as there are remaining groups

that claim Indian or Indigenous, Spanish Creole, and Black identities. Some people who claim these identities and other identities may be able to claim different ones based on whether or not their identity is affirmed by others (Domínguez 1994). I return to this point later in the dissertation when I describe how some Dominicans claim *indio*, Afro-Dominican, and Black identities based on how others in a particular group define them.

Mixture, Status, and Peoplehood in the Americas

Wade (1997) suggests that by the time of the Atlantic slave trade and formation of the New World, European colonizers already had firm ideas of who Africans were although they didn't know about Native Americans:

> "[a]t the time when the Spanish and Portuguese arrived in the New World, Africans were a well-known category of person. Some of this knowledge derived from classical texts, religious sources and travellers' tales; but some of it derived from direct contact with Africa, by virtue of voyages of exploration down the West African coast from the 1430s which had resulted in African slaves entering Lisbon from the 1440s" (25).

Wade goes on to say that both Africans and Indians were considered inferior to the Europeans and were assigned a social status (or location) based on prejudicial beliefs. The inferior status of Africans and Indians translated into types of work and labor (e.g. enslaved, indentured, etc.) that is still evidenced today despite emancipation and racial "democracies." In general, ideas of racial difference justified the formation of a stratified society in the United States (Baker 1998) and throughout the Americas -- such ideas of

differences web race and class in the present day reality in Latin America. As Martinez-Alier (1989:80) suggests:

> By the nineteenth century it had become well established that African origin implied slavery. The Cuban economy run with slave labour perpetuated colour prejudice as a conventional device to justify slavery. The criterion chosen to classify the population hierarchically was physical appearance and particularly skin colour, this initially being the most consistent and also the most salient difference between the two groups.

In can be argued that in Cuba, and in other Hispanic countries as well, that the social class and social status hierarchy was established along racial and color lines. Class is often evident when examining differences in Latin America, but what may be less evident is the racial foundation on which the class system is based. I am not arguing against class as much as I'm arguing that class alone does not paint a complete portrait of the experience. Entering at the point of race, one can explore the ways in which class and gender interact with race. I agree with Torres (1998: 288) when she asserts:

> In the past, scholars who compared the racial-color continuum in Latin America and the Spanish-speaking Caribbean to the racial bifurcation in the United States and elsewhere demonstrated how race and class are interrelated (Hoetink 1967, Mintz 1971, Duany 1985). However, for the most part, these scholars argued that class relations in Latin America and the Spanish-speaking Caribbean took precedence over race relations, and thereby they failed to analyze how discourses about class relations euphemize race and provide a means to deny the existence and persistence of racist practices.

For me, social class is tied into ideas of race and rooted in the colonial period when people were assigned a particular social status (class based) due to their perceived racial difference. Throughout the Americas, Africans seemed to have the lowest social status when compared to American Indians (Wade 1997), the Chinese (Martinez-Alier 1989),

and East Indians (Segal 1993). In this way, labor was divided along the lines of racial "types," and what type of work people could perform.

For instance, cutting sugar cane is a very labor intensive task that is often defined as "Haitians' work" in the Dominican Republic (Martinez 1999). In interviews, I ascertained that there were other job-related tasks that were defined as "Haitian" or "Dominican." For example, during large construction projects (e.g. an apartment building), Haitian immigrants are typically doing the most labor intensive work involving carrying building materials and working with cement while Dominicans do more of the detailing work such as painting. This type of work site serves as a microcosm for examining Dominican-Haitian relations in terms of actual work assignments, ideas of "who does what," and social status.

Haiti is, of course, a nation-state, and a person from Haiti is defined as Haitian. Children born of Haitian parents in the Dominican Republic are considered to be Haitian or Dominico-Haitian, not Dominican. Haitians' social status in the Dominican Republic is still that of immigrant. As discussed earlier, immigrants are often racialized as they enter a new country or territory. The experience of Haitians, as immigrants, in the Dominican Republic vis-à-vis immigrants from Europe has been completely different.

Linking Haitians with an agrarian past (as well as a past with slavery) Moya Pons (1995) discusses the association of Haitians in the Dominican Republic with sugar. He talks about the agrarian, cattle-ranching, society that the Dominican Republic experienced after the Spanish Creoles[35] left the Dominican Republic during the turn of the 20th century. These Spanish Creoles emigrated to other countries in the region leaving much of

the sugar production activities in Haiti (I discuss this period in the historical chapter). Moya Pons asserts that slavery continued in Haiti after a period of decline in the Dominican Republic (although it was still a slave society). This cattle ranching period continued to witness stratification although poor Spanish Creoles, mulattos, and Blacks were considered to be more or less in the same economic situation and involved in trade with Haiti.

The role of race, as a structuring agent, was very important throughout the Caribbean to maintain a racial hierarchy and division of labor. The racial, and structural, inequalities persist today despite efforts to advance racial democracy theories. Harris (1964), Hoetink (1985, 1970, 1967), Mörner (1967) and others have contributed to our understanding of race relations in the Caribbean. Again, at present, the literature often reflects the conflation of race and class in the Caribbean. "There are no racial problems in the Caribbean, only class problems" or "we don't ask for race on our census, so we are not racist." These are common, yet problematic, statements. If we consider the historical processes that created racial inequality in the Caribbean, can we say that race is not an issue because official categories no longer exist? What about the social structures? This is not to suggest that there is not a correlation between race and class because there is; those at the bottom of the socio-economic ladder are dark-skinned -- many socioracial categories continue to reinscribe such a status, as we will see in subsequent chapters.

Stratification in the Dominican Republic soon reflected a color order as it did in other places in the Americas. As stated earlier, mixture created an intermediate social status for people who came to be defined as such. The categories often conveyed a sense

of in-betweenness. Throughout the Americas, there were, and still are, ways of defining and classifying mixture, based on race, along the lines of color. These categories, while constructed and relational must also be affirmed by others -- affirmation is a key aspect to the articulation and assertion of identities. I agree with Dominguez (1994) when she states:

> I take the position that social identities do not exist without public affirmation. Social identifies are simply not who we are genetically nor how we as individuals think about ourselves. They are, I contend, conceptions of the self, constructed in time and place both epistemologically and socially in opposition to other such selves (10).

The idea of identities needing to be affirmed is especially relevant later in the dissertation when I discuss how socioracial categories find expression in different places and among groups that affirm different types of identities at different points in time. The following examples provide a regional comparison of racial and color categories emphasizing the ways in which certain identities are affirmed. In the end, this comparative backdrop will illuminate the Dominican Republic as unique case with respect to the intermediate categories, historical memory of slavery, and affirmation of identities.

Venezuela[36]

Socioracial categories such as *pardo*, *casta*, *zambo*, *mulatto*, *moreno*, and *negro* have been used at different points in time in Venezuela to define, position, and quantify peoples of African descent. However, at present, official categories no longer exist, and

the census no longer records or reports race, and as a result, Venezuela now claims to be a country without racial distinctions, a racial democracy -- the term that is often used to characterize Venezuela and Brazil.[37]

The analogy of "cafe con leche" (coffee with milk) is often used as a metaphor of the mixture that has resulted from years of whitening practices. Venezuela is imagined[38] to be a country of mixture with no racial divisions and no ideas of black pride or négritude. Venezuela, like other countries that practiced whitening in the Americas (*blanquemiento*), expressed ideas of "marrying up" (marrying a person with a lighter skin tone) to "lighten" to "improve the race." Ideas surrounding marrying up also exist in the Dominican Republic (and have existed in the Black community in the United States). To encourage *blanquemiento* state policy encouraged emigration from Europe in 1830 and banned Black migration during the same time period to ensure white physical dominance and reinforce "lightening" on a larger scale. Similar immigration restrictions were made in the Dominican Republic to curb Black migration.

Thus, *blanquemiento* was the biological strategy, as it was in Puerto Rico (Torres 1998) and the Dominican Republic. The cultural strategy in Venezuela involved attaching negative values to blackness and positive values to whiteness. For example, the folklore undermined the self-esteem of Blacks and reminded Venezuelans of African decent of their origin as slaves as depicted in cartoons, jokes, and comic strips (Wright 1990: 45). Therefore, Afro-Venezuelans were effectively reminded of their ancestry, racial heritage, as well as their social location and place in society -- this despite not having racial categories on the census. This is one key difference between Venezuela and the

Dominican Republic. Such negative values and stereotypes were not linked to "mulatto" or dark-skinned Dominicans -- they were instead linked to Haitians. Dominicans were not reminded of their ancestral ties to slavery -- they were reminded of Haitians' past with slavery.

Belize

In 1991, Belize had the following "ethnic" census categories: Mestizo, Creole, Garifuna, Ketchi Maya, Mopan Maya, Other Maya, Indian, German/Dutch Mennonite, White, Chinese, Syrian, and Other (Medina 1997:768). These categories reflect the perceived differences surrounding difference in culture, language or ancestries:

> The Creole category is associated with black identity and 'mixed' ancestry, 'of which at least some element is African' (Judd 1992, p. 172). The Garifuna (formerly labelled Black Carib) embrace a 'mixed' identity attributed to the physical and cultural amalgamation of free Africans into indigenous Carib society in the eastern Caribbean. Mopan, Kekchi and Yucatecos often invoke distinct, language-based identities, though some Mopan and Kekchi leaders have been working to establish an overarching Maya identity. Persons who self-identify as Spanish are officially labelled Mestizo, a Spanish word which refers to mixed indigenous American and European ancestry. Several smaller officially enumerated categories - Indian, Chinese, Syrian, Mennonite, and White - are less central members of the nation (Medina 1997: 758).

Isolating the Creoles and Garifuna, Medina suggests that language, place, and origin are markers of differentiation between these two groups. Interestingly, both groups are of African descent -- one claims to be descendant of "free" Africans (Garifuna) while the other claims to be descendants of "enslaved" Africans (Creoles). Also, the Garifuna claim indigenous ancestry (Carib), and this is an important part of their identity as Medina

(1997) asserts. I wonder if the status of being free or enslaved played a role in their relational identities over time (based on whether or not their African ancestors were enslaved or not). I will explore this idea later when I discuss the relationship between Dominicans and Haitians, where free vs. enslaved status, and claims of indigenous ancestry, I think, have been germane to racial formation in the Dominican Republic.

Ecuador

Radcliffe and Westwood (1996) explore nation, place and identity in Ecuador. Like Mexico, Ecuador is imagined to be a "*mestizo*" nation, and Afro-Ecuadorians are marginalized as a result of falling outside of the national imagination. Mestizaje was integral in the creation of the *mestizo* (1996: xii):

> [T]he ideology and practice of creating new 'races', through miscegenation; under the myth of mestizaje, the majority of the national population were to be mestizos and become the new Latin America.
>
> [Mestizo/a is] a person with both Spanish (or European) and indigenous heritage.

Here, Radcliffe and Westwood make a claim similar to Wade (1993, 1997) that the term "*mestizo*" is derived from the concept of mestizaje, and that Latin America is often imagined as a "*mestizo*" formation. Thus, people of African descent (Afro-Americans) are often marginalized not only in terms of lived experiences but also in terms of much of the research on race mixture and identity.[39]

Radcliffe and Westwood use the concept of "geographies of identities" to talk about space and the locations of people to certain places (e.g. the coast, the interior, etc.). This idea is similar to Jackson and Penrose (1993) and Frankenberg (1993) in that place is used to convey a sense of physical location but also a particular relationship to that place and an identity that stems from "being" in/from that place. This type of association is similar in Puerto Rico and in the Dominican Republic where people in different regions are considered to have certain characteristics and a particular identity. When presenting the racial groups in Ecuador, they do so by region (Sierra and Coast). They list the following racial categories: Whites, Indigenous, Mestizos, Mulattos, and Blacks (p. 69). In Ecuador, as in Mexico, *indio* is a derogatory word denoting "backwardness" and is thus not used as a category.

Puerto Rico

According to Duany (1998), there are three primary "physical" types in Puerto Rico: White, Black and mulatto. In addition to skin color, these categories are defined by hair texture as well as facial features. Despite the categories, it has been argued the racial/color spectrum in Puerto Rico is fluid and is more of a continuum, or "rainbow" (Rodríguez 1989). Like the Dominican Republic, there are ways of describing color that fall outside of these three primary categories (e.g. *trigueño*, *moreno*, *indio*, *prieto*, etc.). And also, like the Dominican Republic, there is an intermediate category of mulatto -- this is a primarily difference between the Dominican Republic, Puerto Rico, and the United States:

> The main difference between Puerto Rican and North American models of racial stratification is not the treatment of blacks -- who are accorded a subordinate status in both societies -- but rather the mixed group. In Puerto Rico, light mulattos often pass for whites, whereas in the United States, this intermediate racial category does not even exist officially (Duany 1998: 154).

The naming of an intermediate category, I think, has been instrumental in the construction of peoplehood in places that have and use such a category. By this I mean that the intermediate categories of *mulato*, *indio*, *mestizo*, etc. point to the emergence of a new people with particular experiences.[40] It can be argued that mulatto in Latin America, while capturing a sense of mixture, is also a social position or location that has ancestral ties to a "free status" during slavery. This was not necessarily the case in the United States -- being mixed did not guarantee freedom, so mixed people, mulattos, were often enslaved although they might have performed different tasks and in different physical spaces (e.g. the field slave vs. the house slave). I contend that the lack of an intermediate category for the majority of the 20th century in the United States created a larger Black community with a common history of slavery albeit varied experiences due to color and social class based on their mixed or un-mixed status.[41]

The idea of mixture also played a role in shaping ideas of integration and equality (which are largely false):

> Puerto Rican nationalist practices draw upon an ideology of mestizaje (the sancocho) that is rooted in the blend of Spanish, indigenous, and African cultures. Upon first glance, it appears that a national emphasis on mestizaje in Puerto Rico promotes processes of social integration; however, this is still a hyper-privileging

> of individuals of European descent with phenotypic features associated with "whiteness" (Torres 1998: 286).

The "hyper-privileging" practices that Torres describes here also takes place in the Dominican Republic. The emphasis on mestizaje and the intermediate racial categories place "mixed looking" or lighter people in relation to darker skinned people. The relationship becomes a contrast where distinctions are made about the perceived social status of the person based on phenotype and other markers (such as dress, language, etc.).

In general, the above discussion paints a broader picture of a region and widespread practices. In this vein, the Dominican Republic emerges as a unique site to examine the co-construction of racial and national identities because of its relationship with Haiti. From "*mestizo*" vs. "*negro*," the Dominican Republic sheds a different light on how nationness was defined and configured, and is being reconfigured due to agentive practices as well as transnational forces interacting with "national" ones in the reconfiguration of Dominicanness.

As in other places in Latin America and the Hispanic Caribbean, race and nation are webbed in the formation of nationness. In the Dominican Republic "being mixed" has been, and continues to be, tied to 'being' Dominican. Mixture, or the idea of mixture, is a "given" -- and the discourses surrounding mixture compete in defining of mixture itself. This is especially true of Mestizaje and Mulutaje. Africanidad is less concerned about defining the mixture -- it recognizes mixture, but more importantly, it seeks to recapture the African past. The idea of mixture is a key concept throughout the dissertation.

Nationness, Race and Nation in the Dominican Republic: Exploring Dominicanness

In the dissertation, I illustrate how racial and national identities have been co-constructed and articulated in the Dominican Republic, throughout the 20th century, and describe the ways in which Dominican actors are currently redefining themselves, along the lines of race and color, based on different life experiences, transnational migration experiences, as well as relationships and linkages they maintain outside of the Dominican Republic. In addition, I assess the impact that migration and other transnational projects have on ideas about race in the Dominican Republic in terms of newly created categories and ways of describing mixture and *Dominicanidad* or Dominicanness.

While mestizaje, as race mixture, is applicable in the dissertation when I describe the ways in which Dominicans defined themselves over time -- even as *mestizo* -- I suggest that in the case of the Dominican Republic, it is necessary to conceptualize mixture in a different way. For me, mestizaje, as an overarching conceptual idea, is problematic when addressing mixture in the Dominican Republic where like in Cuba, Puerto Rico, Venezuela, Brazil, and Colombia, there are people of African descent as "*mestizo*" (as a term) is derived from mestizaje. Instead, the conceptual idea that brings together all of the "ancestries" and subsequent categories that we find in a place like the Dominican Republic is one that emerges from the mixture in terms of the creation and embodiment of race/color categories.

Therefore, I suggest the concept of Mulutaje as a way of describing and analyzing the race/color categories that emerge as a result of African/Black - European/White mixture, and I introduce the term "colorization" as a way of describing and analyzing color categories within a particular racial category. Conceptually, colorization is similar to mestizaje in that its point of departure is also race mixture, but it diverges in that it is linked to "of color" discourses and categories such as "colored," "light," and "dark" and implies African ancestry. Furthermore, what has emerged in the Americas, especially among communities of African descent, as a result of mixture, is the proliferation of categories that attempt to describe color. Color categories are often defined within and across groups and are linked to history, ancestry, and race.[42] This is especially relevant as the dissertation focuses on race/color categories, identities, and their webbed relationship to race and nation.

Arguments in the Dissertation Related to the Dominican Republic

Sancocho. Mezcla. Liga. These are a few of the ways in which Dominicanness is articulated. Sancocho is a national dish and culinary favorite for family gatherings and celebrations. Similar to a gumbo or stew, sancocho is filled with various ingredients -- chicken, potatoes, yucca, plantains, etc. -- and is often used as a metaphor to describe the mixture associated with being Dominican. *Mezcla* and *liga* refer to a combination of groups and mixture and are commonly used when referring to race in the Dominican Republic -- it is the idea that Dominicans are a "mixed race" people.

In the chapters that follow here in the dissertation, I argue that 1) Since the Dominican Republic is often imagined to be a country where people are of "mixed" ancestry, Dominicanness has been constructed along the intermediate lines of *mestizo/indio/mulato* -- having excluded, historically and contemporaneously, different immigrant groups -- in order to define and construct a "Dominican" national identity along the lines of color, religion, and language; 2) Racial categories, used in and before 1935, were replaced with color categories in 1950, where *mestizo* (racial category) was substituted with *indio* (color category) in order to construct a national identity encompassing color as a contemporary defining characteristic of Dominicanness; and 3) It a combination of actual migration to/from the United States and ideas about race "entering" the Dominican Republic from the United States that contribute to the emergence of new racial/color identities in the Dominican Republic, affecting both migrants and non-migrants in similar ways.

III. Research Site, Methodology and Procedures

The Caribbean as a Culture Area Within Anthropology

The Dominican Republic is geographically located in the Caribbean Sea and is physically a part of what we have come to refer to as "the Caribbean." As a geographical area, the Dominican Republic has much in common with neighboring countries in the region (history of plantation economies, slavery, migration, etc.). This section conceptually links the Dominican Republic with countries in the region to shed light on how racial and national identities were configured over time and space.

Caribbean as Open Frontier

Michel-Rolph Trouillot (1992) suggests that Caribbean Region is an open frontier in anthropological theory. This statement begs the question, "why is the Caribbean just now open to anthropological theory?" In his review article, Trouillot asserts that anthropologists have only recently become interested in the Caribbean as a culture area because of how the Caribbean was first imagined and constructed by scholars. He gives his article as an example; it is the first review article on the Caribbean to appear in the *Annual Review of Anthropology.*

Unlike Africa and Asia, for example, the Caribbean was not viewed as an "isolated" and "remote" area. Moreover, it was not "pure" and "in tact" as African and Asian countries were "imagined" to be. More specifically, with a history of genocide of

indigenous peoples, enslavement of Africans and indentured Asian laborers, Trouillot claims that the Caribbean was not "Western" enough for sociologists and not "native" enough for anthropologists. The idea of "mixture" and heterogeneity, with different peoples coming into contact with one another and "mixing blood and cultures," contributed to the avoidance of the Caribbean as a culture area until recently. This may have contributed to the paucity of research and subsequent publications focusing on such issues as identity in the Dominican Republic.

This is not to suggest, however, that all anthropologists have avoided the region because this is untrue. Early contributions included Melville Herskovits (e.g. "New World Negro" and "Africanisms") and Zora Neale Hurston (Afro-American folklore). Julian Steward's work on Puerto Rico (1965) influenced many of his students to continue research in the region. Sidney Mintz, one of Steward's students, and one of the pioneers in this area, conducted research in the Caribbean and contributed to what would later be referred to as "Afro-American" anthropology (Mintz and Price 1976). The work of R. T. Smith (1973), on family and kinship in the 1960's, with a particular emphasis on matrifocality (mother-centered households), found its way into Afro-American anthropology combining race and gender in explaining Black women's roles and position within their households.

Afro-American Anthropology

The Caribbean was, at once, termed "Afro-America" within Anthropology. Herskovits, DuBois, Hurston, and Turner were all instrumental in creating a foundation

for Afro-American Anthropology (Houk 1993). In the mid-20th century, Herskovits suggested that anthropologists be concerned with African derived "culture" in the New World in terms of retentions and syncretism (Houk 1993). This focus later shifted to explore peoples of African descent in the Americas (primarily the Caribbean) with regard to Afro-American cultural practices.

Whitten and Szwed (1970) introduced Afro-American Anthropology to the discipline in 1970 with their edited volume *Afro-American Anthropology: Contemporary Perspectives.* In the introduction, Mintz states that "Afro-American" can refer to biological and cultural phenomena while "Afro-Americana" refers to culture. Whitten and Szwed also suggested that the focus should be on culture since groups mutually influence each other. Since the publication of that volume, much has been written in an attempt to redefine the Caribbean as "Afro-America," explore family structures (e.g. matrifocality), as well as trace some of the "Africanisms" (e.g. religions (Haitian Vodou, Brazilian Candomble, Cuban Santería, etc.), music, beliefs and rituals, and other "cultural" practices).

The issues surrounding biology and culture were not only prevalent in academic circles but also in "American" communities where naming practices and labels were contested. For example, in the United States in the late 1980s, Jesse Jackson and others met and discussed the relevance of the racial category "Black.[43]" This meeting led to the group proposing a change in nomenclature from Black to African American. "Black" had been historically constructed as a racial/biological category while African American

represented an ethnic/cultural category and mirrored the hyphenated identities of White ethnics (e.g. Polish-American). Thus, African American became an ethnic category.

There has been a proliferation of "Afro" identities throughout the Americas and the ways in which scholars describe peoples of African descent as a result of this shift in the United States. Interestingly, while the change in the United States stems from group reflection based on a particular history, experience, and set of relationships, "Afro" became a way of describing all people of African descent in the Americas -- this was an unintended outcome.[44] Consequently, Afro-American Anthropology was reconceptualized in this process.

Houk (1993) describes the webbed relationship between the emergence of "African American" as category for a particular group of people and how this change altered Afro-American Anthropology. In fact, Mintz and Price (1976) changed the title of their book in response to the name change from *The Birth of Afro-American Culture* to *The Birth of African-American Culture*. Houk suggests that Afro-American Anthropology had been more in line with culture before changing its name to African American Anthropology (in concert with the category change), and in effect, moved away from culture toward race. This is interesting in that the category shift, as a group marker, moved away from the racial marker of Black to the ethnic marker of African American. African American Anthropology, in my view, still maintains a link to "culture," but the difference now is reflected in linking people with their history, experiences, and their cultural practices -- webbing ideas of culture and biology.

In line with globalization and the proliferation of ideas, when a new category is introduced, as was the case with "African American," it became a new marker for a particular group with a particular history, but at the same time, it became a way of describing people of African descent throughout the New World and is used throughout Latin America and the Caribbean today. This is evidenced by groups defining themselves as Afro-Latino, Afro-Caribbean, Afro-Dominican, and even African American (as a way of talking about being of African decent in the Americas).

A Caribbean Research Site: Santiago de los Caballeros, Dominican Republic

I have grown quite familiar with, and fond of, Santiago de los Caballeros (Santiago) over the past six years -- this was my third fieldsite visit. I first went to Santiago in 1993, while at Iowa State University, to conduct research for my master's thesis. During that time, I had a university affiliation with La Pontificia Universidad Católica Madre y Maestra (PUCMM), a private Catholic and prominent university in Santiago, and worked closely with Carmen González, who at the time, was the Director of the Women's Studies program at (PUCMM). I also met and had on-going discussions with some of the faculty members associated with the Council on International Educational Exchange (CIEE) about my research interests.

The personal and professional contacts that I made in 1993 have been very instrumental during the course of my graduate study at Michigan State University, in terms of general assistance in the field with introductions, discussions as well as feedback.

I returned to Santiago in 1995 to conduct a pre-dissertation research pilot study focusing on race, color categories, and identity, with a particular focus on women. Thus, my dissertation research, from May to November of 1998, to some degree, was longitudinal in scope as I was able to build on previous conversations and interviews and expand relationships with key individuals who then became cultural consultants during the dissertation research. While Santiago was my primary fieldsite during the dissertation research, I also made occasional trips, however, to Santo Domingo, Puerto Plata, and the Dominican-Haitian border which provided opportunities to have informal interviews with people outside of Santiago.[45]

Santiago is located in the northern region of the Dominican Republic in a mountainous region and proudly claims to be the first Santiago of America -- as displayed by the Rotary International sign at the entrance of the city. In general, the Dominican Republic, touts itself as the first Spanish settlement in the New World and takes great pride in that fact as evidenced by the historic buildings and monuments in Santo Domingo. I conducted ethnographic and archival research in Santiago. As the second largest city in the country, Santiago is a dynamic place as it has witnessed large numbers of out-migration to the United States (a primary sending region) as well as in-migration from the *campo* or rural area into Santiago and surrounding areas.

Since 1968, the Dominican government has been attempting to decrease the growth rate by implementing family planning programs and by encouraging emigration to the United States. As a result, many Dominicans migrated to New York City and continue to do so. In 1990, 60.4% of the population lived in urban areas following

extensive rural to urban migration that took place during the 1970s. Because of the massive rural to urban migration, many cities are, at present, over-crowded.

In terms of unemployment, the overall rate was 28% in 1994. Despite the unemployment rate, women migrating from rural areas have more employment opportunities than men as they typically find work in one of the free trade zones (factories), local stores, as "marchantas" (women who sell produce in neighborhoods -- a Santiago phenomenon), or as housekeepers. There are various job openings for women in the free trade zones as they are sought because of the need to sew shirts, pants, or shoes (as these tasks are defined as women's work).[46] Currently, women account for half of the population in the Dominican Republic following (as they have throughout the 20th century).

The unemployment situation can often be grim for men, as they do not have as many options as women in terms of local employment resources; so some men leave the Dominican Republic to seek work elsewhere (typically the United States). Some men do, however, serve in supervisory positions in the factories, drive public cars and taxis, or work in some of the neighborhood stores. People who migrate to the urban areas do so in order have better access to schools, clinics, and jobs; however, they are often met with hardships.[47]

Grasmuck and Pessar conducted a survey in Santiago in 1981, and according to their findings (Grasmuck and Pessar 1991), "almost one out of four Santiago households has been directly involved in out-migration" (67). They found that most of the migrants were men, but there was evidence of sons (32.1%) and daughters (26.2%) as first migrants

of the household as well as wives (2.4%) and husbands (16.6%) (page 69). At the time of the survey, one-third of the urban families (33.8%) had, at some point, received some form of aid from relatives living abroad (71). This number has increased in recent years (Torres-Saillant and Hernandez 1998) and is continuing to increase.

The Research Setting in Santiago

Demographic Information

The most recent census was taken in 1993, and the total population in the Dominican Republic was 7, 293,390. There continue to be more females than males as 3,742,593 were female (women and girls) while 3,550,797 were male (men and boys). The census data also indicate that there are, at present, more people living in urban areas than rural areas as there were 4,094,263 residents in urban centers and 3,199,127 residents in rural areas. Santiago (city and province) is a primary receiving location in terms of migration from rural areas (due to more employment and educational opportunities, access to healthcare and family support). The total population for Santiago Province in 1993 was 710,803 with 366,668 females and 344,135 males, and the city of Santiago de los Caballeros had a total population of 493,412 with 258,050 females and 235,362 males. According to more recent statistics (World Factbook 1998), the estimated total population of the Dominican Republic, in 1998, was 7, 998, 766 with 60% of the population between the ages of 15-64 and 35% between 0-14 years of age.

Painting a Transnational Portrait

Dominican circular migration has been well documented (Grasmuck and Pessar 1991; Grasmuck and Pessar 1996; Georges 1990; Hendricks 1974) where New York City and the region of Cibao surrounding Santiago have been identified as the primary receiving and sending communities respectively. In line with U.S. scholars, Dominican scholar Bueno (1995) gives voice to the migration experience of five Dominican migrant women (who returned to the Dominican Republic) by recounting their experiences with employment, rearing children, public assistance, relationships, and discrimination in New York City.

The causes of international migration, settlement patterns, and transnational communities have been the topics of various studies in recent years. Grasmuck and Pessar (1991) have focused on division of labor, social class relations, in sending and receiving communities, social networks, as well as the reasons that Dominicans migrate to the United States. While many broader issues are explored here in this work, there is little attention given to ethnic group formation or racialized identity that is very much a part of this migration process. While class and gender are considered, Grasmuck and Pessar seem to overlook elements of race and color which, in the United States, transform the class and gender experience all together. Since the United States "racializes" gender and class (Higginbotham 1992), the inter-relationships between race, gender become more important when exploring migration and settlement experiences.

Another work focusing on Dominican migration to the United States (Georges 1990) explores patterns of migration and culture change over time. Again, while this work illuminates the reasons and consequences of migration, a piece of the migration experience is missing with regard to race and where Dominicans are "located" racially within the system and in their own communities.

A key element lacking in both works on Dominican migration is human agency. Societal structures are in place and are part of the analysis, but there is no sense of the strategies that were used by individuals to create options and opportunities for themselves. In other words, how do Dominicans impact the structure? By not considering the human agency-societal structure relationship, we fail to understand how individuals, in a pro-active manner, contest categories and organize their lives. Moreover, we don't learn about their everyday "lived experience."

Furthermore, we don't have a sense of how Dominicans' racial and color identities change in the United States and what impact this has on the Dominican Republic in terms of return migration, correspondences, and ideas about the U.S. racial system that are "transmitted" to the Dominican Republic. As Davis asserts (1991: 121):

> The same light mulatto defined as black in the United States might be classed as "coloured" in Jamaica and white in Puerto Rico. Sixty percent of more of the migrants from Puerto Rico are perceived in the United States as blacks, yet most of those 60 percent are racially mixed and were known on the island by one of the many color terms other than black, and many of them as white.

The idea here is that these racial/color categories are linked to nations and particular (and webbed) histories. This is the part of the puzzle I address here in the dissertation.

Research Procedures

I conducted ethnographic and archival research for the dissertation for a period of six months in Santiago, Dominican Republic, beginning in May of 1998. The overall ethnographic sample is comprised of the following individuals: 1) individuals who have not left the Dominican Republic; 2) individuals who have migrated to the United States; and 3) Dominican-Americans (residents or citizens of the U.S.) visiting family in Santiago. In order to examine how racial and national identities are constructed, as well as how they may change over time, I found it necessary to have a sample of non-migrants as well as migrants in order to understand "local" conceptions of Dominicanness and how/why these ideas may or may not change.

I used a multi-method approach to fully explore the questions in the research. As a whole, my data consist of the following: 1) 100 interviews using an interview schedule (open-and closed-ended questions); 2) 35 in-depth informal interviews; 3) 150 *cédula* observations; 4) five discussion/focus groups with different socio-economic, gender, and migration status (women at the *Coordinadora*, men at the Gran Teatro de Cibao, men and women at the bookstore at the National Supermarket, CIEE students (U.S. and Dominican students), and women in the *barrio* of *Cristo Rey*); 5) 10 photo exercises; and

6) newspaper clippings, census data, and archival data (early census reports, newspapers, letters, memos, etc.).

All of the participants had relatives residing in the United States as well as in the *campo* (rural area) in the Dominican Republic. Many had relatives in other regions of the Dominican Republic. The non-migrants in my study often came to construct new identities for themselves based on what they read, discussed in groups, or because of what they heard about racial experiences in the United States. All of the migrants spoke about the U.S. and its "preoccupation" with race as they found themselves in a different national context where the meanings of familiar categories were different, and where they themselves were defined in new ways. The Dominican-Americans discussed their transnational migration experiences and how their own ideas about race and racial and identities changed in the United States and how they negotiate these identities as they move across borders.

Participant Observation

As I settled back into Santiago for the third time, I found myself having similar yet different experiences as a participant observer. Unlike my previous experiences in the Dominican Republic, I was, for the first time, accompanied by my husband and colleague, David, and our one-year old daughter, Asha. Having a family in the field was a different experience for me in that I was treated differently by others and experienced life more

"closely as a Dominican" because I had to encounter the healthcare system (e.g. pediatric visits) and daycare options (daycare centers vs. in-home care), grocery shopping, etc.

In 1993 and 1995, I was always asked questions about not having children (since I was married). My master's research suggested that motherhood is one of the most valued roles of women in Dominican society and that women aren't quite "women" (gender status) unless they have children. I was expected to have children, and women in my study didn't understand why I was "waiting" to have children. During this most recent trip, not only was I a mother, but my daughter was in the field with me. I found myself focusing a lot on her health and well-being. I realized that many of my "worries" came to mirror those of the women in my study in 1993 when I explored the cultural construction of gender and female identity (e.g. women were concerned about potable drinking water, water-borne illnesses, childcare, education, safety, etc.). Having a child in the field gave me insights that I otherwise might not have had as well as relational experiences due to my status as "mother."

I draw on some of the experiences I had at birthday parties, the Centro Español (The Spanish Club Center in Santiago), PUCMM functions, nightclubs, family gatherings, childcare centers, clinics and hospitals, grocery and retail stores, hair salons, restaurants, and the *Junta Central Electoral* (where I observed 150 *cédula* application procedures). In addition, to these sites of interaction, I also had encounters with *conchos* (public cars) and taxi drivers, my neighborhood pharmacy and *colmado* (small neighborhood store), banks, and potable water supplier.

I participated in workshops and conferences such as the Afro-Latin American Research Association (ALARA) Conference in Santo Domingo, *Identidad's* workshop in Santiago, the Columbus Day (a.k.a. "Race Day") meeting on racial identity at the *Coordinadora*. The curriculum development consultancy that I had with CIEE afforded me the opportunity to work closely with some of the students from the United States as well as with PUCMM faculty involved with the program. The following is a summary of the overall data collection; although for the purposes of the dissertation, I am closely analyzing the census and archival data as well as the informal interviews.

Structured Interviews

The interviews focused on color classifications, the importance/non-importance of race, ancestry, self-description, and the most important personal identity (e.g. color, national, racial, or other). Using a snowball sampling method, I first interviewed people that I knew and later asked them to suggest other possible candidates (indicating that I wanted to interview people with different experiences (migration, color, gender, socio-economic, etc.). I also interviewed people that I saw frequently as a participant observer (e.g. at the *colmado,* pharmacy, PUCMM, grocery and retail shops, taxi drivers, etc.). The sample was comprised of migrants as well as non-migrants, people who claimed different types of socioracial identities, men and women, people from different social class backgrounds, and different age groups. The snowball sampling, while it helped me to create diversity within the sample, also was "culturally appropriate" in that

introductions are typically made in order to have "access" to people/groups and be "trusted" (see Appendix A).

Informal Interviews

As with the structured interviews, I began the informal interviews with people I came into contact with over time (e.g. daycare center staff, pharmacy staff, the *colmado* owners, taxi drivers, etc.). For example, I often called one of four taxi drivers when I needed to travel a distance; thus, we were able to have on-going discussions about Dominicanness.

I explored some of the same issues in the informal interviews as I did in the more structured ones. I wanted to know about ideas of race, color categories, migration experiences, knowledge of the U.S. racial system and experiences that Dominicans have in the United States, as well as how identities are constructed and how/why they may change in the Dominican Republic. With some of the informal interviews, I incorporated a photo exercise in which I referred to a photo and asked the respondents to describe the person in the photo in terms of color, race, and nationality (all of the photos were taken from Dominican magazines and newspapers).

Focus Groups

Each focus group was organized and selected for different reasons -- the primary reason was to interact with different groups and people with varied background and

experiences. Each was different in terms of the composition of the group (color, socio-economic, gender, and migration status) as well as the discussion that took place. In each focus group, I attempted to explore issues related to the research by asking different types of questions and using different points of departure. For example, during the focus group session with professional men and women (middle-class) at the bookstore in the National Supermarket in Santiago, I started with a brief discussion of identity to contextualize the discussion, defining nationality, color, and race. We began with two role play exercises involving two volunteers (with a participant recording her observations and taking notes during the discussion). The first role play exercise, based on an actual event, examined the migration experience from the U.S. Customs perspective whereby a Dominican migrant is questioned about the *indio* color category on her passport as she goes through customs. The second role play, also based on an actual experience, involved traveling to Puerto Rico to attend a conference where the participant was thought to be Puerto Rican, not Dominican because of color. With each exercise, I told each of the two volunteers individually what their respective role was (without saying who the other person was or what his/her role was). As a group, we watched the scenario unfold and discussed the issues that each exercise presented.

By point of comparison, another focus group involved a group of men (different ages but mainly ranging from 20-40 years of age) outside of the Gran Teatro de Cibao (where they were employed in various capacities). At that time, much had been written in the newspapers about the Sammy Sosa-Mark McGwire home run race, and there was tremendous excitement in Santiago surrounding Sosa. Again, I introduced the topic and

asked general questions for discussion purposes and then moved into a more focused discussion involving Sosa and how the participants interpreted what was happening to him in terms of celebration and media depiction in the United States and in the Dominican Republic.

Archival Data

I worked closely with the archivist, Cesar Franco, and staff at the Archivo Histórico de Santiago and gathered early census reports, newspaper clippings, letters and memos. The archival data complement the contemporary data I collected (newspaper articles, television footage, and popular culture images and messages).

Data Analysis

After having recorded notes and observations, I began some of the data analysis while in the Dominican Republic in order to begin making sense of what I was reading, hearing, and observing. I also began preliminary analysis of the interviews (transcription and translation from Spanish), looking for trends, shifts, and various complexities in order to clarify points and/or ask different types of questions. The data that are presented in the dissertation consist of the following: 1) interview excerpts; 2) findings and narratives from informal interviews; 3) fieldnotes; 4) *cédula* observations; and 5) tables from the census data.

Data Presented in the Dissertation

As with any research project, there is always more data than can be used in the writing process. As stated in the introduction, this dissertation is about the articulation of Dominicanness in racial and national terms over time. To this end, the data in the dissertation consist of the census, newspaper, and encyclopedic data I collected at the Archivo Histórico de Santiago (Historic Archives of Santiago) along with informal interviews and the interviews and observations at the *Junta Central* where the *cédulas* (the national identification/election card) were issued. Thus, the data illustrate how ideas of Dominicanness were expressed in the media, by the state, and by people who articulate certain identities. The census data show how the state classified people over time and the importance it gave to national origin, race, and color. The interviews demonstrate how people talk about and define themselves in relation to the state and each other, and the observations and interviews from the Junta Central show the state defines its "members" along the lines of color. The presentation of the data is organized around the idea of discourses, where race and nation are articulated within 1) an historical context that helped to shape, define and "root" Dominicanness and 2) the contemporary discourses that both maintain and challenge existing notions of Dominicanness.

Chapter four moves into the historical part of the dissertation focusing on how Dominicanness -- the sense of being Dominican -- has been constructed over time. In particular, I focus on the period before the dictatorship of Rafael Trujillo, paying attention to changes in racial/color categories as well as the Dominicanization process that

defined the Dominican Republic as a Roman Catholic and Spanish-speaking country comprised of "mixed" people since the turn of the 20th century.

IV. Historical Construction of Dominicanness (1900-1930): Gente de Color

This historical chapter roots Dominicanness within a particular point in history as my point of departure. As stated earlier in the introduction, if the movement of people across borders weds them in the formation of race and nation while co-constructing racial and national identities in the articulation of nationness, then a cursory glance at history should provide insight into some of the more salient periods when particular identities were articulated over others in the configuration of nationness. Here, I suggest that Dominicanness, while part of a much larger history and events, has its roots in periods of emigration and immigration and ideas of race and social status:

> Historians have shown that the present-day population of the Dominican Republic is the result of the intense mixture of peoples of European, African, and, to a lesser extent, Amerindian origin. By the end of the 18th century, the majority of Dominicans were classified as colored -- that is mulattos and blacks or, in contemporary parlance, pardos and morenos (Duany 1998: 150).

I consider a self-defined historical period, 1900-1930, in order to show how early ideational seeds were planted along the lines of racial and national identities, having an impact on the present. This period is a pre-Rafael Trujillo/U.S. occupation era (the next chapter is that of the dictatorship itself). Many participants point to the era of Trujillo as a time when Dominicanness was constructed along the lines of being mixed race, anti-Haitian, Spanish-speaking, and Roman Catholic. To show what Trujillo might have been reacting "against" during his regime in reconfiguring Dominicanness, I explore the state-sanctioned categories that preceded Trujillo.

Again, in this chapter, and throughout the dissertation, I rely on census and archival data (e.g. newspaper clippings and advertisements) for references to race, color, and nationality. Much of the data in this chapter are from census reports during the first half of the 20th century and speak to a growing concern of labeling groups according to national origin and race. National origin has a prominent position on the census, detailing at times, gender composition according to nationality. Interestingly, the term "race" is used throughout the census during this time period but is later changed to "color" referring to the same groups of people -- the relevance of this is discussed later.

In my view, the Gente de Color discourse positions the Dominican Republic with other countries in the Caribbean as well as other peoples of African descent, due to a shared history of slavery and colonization, whereas Hispanidad (next chapter) constructs a "Spanish-Dominican" *diaspora* in the sense that Spain is viewed as the Motherland and distances itself away from the "Black" Caribbean and similar peoples of African descent in the Americas. I have created tables from the census data as a way of presenting the ways in which national origin and race were interrelated in the construction and articulation of Dominicanness. The importance here is the attention to classifying people and the ways in which categories were defined and how they changed.

Gente de Color (People of Color): The "Colored" Discourse (1900-1930)

Racial Views and Concepts

As stated earlier, at the turn of the century, there was a belief in races as distinct biological groups, and many places had to contend with creating categories for specific

types of "race mixture." In the Dominican Republic, according to archival and census data, there were three state-sanctioned racial groups (*blancos*, *mestizos*, and *negros*). The *mestizo* category included both the mixed (Black-White) population as well as the Asian immigrants (see Table V below). While *mestizo* described the majority of the population in racial terms, at the same time, *mestizos* were also considered to be of color. This discourse maps the relationship between race and color -- those who were non-White (in racial terms) were of color (racially and in terms of the color categories describing varying degrees of skin color).

Since the emigration of many Spanish Creoles at the turn of this century, a light-skinned *mestizo/mulato*[48] elite has been the normative group.[49] As Torres-Saillant (1998:134) states:

> The decay of the plantation and the virtual destitution of whites helped to breakdown the social barriers between the races, stimulating interracial marital relations and giving rise to an ethnically hybrid population. The racial integration and ethnic hybridity that characterized seventeenth-century Santo Domingo explain the emergence of the mulatto as the predominant type in the ethnic composition of the Dominican population.

The *mestizo/mulato* elite then defined everyone in relation to themselves; Haitians were *negro* (Black), the European immigrants were *blanco* (White). Considering the literature at the time, "outside" scholars defined Dominicans as *mulato*, but the state used *mestizo* as a way of defining mixture -- the census demonstrates this distinction.

Racial Discourse and the Articulation of Racial and National Identities

The racial discourse *de color* was often articulated in newspaper articles and advertisements where Dominicans were described as "damas y caballeros de color" (women and men of color) during the early 20th century.[50] It was normative to be "of color" -- this is to say, non-White. In addition, at the same time, the Dominican Republic imagined itself to be "part of the West Indies."[51] The fact that the Dominican Republic was "imagined" to be comprised of people of color and "in the West Indies," during the early part of the century is very important, because this image would soon be changed, purposefully, after the rise of Rafael Leonidas Trujillo (1930-61), as we will later explore.

In general, the co-construction of race and nation is made evident when a nation-state becomes concerned with an inventory of its people with respect to who resides within its borders. Along these lines, the census provides a way of directly dealing with race and national origin. Immigration and categories of nationalities are often tangled in the web of race, nation, and national belonging and are expressed in the taking and recording of the census.

Individual Identities and State-Sanctioned Categories

The following tables have been created from census data collected at the Archivo Histórico de Santiago. These tables illustrate the importance of classifying people in terms of "Dominicans" and "non-Dominicans" at the turn of the century as there were *different* groups residing in the Dominican Republic at the time.[52]

Table I
Santiago Population Census by Gender, 1903

National Groups by Gender	Population
Dominican Men	4,775
Dominican Women	5,624
Spanish Men	60
Spanish Women	31
French Men	4
French Women	7
English Men	3
English Women	0
German Men	1
German Women	0
Belgian Men	1
Belgian Women	0
Danish Men	2
Danish Women	1
Dutch Men	2
Dutch Women	1
Italian Men	33
Italian Women	0
Arab Men	113
Arab Women	80
Chinese Men	2
Chinese Women	0
American Men	64
American Women	28
Cuban Men	23
Cuban Women	13
Haitian Men	31
Haitian Women	20
Venezuelan Men	1
Venezuelan Women	1
Mexican Men	1
Mexican Women	1

SOURCE: 1903 Census of Santiago. Archivo Histórico de Santiago. Translated as presented by K.E. Simmons.

Table I shows the diversity that existed in Santiago during the early part of the 20th century. It also shows that there was attention given to not only defining national groups in the sense of knowing who was Dominican but also knowing the national "origins" of the remaining residents. There was also interest in knowing the gender composition of the population at this early point in time. The alphabetical location of Haitians is worth noting here as they are listed in order with the other national groups -- this later changes as their presence in the Dominican Republic is closely monitored. Haitians' presence takes more of a prominent position on the census in later years, especially during the Trujillo era.

Table II

1916 Santiago Census
Santiago de los Caballeros

Total Population in Santiago 14,774

Gender		**Nationality**		**Religion**	
Women	Men	Dominican	Foreign	Catholic	Other
8,077	6,697	13,167	1,607	14,303	471

Above, Table II summarizes the gender, nationality, and religious background of the population in Santiago in 1916, thirteen years after the first census. Here, "Dominican" and "Foreign" are the two categories for nationality, and "Catholic" and

"Other" categorize the religious practices. Here, we see the early formation of Dominicanness in religious terms -- being Dominican and Catholic.

The next table is similar to Table I in terms of detailing nationality in Santiago de los Caballeros.

Table III
Nationality of Resident Foreigners in the City of Santiago de los Caballeros in 1916

Nationality	Population
North American	692
Haitian	388
Arab	184
Puerto Rican	104
Spanish	60
Italian	49
English	37
Chinese	21
French	18
Cuban	16
Belgian	13
German	10
Venezuelan	5
Danish	4
Dutch	3
Colombian	2
Mexican	1
TOTAL	1,607

Unlike the nationality table from the 1902 census that was concerned about gender and nationality, this nationality table accounts for total group representation. This table shows that there was growing diversity in Santiago in 1916. Interestingly, "North

American" and "Arab" are nationality categories. North American refers to someone from the United States while Arab typically refers to Lebanese immigrants to the Dominican Republic. The data show that there was an increase in North Americans and Haitians during this time. The North American presence is due, in large part, to the U.S. occupation of the Dominican Republic from 1916-1924.[53] There were more Haitians in the Dominican Republic during this time because of a growing need for labor in the sugar cane fields for the export of sugar (Martinez 1999). Other emerging groups are the Arabs and the Chinese -- the Arabs were an active part of the commercial life as merchants, and the Chinese were involved in laundry services and restaurants (Hoetink 1982). This all points to an increase in peopled migration to the Dominican Republic for a variety of reasons.

The next table compares the nationality groups in Santiago during two census years.

Table IV
Nationalities in Santiago, 1903 and 1916

Nationality	**Total 1903**	**Total 1916**
Dominican	10,399	13,167
Spanish	91	60
French	11	18
Italian	33	49
Haitian	51	388
Arab	193	184
Chinese	2	21
American (North American)	92	692
Cuban	36	16

Table IV illustrates the change in population in terms of nationalities recorded between 1903 and 1916 in Santiago. As noted above, there is a significant increase in Haitians and North Americans. There is also a decrease of Spanish Creoles because many of them, who had the financial means, emigrated from the Dominican Republic and went to Cuba, Puerto Rico, and other places (Hoetink 1982; Nelson 1988).

The next set of tables map nationality and race in the Dominican Republic in 1920 during the first national census. This data reveal some of the early defining points of Dominicanness while classifying Dominicans and foreigners along religious and racial lines.

Table V
Race in the First National Census, 1920
Total Population 894,665

Racial Category	**Number**	**Percentage**
Blancos/White (Dominicans and Foreigners)	223,144	24.9%
Mestizos/Mixed (including Amarillos/Asians)	444,587	49.7%
Negros/Black (including 28,258 Haitians)	226,934	25.4%

Note: Generally in the provinces, the number of whites in the cities is higher than in the campo. Haitians account for 3.2% of the population.

As Table V illustrates, there were three national (official) racial categories in the Dominican Republic in 1920. *Blanco*, as a category, includes both White Dominicans and White foreigners. *Mestizo* includes both mixed Dominicans as well as Asian immigrants (Chinese in particular) -- this changes in subsequent censuses. *Negro*, similar to the *blanco* category, encompasses two groups -- Black Dominicans and Haitians. I suspect that *Negro* also included the immigrants from other Caribbean countries who, along with

Haitian laborers, also worked in the sugar cane fields. These immigrants were often from the British, Dutch, and Danish Islands of the Caribbean.[54] The fact that these early categories were defined in this way is worth mentioning because the make-up of these categories change at a later point in time -- *mestizo* later becomes the primary category of mixed Dominicans and *negro* is later used most often to refer to Haitians.

Continuing to map race during the first census, the next table reflects the racial composition according to the provinces in 1920.

Table VI
Race According To Province, 1920

Province	Blancos	Mestizos	Negros
Santo Domingo	32,985	58,013	55,644
San Pedro de Macorís	8,141	14,839	15,629
Seybo	14,791	27,416	16,513
Azua	21,503	47,895	31,746
Barahona	9,800	23,853	14,529
Samaná	3,000	8,307	5,608
Pacificador	25,092	38,570	14,554
La Vega	26,084	62,369	17,792
Espaillat	14,217	29,416	7,313
Santiago	41,825	62,665	18,550
Puerto Plata	13,106	37,750	8,067
Monte Cristi	12,600	33,484	20,989
TOTAL	223,144	444,587	226,934

Isolating Santiago province, in relation to the rest of the country, Table VI shows that there were more *Blancos* and *Mestizos* in Santiago than in any other province in 1920. Santo Domingo had the most number of *Negros* -- this is still the case today. The fact that there were more *Blancos* and *Mestizos* in Santiago during this time period is important in terms of the current ideas surrounding race in Santiago -- many participants suggested that Santiago has more light-skinned people than areas in the south (e.g. the capital, Santo Domingo).

Table VII
Religion according to Province, 1920

Province	**Catholic**	**Protestant**	**Jewish**	**Other**
Santo Domingo	145,950	575	24	103
San Pedro de Macorís	33,056	5,513	0	40
Seybo	57,391	1,296	3	30
Azua	101,083	58	2	1
Barahona	47,927	250	0	5
Samaná	14,779	2,127	6	3
Pacificador	77,984	225	0	7
La Vega	106,141	87	5	12
Espaillat	50,747	187	2	10
Santiago	122,806	198	0	36
Puerto Plata	57,766	1,141	6	10
Monte Cristi	66,795	270	7	1
TOTAL	882,425	11,927	55	258

Table VII illustrates the predominance of Roman Catholicism throughout the Dominican Republic. Santo Domingo had the largest number of people in the Jewish and "other" religious categories. The majority of the Protestants resided in San Pedro de Macorís -- many of them came from other Caribbean counties to work. The second highest Protestant group resided in Samana -- this is likely related to the historical group from the United States (Black Americans from the African Methodist Episcopal Church) who emigrated to the Dominican Republic when it was Haiti (1822-44). The Protestant and Jewish presence will be explained in the following racial discourse section.

The next table shows the attention to nationality in the first national census and highlights the diversity, in terms of national origin, in the Dominican Republic in 1920.

Table VIII
Nationalities, 1920

Nationality/National Origin	**Total**
Germany	87
China	255
Cuba	741
Danish Antilles	885
Spain	1,444
United States	891
France	236
French Antilles	1,093
Haiti	28,258
Dutch Antilles	1,449
England	193
English Antilles	5,763
Italy	411
Puerto Rico	6069
Syria	1,187
Turkey	115
Venezuela	247
Colombia	38
Mexico	31
Denmark	22
Russia	12
Canada	12
Belgium	18
Arabia	14

Table VIII illustrates that there was tremendous diversity within the population in 1920 in terms of national origin. Attention was given to recording exacting where people

were from. Spain (1,444), Haiti (28,258), Puerto Rico (6069), Syria (1,187), the Dutch Antilles (1,449), French Antilles (1,093), and English Antilles (5,763) were among the nationality largest groups residing in the Dominican Republic at the time. The following countries had fewer than ten (10) people: Costa Rica, Corcega, Finland, Austria, Ecuador, Brazil, Peru, Switzerland, Norway, Sweden, Portugal, Indostan, Holland, Argentina, Poland, Panama, and English Guyana (names are time-specific). Here again, the Haitian and Antillian presence is linked to labor and agricultural work. This diversity becomes important later as ideas of Dominicanness take root along the lines of national origin.

Transnationalism: Migration, Ideas, and Relocalization

The United States occupied both the Dominican Republic and Haiti for years during this time period. While in the Dominican Republic, from 1916-1924, the U.S. Marines established a U.S. Military Government and *Guardia Nacional Dominicana* (Dominican National Guard -- GND) -- this is where the "post-intervention" President Rafael L. Trujillo received his military training. Examining some of the declassified memos from this time, it is clear that the U.S. viewed Haiti as a "Black" country. What is less clear is how the U.S. viewed the Dominican Republic in relation to Haiti. In the United States at this time, the mulatto category dropped from the census, and all mulattos "became" Black.

The United States might have viewed the Dominican Republic, at least the "mulatto" population in the Dominican Republic, in a similar way as it did "mulattos" in the United States although there were some place-specific differences. In the United

States, power relationships, White-Black relational categories, legal segregation, and institutional forms of racism restricting access to resources to people of color were simultaneously occurring. In the Dominican Republic, the United States exercised military control of an island comprised of Blacks (Haiti) and mulattos (Dominican Republic). I suspect that the United States played a role in that distinction in the Dominican Republic as evidenced in the United States because while "mulattos" officially became Black in the United States in 1920, they often enjoyed an elevated social status over darker-skinned Blacks (Davis 1991).

Returning to the point of migration, there was a great deal of transnational migration to and from the Dominican Republic during this time. While many Spanish *Creoles* emigrated from the Dominican Republic to other countries in the region, Haitians and Black Caribbean people immigrated to the Dominican Republic often to work in the sugar cane fields. The fact that there was a decrease in the Spanish *Creole* population (a *Blanco* group) concurrent with an increase in Haitian and other Caribbean immigrants (*Negro* groups) is very significant in the next period as the racial discourse moves away from one *de color* to one embracing Hispanidad (Spanishness) in the next chapter.

V. Hispanidad Discourse (1930-1961): Rafael Leonidas Trujillo and the Shift away from *de Color*

As discussed in chapter IV, the period before Trujillo witnessed tremendous emigration from and immigration to the Dominican Republic. The United States also had a physical presence in Hispaniola at the same time. All of the groups that resided in the Dominican Republic were listed and recorded on the national census as part of the national body. Haitians didn't seem to have any more prominence than any other national group. All of this changed as Rafael Trujillo came to power and institutionalized categories and immigration policies that would have a lasting effect on how the Dominican nation would be imagined and configured at the end of the 20th century. In this period, from 1930-61, I pay close attention, to the importance of knowing where Haitians reside and the efforts that were made to decrease Haitian immigration while increasing immigration from Europe.

Racial Views and Concepts

During the regime of Rafael Leonidas Trujillo (1930-61), race is conceptualized with a distance to "Blacks" and "Africans" and moves away from one "of color" as we reviewed in the last chapter. Changing and removing references to Blacks, Trujillo put forth an ideology of Hispanidad which then emerged as a way of talking about Dominican people and "culture:"

> Instead of redefining the Dominican Republic as a mulatto nation -- as Mexico's postrevolutionary mestizo elite had redefined that country as a mestizo nation -- he surrounded himself with white sycophants and Hispanophile intellectuals like Joaquín Balaguer, and transformed the white elite's identification with Spain into a national ideology of *hispanidad*, which define Dominicans as "the most Spanish people of America" (Winn 1992:289).

Hispanidad meant embracing "all that was Spanish" and identifying and appreciating Spanish culture and society. In this way, Spain became the point of reference and a link to understanding Dominican life and people.

The idea of mixture continued to exist within Hispanidad as the majority of Dominicans were considered to be a *liga* (mixture), and in particular, an Indigenous-Spanish mixture. It is this "type" of mixture that forms the basis for the construction of *indio*. Again, while *indio* literally means "Indian," it represents skin color and the variation in color due to mixture over time. While *indio* is used most often as a color category, it is also a racial "type" since it defines a racial status in-between Black and White category.

As we saw in the last chapter, *mestizo* continues to be used as a racial term on the census, and *indio* emerges as a racial and color term on the *cédula* (the national identification card). For light-skinned Dominican elites, *mestizo* and *indio* were preferred race/color categories over *mulato* since they do not imply African ancestry, and for that reason, a *mulato* identity is not articulated -- *mestizo* was used in place of *mulato*, and *indio* became the institutionalized color category. Much of what happens during this time period is a reaction to earlier circumstances (e.g. the decrease in Spanish *Creoles* and the increase of *Negro* immigrants). The "reaction" to Haitians during the regime of Trujillo

are rooted in what has been termed the "Haitian Domination" of the Dominican Republic from 1822-44. During this particular time, the President of Haiti, Jean Pierre Boyer, wrote a message to the then leader of the Dominican Republic, José Núñez de Cáceres, indicating that he had made the necessary preparations to unite the island; this was against the backdrop of the imminent French invasion entering from the Dominican Republic side (Moya Pons 1995: 122). Cáceres did not want unification but felt he couldn't win and despite resistance, Boyer soon became the leader of the entire island, but resigned in 1843 because of growing tension and revolts, seeking exile in Jamaica (ibid. page 139).

Boyer left a legacy with which future generations would have to contend, and in particular, Trujillo. In particular, religious freedom of expression and language would be highly contested in later years as Boyer invited various groups to settle in the Dominican Republic. One of these groups consisted of Black Americans, affiliated with the American Methodist Episcopal Church (AME) in Philadelphia, PA. At the invitation of Boyer, they left the United States and settled in Samana Bay, on the eastern peninsular coast of the Dominican Republic. They continue to reside there, with some of them speaking a form of "Old English," and are still members of the AME church they formed in Samana. Jehovah Witnesses also settled in the Dominican Republic during this time, and the role of the Catholic church changed during the time of Boyer in terms of being "the church" of the people. Boyer also ordered the abolition of slavery in the Dominican Republic and attempted to create a more egalitarian state:

> This revolution would consist of the abolition of slavery and the institution of a new land-tenure system based on French and Haitian practices, as well as the social and juridical equality of whites, mulattos, and blacks (Moya Pons 1995: 123).

Trujillo sought to change the image of the Dominican Republic in the minds of outsiders by hosting international fairs and displaying photos of Spanish immigrants and very light women (with captions stressing the beauty of Dominican women).[55] I suggest that this was an attempt to change the image of the Dominican Republic, from an "of color" country to a very light, almost white ideal. While scholars outside of the Dominican Republic often described the Dominican Republic as a predominantly racially mixed country comprised of "mulattos," Trujillo continued to use *mestizo* and later *indio* to racially classify the majority of Dominicans -- there was a consensus regarding the "significance" of mulatto and *mestizo* in the Americas, and Dominicans were not considered to be *mestizo* by "outsiders" when defining mixture and mixed categories.

Haitians were associated with the "browning" of the Dominican Republic, and they became the "undesired" immigrants while Europeans became the "desired" immigrants. All of this was part of a larger "biological" effort of *blanquemiento* (whitening). The cultural strategy then involved the appreciation of Spain in terms of culture, religion, and language. The relationship between biology and culture was forged in a state-sanctioned attempt to create a nationality, change and rewrite history, and through instruments of fear, create a climate where much of these changes were implemented and accepted -- this was the power of the Trujillo regime.

Much of what I outline here deals with Dominican-Haitian relations over time. The Dominican Republic found itself in a unique situation even before the turn of the 20th century. The United States had at one time considered making the Dominican Republic a U.S. territory, and the island itself was unified under Haitian rule from 1822 to 1844. The Dominican Republic came to define itself in direct opposition to Haiti and harbored resentment for the alleged "browning" of the Dominican Republic.

While ideas of race and nation are firmly planted during this period, social class and social status also took shape. Dominicans, as a whole, were considered to be "better off" than Haitians. One participant in my research suggested that "even the poorest Dominican is better off than a Haitian." This comment speaks to racist practices that keep Haitians in neo-slavery conditions where they are marked as "poor," "dirty," "disease-ridden," and to be "feared" (because of Haitian voodoo and the "belief" that "Haitians eat people").[56] I return to this discussion in the next chapter on mestizaje and contemporary relations with Haiti and Haitians in the Dominican Republic.

Racial Discourse and the Articulation of Racial and National Identities

Hispanidad is both a racial discourse and a Spanish diaspora in its articulation during the dictatorship of Rafael Trujillo. Within the realm of Hispanidad, mestizaje emerges.[57] Here, *mestizaje* -- in the sense of race mixture -- assumes that there are distinct racial groups, and that if/when miscegenation occurs, the offspring will be "racially mixed." *Blanquemiento* -- in the sense of whitening -- refers to the actual

practice of race mixing or whitening. While Hispanidad advances the absolute appreciation of everything "Spanish," it also firmly established and rooted *mestizaje* and *blanquemiento*.

Trujillo declared that the Dominican Republic was the most Spanish of the Americas and that Dominicans should identify with everything Spanish (Moya Pons 1995; Winn 1992). It has been said that Trujillo ordered the (re)writing of history in order to 1) erase the presence of sub-Saharan Africans and to 2) suggest that the Africans who were brought as slaves to the Dominican Republic were from North Africa (Winn 1992; Torres-Saillant 1995). Trujillo also allegedly ordered the removal of one of the drums used in merengue music because it sounded "too African" (Austerlitz 1997). The altered historical account became part of the Dominican history as it was told and retold in text books as well as in oral tradition, explaining why many Dominicans do not consider themselves to be of African descent. The category "*indio*" was attractive to Trujillo in that it implied racial mixture and could be used as a color denominator to describe skin color (e.g. *indio claro*/light skinned or *indio oscuro*/dark skinned). While *indio* never appeared on the census, Trujillo was effective in institutionalizing it as he set in motion its usage on the *cédula*, a state-sanctioned identification card (Torres-Saillant 1995).

As alluded to above, the creation of *indio,* and its significance as a non-Black race/color identity, was created in relation to Haitians who were considered to be African and racially Black.[58] Again, this might have to do with the lingering effects of slavery and the tasks that people were assigned based on their socioracial category in that Haitians

were closely associated with slavery, strenuous manual labor, and "being" Black -- this was echoed by participants throughout the research. The usage over time of *indio* color descriptors and categories had the effect of distancing Dominicans from their African heritage and ideas of blackness in an attempt to create an affinity towards Spanish ideals against an Indigenous (Taino) landscape. The effort to advance Hispanidad not only meant a cultural affiliation with Spain, but also a "biological" one. White was used to classify someone of Spanish (or other European) ancestry, and Black was used to classify someone of African ancestry (Haitian or other West Indian). Immigration from Spain and other European countries was encouraged while Haitian immigration was not only discouraged but unwanted (see memos later in this chapter).

According to interviews, Trujillo was successful not only in creating images and giving meaning to categories, but also in maintaining a level of appreciation of everything that was Spanish and depreciating anything that had to do with Haiti. In essence, he created a systematic fear of Haitians and belief that they were not to be trusted and needed to be closely monitored -- he also reminded people that the Dominican Republic had been "invaded" by Haiti in 1822 and this was not to happen again. Relying on the media and educational system to perpetuate his ideas, Trujillo, in effect not only orchestrated a racialized immigration project (see memos later in this chapter), but he also planted and sowed seeds for on-going anti-Haitian sentiment as he was greatly influenced by the racist ideology of Adolph Hitler which culminated in the extermination of thousands of Haitians residing in the Dominican Republic in 1937:

> The Haitians living near the border were completely marginal to Dominican society and the territory they occupied functioned as an extension of Haiti. Haitian currency circulated freely in the Cibao, the main agricultural region of the country, and in the south it circulated as far as Azua, only 120 kilometers from Santo Domingo. Trujillo did not want to accept that fact. He traveled to the frontier at the beginning of October 1937, and there gave a speech announcing that the occupation by Haitians of the frontier territories must not continue. Afterwards, he ordered that all Haitians remaining in the country be exterminated. In the days following October 4, 1937, the army assassinated all Haitians on sight. Eighteen thousand Haitians were killed. The only ones able to save their lives were those who managed to cross the border and those protected by the sugar mills, which did not want to lose their Haitian labor force (Moya Pons 1995: 368).

When there was international and public protest against this act, Trujillo allegedly paid large sums of money to Haiti for damages and suggested that there were border disputes. The present-day tensions between Dominicans and Haitians, as well as contemporary images have their roots in this particular period. Importantly, despite efforts to remove them, Haitian immigrants and their descendants still have a presence in the Dominican Republic, albeit a difficult life, performing arduous tasks and working long hours for little pay (e.g. construction work, sugar cane fields and other plantations, etc.) and facing tremendous discrimination.

The United States and neighboring countries (e.g. Mexico and Cuba) were made aware of the growing tensions between the Dominican Republic and Haiti. In a letter to President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Rafael Trujillo writes "My Government will concur in the conciliation procedure initiated by Haiti with the same desire it has always cherished of giving the Government and people of Haiti the most complete satisfaction with regard to any legitimate claim that they may present on the ground of the regrettable and regretted incidents that occurred in the Dominican territory early in October."[59]

In his response to Trujillo, President Roosevelt writes "Permit me further to express my gratification by reason of Your Excellency's statement that the Government of the Dominican Republic will not give the slightest ground for a disturbance of the peace of America, in the preservation of which all the peoples of the New World have so great and legitimate an interest. I extend to Your Excellency my most sincere wishes that the controversy which regrettably exists between two sister republics may obtain a rapid, just, and pacific solution through the utilization of the inter-American peace instruments to which they have now announced their determination to have recourse."[60] President Roosevelt was also in communication with the President of Haiti and other heads of state in the region about the "controversy" and possible "disturbance" in the region. Because of the ongoing conversations surrounding the massacre at the governmental level between the United States and the Dominican Republic, the United States played a part in monitoring the situation between Dominicans and Haitians in the Dominican Republic while keeping a close eye on Trujillo himself.

Individual Identities and State-Sanctioned Categories

As presented in the tables below, during this time, there is a growing importance of quantifying Haitians, in both rural and urban areas, and along the lines of gender. The census of 1935 is an important official document in terms of what it suggests; there was a close monitoring of the Haitian population. For the first time, in the census summary, the Haitian population data are prominently placed after Dominicans and foreigners, drawing attention to the numbers and their overall presence in the Dominican Republic (see Table

IX

and

of I

"Fo

tab

(see

in 1

Tota
Dom
Fore
Hait

SOU

Domi

differe

IX). I demonstrate here that the numbers of Haitian significantly drop between the 1935 and 1950, according to census figures, following what was termed the *matanza* (massacre) of Haitians in 1937, at the request of Trujillo as discussed above.

Another trend during this period is differentiation between "Dominican" and "Foreign" categorizations of race in that the racial composition of Dominicans has its own table followed by the racial composition of foreigners residing in the Dominican Republic (see the following tables). The next table provides a closer look at the foreign population in 1935.

Table IX
National Population Census May 13, 1935

Total Inhabitants		1,479,417
Dominicans		1,406,347
Foreigners: all races		73,070
Haitians:		
Urban Zones	Men:	1,571
	Women:	1,436 (3,007 total in Urban Zones)
Rural Zones	Men:	30,748
	Women:	18,902 (49,650 total in Rural Zones)
		Total: 52,657

SOURCE: 1935 Census, Archivo Histórico de Santiago. Translated by K.E. Simmons.

Like previous population census tables, Table IX also makes distinctions between Dominicans and Foreigners. However, for the first time, there are two striking differences: 1) the classification of foreigners of "all races" and 2) the detailed

classification and quantification of Haitians, along the lines of gender and in terms of rural or urban location. Again, it is important to note the number of Haitians residing in the Dominican Republic in 1935 as this number is significantly later (following the *matanza* in 1937). The next table focuses on the distribution of foreigners in the Dominican Republic of all races in 1935.

Table X
Foreigners (All Races) by Province, 1935

PROVINCE	MEN	WOMEN	TOTAL
Montecristi	1,868	2,111	3,979
Puerto Plata	1,776	1,297	3,073
Santiago	1,196	888	2,084
Espaillat	205	106	311
La Vega	332	191	523
Duarte	388	210	598
Samaná	384	191	575
National District	3,062	2,023	5,085
Trujillo	403	177	580
San Pedro de Macoris	7,956	3,709	11,665
Seybo	14,564	5,270	19,834
Azua	11,092	8,133	19,225
Barahona	2,803	2,735	5,538
TOTAL	**46,029**	**27,041**	**73,070**

SOURCE: 1935 Census, Archivo Histórico de Santiago. Translated by K.E. Simmons.

The above table "unpacks" foreign to show where "they" reside. The majority of foreigners resided in Seybo province followed by Azua. At this point, a "we" and "they"

emerge as the data indicate where the foreigners reside. The next table illustrates the racial composition of Dominicans in 1935.

Table XI
Dominicans: Racial Categories, 1935

Racial Category	**Number**
Blanco (White)	184,741
Mestizo (Mixed)	994,420
Negro (Black)	227,160
Amarillo (Yellow/Naturalized Chinese)	26
Total	1,406,347

Note: With regard to race, Dominicans are divided into the following groups: Blancos (White) 184,741; Mestizos 994,420; Negros (Black) 227,160; Amarillo (yellow) 26. The last group refers to naturalized Chinese.

Unlike the census of 1920 where there were three racial categories (where Asians were included in the *mestizo* category), there are four racial groupings in the 1935 census. Here, the Naturalized Chinese have their own category, *amarillo*, moving out of the *mestizo* category. This category shift, I suggest, is an attempt to define the majority of the Dominican population as mixed, and importantly, as *mestizo*. Again, at this point in time, *mestizo*, not *mulato*, is the intermediate racial category that is used to describe and define mixture in the Dominican Republic.

Table XII presents an interesting view of race among foreigners.

Table XII
Foreigners: Racial Categories, 1935

Blanco (White)	7,992
Mestizo (Mixed)	4,248
Negro (Black)	60,517
Amarillo (Yellow/Asian)	313
Total	73,070

Note: The foreigners are: blancos (white) 7,992; mestizos 4,248; negros (black) 60,517, and amarillos (yellow) 313.

The above table shows that *Negros* outnumber the other racial groups among the foreigners. In fact, if we compare Table XI with Table XII, we see that the majority of Dominicans are classified as *mestizo* while the majority of foreigners are classified as *Negro*. This is an early formation of the idea that Dominicans are mixed while Haitians, for example, are Black (despite the fact that there are Black Dominicans as well as mixed Haitians).

The same categories are used for "Dominicans" and "foreigners" in these tables suggesting that someone could be a White, Black, Mixed, or Chinese Dominican or White, Black, Mixed, or Asian foreigner. That the same racial categories exist for both Dominican and Foreign populations seems to suggest that race is viewed as a constant -- what changes here is nationality. Later, I will demonstrate how nationality and race are merged in the formation of Dominicanness and the idea that Dominicans are mixed.

Looking at the 1935 census closely, it appears that there is a stronger emphasis on identifying and naming the foreign residents in terms of their provincial locations. This is the type of data that Trujillo allegedly relied on to implement immigration initiatives, targeting certain provinces in the Dominican Republic (see discussion below).

There are some significant shifts that followed the census of 1935, linking Hispanidad to the present. In particular, the census of 1950 moved away from race and racial classifications in favor of color as a category (although at this time, there was no clear distinction between race and color). In other words, the shift from race to color was in name only as the categories themselves as they did not change -- there were still four categories (*negro*, *blanco*, *mestizo*, and *amarillo*). For the first time, color and nationality were defined for census purposes (see below), bringing a definition to these categories in terms of what they represented. Another shift at this time involved the first-time usage of "La República," as a way of talking about the Dominican Republic -- it was placed on the census as a complete representation of the population with regard to color (see the tables below following the definitions that were used to guide the census takers).

As mentioned above, color and nationality were defined for the first time for census purposes in 1950. These definitions are from the 1950 National census (regarding color and nationality):[61]

Color- Se determinó el color, no la raza, de las personas empadronadas. Se clasificó la población en blanca, negra, mestiza y amarilla, según el caso, y de acuerdo a la apreciación del empadronador, quien fué instruído para que salvo en circunstancias especiales, hiciese esta pregunta (xiv).

Color - The color, not the race, was determined of registered people. The population was classified into white, black, mixed and yellow categories, according to the case, and according to the census taker, who was instructed to ask questions in special circumstances (xiv).

Nationalidad- Esta pregunta cubrió dos aspectos: en primer lugar se anotó: "dominicano," "naturalizado dominicano," o "extranjero," de acuerdo con la declaración de la persona interrogada. Si ésta declaraba ser naturalizada dominicana, en un segundo renglón, como consecuencia a esta primera anotación, se hizo constar a que nacionalidad pertenecía antes de haber adquirido la nacionalidad dominicana. Si por el contrario la persona declaró ser extranjera, en este mismo segundo renglón se anotaba su nacionalidad (xiv).

Nationality - This question covered two aspects: in the first place one noted: 'of the Dominican Republic,' 'naturalized of the Dominican Republic,' or 'foreigner,' in accordance with the interrogated person's declaration. If he/she declared to be naturalized of the Dominican Republic, in a second line, as consequence to this first annotation, it was noted that there was a different nationality prior to having acquired the nationality of the Dominican Republic. If on the contrary the person declares to be foreign, in this same second line, the nationality is noted (xiv).

This shift from race to color is similar to that of other countries in Latin America (such as Brazil and Venezuela) that claim to have no racial distinctions. This is a "no race" position in favor of a color spectrum (from light to dark) based on racial mixture. I discuss this later in the dissertation when I present an overview of whitening practices in the region.

In 1950, "color" replaced "race" as a category header for *blanco*, *negro*, *mestizo*, and *amarillo*. According to instructions, the census taker had to record the color of the person, but in situations where their color was not obvious, he/she might have to ask. While the previous censuses dealt with nationalities and classifying different national groups, this was the first time a definition appeared on the census to the reader to interpret the results.

The following tables show how race and color became intertwined and how Dominicanness was firmly defined, not only in terms of race and color, but also in terms of nationality and first language.

Table XIII
Color of the Dominican Population, 1950 Census

NOTE: The following table contains the exact same categories, but in 1950, the title of the table read "color," not "race" as is did in 1935.

Color	Total	Urban	Rural
La República/The Dominican Republic	2,135,872	508,408	1,627,464
Blanco/White	600,994	182,297	418,697
Negro/Black	245,032	61,053	183,979
Mestizo/Mixed	1,289,285	264,521	1,024,764
Amarillo/Asian	561	537	24

In Table XIII, we see that the majority of the population was classified as *mestizo* and that the majority of the *mestizo* population lived in rural areas in 1950. In fact, the only urban-based majority was the *amarillo* group. The majority of *blancos*, *negros*, as well as *mestizos* resided in rural areas. This will shift in later years due to rural to urban migration.

Again, this is the first time that *La República* (The Dominican Republic) is used in the total as a "sum of its parts." By way of comparison, the next table, from 1935, categorizes Dominicans into "color" categories.

Table XIV
Race and Color of the Dominican Population, 1935 Census

Color	Total	Urban	Rural
La República/The Dominican Republic	1,479,417	263,625	1,215,792
Blanco/White	192,733	59,400	133,333
Negro/Black	287,677	47,198	240,479
Mestizo/Mixed	998,668	156,720	841,948
Amarillo/Asian	339	307	32

Again, this table is taken from the 1950 census data but refers to the population of 1935. Interestingly, the title is "Race and Color of the Dominican Population," but the categories are labeled "color" not "race." Later in this chapter, I consider some of the memos during the regime of Rafael Trujillo (1930-61) that demonstrate that Trujillo was influenced by the racial thinking of Adolf Hitler and Nazi Germany. Like Hitler, Trujillo believed in the idea of racial purity and the "biological threat" of "non-white" or "racially inferior" groups. For Hitler, they were the Jews, and for Trujillo, they were the Haitians. Within the ideology of racial supremacy, these two groups, Jews and Haitians, were considered to be inferior within particular national contexts.

In 1950, the categories of the census seem to reflect post W.W.II ideas of "no-race" in favor of color. In other words, we see a "race to color" shift in the way in which groups are defined in the Dominican Republic -- again, this also mirrors Brazil and Venezuela, for example, in the idea of racial democracy. In 1935, these same categories were considered racial categories, and in 1950, they became color categories. This is an

important shift in terms of how this "simple" change came to influence the no-race contemporary view we see today in the Dominican Republic.

The following chart details the change in population along the lines of race and color in 1935 and 1950.

Table XV
Race and Color in Comparison, 1935 and 1950 Census

Color	1935	1950
Blanco/White	192,733	600,994
Negro/Black	287,677	245,032
Mestizo/Mixed	998,668	1,289,285
Amarillo/Asian	339	561
TOTAL	1,479,417	2,135,872

What Table XV shows is that there was a significant increase of *blancos* between 1935 and 1950 while there was a simultaneous degrease of *negros*. The memos presented later in this chapter point to heightened European immigration efforts which could explain the increase in the *blanco* population illustrated above. All of the racial/color categories experienced an increase from 1935 to 1950 except for those in the *negro* category. This decrease in *negro* population followed the *matanza* of the Haitians in the Dominican-Haitian border communities.

The population changes, I suggest, played a role in nation building. The Dominican Republic became a place that witnessed immigration from Europe and from the Caribbean region. European immigration was favored over what was considered

"Black" immigration. The numbers indicate that there was growth among Whites in the Dominican Republic -- Whites were necessary for the biological whitening strategy that Trujillo wanted to, and did, implement.

As I will discuss later, over time the idea of immigration played a lesser role in constructing nationness in the Dominican Republic in terms of how people came to see themselves with respect to their histories and ancestry. The Dominican Republic is not imagined as a land of immigrants -- the focus is not on immigration per se. Instead, immigration is a necessary component in the construction of Dominicanness in that the sense of being Dominican is linked to being racially mixed. This mixture is due in part to immigration and whitening practices implemented by Trujillo. I will return to this point later in the chapter.

The next table considers racial and color composition according to gender in 1935 and 1950.

Table XVI
Race and Color of the Dominican Population, by Gender in Comparison, 1935 and 1950 Census

Gender/Color	1935 Total	1950 Total
VARONES/MEN	750,704	1,070,742
Blanco/White	94,082	286,736
Negro/Black	156,132	133,292
Mestizo/Mixed	500,152	650,224
Amarillo/Asian	338	490
HEMBRAS/WOMEN	728,713	1,065,130
Blanco/White	98,651	314,258
Negro/Black	131,545	111,740
Mestizo/Mixed	498,516	639,061
Amarillo/Asian	1	71

Here Table XVI shows the change in population along the lines of race and color between 1935 and 1950 for both men and women. In both gender categories, there was an increase in the *Blanco*, *Mestizo*, and *Amarillo* categories and a decrease in the *Negro* category -- again, this followed the *matanza* of Haitians in the Dominican Republic. It is striking, however, that while there is a sharp increase in the *Blanco* category for men and women, there is a significant decrease in the *Negro* category for men and women. These data reflect the efforts of the time -- to encourage White immigration and discourage Black

immigration while working to rid a "Black presence" in the Dominican Republic (see memos below).

The above table also illustrates that in both 1935 and 1950, there were more *Blanco* women than men while *Negro*, *Mestizo*, and *Amarillo* men outnumbered women in the same categories in both years. In combination, the total population of men outnumbered women by only 5612. In 1950, we begin to see the results of some of Trujillo's efforts mentioned above. It seems that by increasing the presence of both White men and White women, to an extent, whiteness is preserved (e.g. social status, elites, etc.), and at the same time, the goals of whitening are achieved.

L
D
D
G
A
Ca
Cu
Ch
Da
Sp
Ar
Fr
Ha
Du
Hu
Ing
Ital
Jam
Leb
Me
Pal
Pol
Pue
Rus
Syri
Vene
Othe

The next table illustrates the attention given to nationality and gender in 1950.

Table XVII
Nationality, 1950 Census

Nationality	Total	Men	Women
La República/The Dominican Republic	2,135,872	1,070,742	1,065,130
Dominican	2,103,249	1,048,236	1,055,013
German	240	136	104
Austrian	145	86	59
Canadian	113	75	38
Cuban	389	225	164
Chinese	455	431	24
Danish	62	35	27
Spanish	1,599	1,078	521
American (USA)	1,098	603	495
French	550	353	197
Haitian	18,772	13,275	5,497
Dutch	383	214	169
Hungarian	174	115	59
Inglesa	4,797	3,593	1,204
Italian	405	287	118
Jamaican	60	42	18
Lebanese	631	378	253
Mexican	54	24	30
Palestian	143	93	50
Polish	67	38	29
Puerto Rican	1,706	969	737
Russian	141	80	61
Syrian	94	62	32
Venezuelan	85	45	40
Other	460	269	191

In 1950, in terms of gender, there were slightly more Dominican women than men. The national groups with the most striking difference in gender ratios are the Chinese, Spanish, Haitian, and Inglesa (Black immigrants from the English Caribbean) where the men greatly outnumbered the women in the same categories. In fact, except for Mexicans and Dominicans, men outnumbered women in all national categories in 1950. This has implications for marriage and reproduction. It would seem likely then that men would leave their national group in order to marry and have children.

This table also illustrates that there were numerous "national" groups residing in the Dominican Republic and were categorized as such -- according to national origin. In 1950, these national groups had not been incorporated into the larger Dominican population as "Dominican;" they were still tied to their place of origin. In the case of the "French" and "Haitians," it is unclear if the descendants of *mulato* Haitians (from 1822-44) are classified here as Haitian, French, or Dominican, given their family surnames and importance attached to color.[62] I wonder, over time, if the descendants of *mulato* Haitians became Dominican or "French," while the Black Haitians remained Haitian. Again, the "*Inglesa*" category refers to the "cocolos" from neighboring Caribbean islands (e.g. St. Kitts, Antigua, St. Martin, Montserrat, Anguilla, etc.) who were migrant workers on the sugar cane estates in the Dominican Republic (Martinez 1999). The *Inglesas* and Haitians were both racially defined as Black but were considered to be different national groups. Being Black, they both were assigned similar tasks with regard to sugar cane labor and production. How the Black American descendants in Samana were classified during this time remains unclear -- they did not come to work on the sugar estates.

Continuing with nationalities and the classification of national groups, the next table shows the change in population according to nationality between 1920 and 1950.

Table XVIII
Nationality by Comparison, 1920 and 1950 Census

Nationality	Total 1920	Total 1950
German	87	240
Canadian	12	113
Chinese	255	455
Cuban	741	389
Spanish	1,444	1,599
American (USA)	891	1,098
French	236	550
Haitian	28,258	18,772
English	193	4,797
Italian	411	405
Puerto Rican	6069	1,706
Dutch	2	383

This table shows that there was a significant increase among the German, Canadian, Chinese, French, English, and Dutch national groups. That the white immigration, with the exception of Italians, has increased since 1920, is due to efforts to attract more Whites to the Dominican Republic (see memos later in this chapter). The Cuban, Puerto Rican, and Haitian populations have decreased in part due to emigration to other locations in the Caribbean (Hoetink 1982; Nelson 1988).

The diversity of national origins and nationalities in the Dominican Republic also suggests that there would be some diversity in religious denominations. Table XIX shows that there were different religions present in the Dominican Republic in both 1935 and 1950.

Table XIX
Religion, 1935 and 1950 Census

Religion	**1935**	**1950**
La República/The Dominican Republic	1,479,417	2,135,872
Catholic	1,458,790	2,098,474
Protestant	15,384	30,538
Buddhist	0	56
Jewish	0	463
Adventist	0	2,902
Other	5,243	1,356
None	0	1,845
None Declared	0	238

Table XIX shows an increase in all of the religious categories except for "other" between 1935 and 1950. The most prevalent religion is Roman Catholicism followed by protestantism. Buddhist, Jewish, and Adventist were among the new categories added to this census in 1950 -- they had "0" recorded practitioners in 1935.

I later argue that part of the Dominicanization process emphasized Roman Catholicism and Spanish language as two important defining characteristics of being Dominican. The census data reflect an effort to identify certain practices and link them to

national groups. In order to dissuade other religious practices and languages, other than Roman Catholicism and Spanish, the state had to first identify and locate them.

The next table shows the focus on first language in 1950.

Table XX
First Language, 1950 Census

First Language	Total	Men	Women
La República/The Dominican Republic	2,135,872	1,070,742	1,065,130
Spanish	2,093,195	1,043,760	1,049,525
Arabic	1,978	1,100	878
French	25,405	16,747	8,658
English	12,140	7,288	4,852
Italian	562	372	190
Other	2,578	1,554	1,024
Unknown	14	11	3

Clearly, for the majority of the population in 1950, Spanish was their first language. There was a significant group of people, however, who spoke either French or English as their first language. It is not clear if people who spoke a language other than Spanish for their first language also spoke Spanish. Arabic, French, English, and Italian are recognized as languages while Haitian *Creole* is not. Later in this chapter, I will demonstrate how *Creole* is viewed as an "inferior" language.

In sum, this section, using census data, illustrates the growing importance of "knowing" who was "Dominican" and who was "foreign" as well as classifying the general composition of the Dominican Republic (e.g. language, race/color, first language).

These data are tied into early articulations of Dominicanness in the face of immigration (both desired and undesired) and in terms of the formation of a Dominican national identity that encompasses race and color, religion, and language.

Transnationalism: Migration, Ideas, and Relocalization

One of the largest Caribbean migrations during this century involved Cubans (leaving Cuba since the early 1960's). They primarily went to the United States although some went to the Dominican Republic and Puerto Rico (Hoetink 1985). People from the Dominican Republic and Puerto Rico also migrated in large numbers during this century throughout the Caribbean and primarily to the United States (Georges 1990; Grasmuck and Pessar 1991; Hendricks 1974; Kasinitz 1992; Portes and Rumbaut 1990; Watkins-Owen 1996). Some sociologists, referring to early migration, attributed it to "push-pull" factors whereby migrants were seeking to improve their lot elsewhere because of economic constraints in their home countries.

As suggested earlier (and examined closely in the next section of memos), Trujillo worked to increase immigration from Europe, the "desired" immigrants, all while curbing immigration from Haiti, the "undesired" immigrants (Martinez 1999), and placing restrictions on Dominicans emigrating to other countries (Torres-Saillaint and Hernández 1998). His actions shed light on the historical formation and construction of the Dominican nation as well as his ideas about Dominicanness itself -- he planned to "lighten" the population and create a non-Black/non-White racial people and category.

The following commentary, "We Need Immigrants," was written in 1930 and clearly articulates the "need" for immigrants but of a certain "type:"

> ...Como no podemos traer todos esos inmigrantes, de un sólo golpe, podríamos, en cambio, seleccionar un grupo de ellos y dar principio en seguida, sin fabulosos gastos, a la obra de poblar nuestro suelo de gente sana, honrada y trabajadora, tan necesaria para aumentar la riqueza el poder y el bienestar de nuestra Patria.
>
> Y de ninguna parte podríamos traer mejor gente que de España. El inmigrante español, por afinidad de raza, religión e idioma, es el que mejor liga hace con nuestro pueblo, y es, por lo tanto, el que más nos conviene.
>
> No hablaremos más del importante problema de que nos libraría automáticamente el fomento de esta inmigración. No hablaremos de que ella evitaría la lamentable despoblación de nuestra tierra, para pasar a hacer una consideración de otro importante mal de que nos libraría también la llegada al país del elemento sano y tabajador [sic] de que venimos hablando.
>
> Este mal, es la lamentable "haitianización" de que estamos siendo víctimas. Todos saben que la inmigración haitiana ha llegado a tomar tal incremento, que constituye un peligro cierto para nuestra personalidad latina, para la fisonomía de nuestro pueblo, para la Patria, en fin, dejando a un lado las insinuaciones Pues bien; sabido esto, sale al paso en seguida una de las más apreciables ventajas de la inmigración a que primero nos referimos. Poniendo a estos inmigrantes como barrera en los campos cercanos a nuestro límite occidental, queda suprimida la invación.

Source: El Diario, January 15, 1930, from the "Lineas Editoriales" section entitled "Necesitamos Inmigrantes," front page; Archivo Histórico de Santiago.

Translation

> ...As we cannot bring all those immigrants, at one time, we would, on the other hand, select a group of them and soon after, without much expense, work to populate our land of healthy, honest and hard-working people, as it is necessary to increase the wealth, the power and the well-being of our Homeland.
>
> And there is no other part from where we could bring a better people than that of Spain. The Spanish immigrant, for likeness of race, religion and language, is the best combination with our community, and, therefore, the one that we need.
>
> We won't speak any more of the important problem that would liberate us automatically as a result of this immigration. We won't speak that it would prevent the lamentable depopulation of our land, to continue to make a consideration of the importance that we would be liberated by their arrival to our country bringing a healthy element and work ethic that we are talking about.
>
> This bad [situation], is the lamentable ' haitianizacion' that we are falling victim to. Everyone knows that the Haitian immigration, over time, has created certain danger for our Latin personality, for the physical features of our community, for the Homeland, in short, leaving a side the insinuations well; knowing this, let's move quickly toward the advantages of the immigration to which we first referred. Placing these immigrants as barriers in the rural areas near our western border, the invasion is suppressed.

The type of immigrant that is clearly desired and wanted is Spanish because perceived likenesses -- race, religion, and language. Interestingly, the Spanish were considered to be White not of "mixed race." Haitians, on the other hand, pose a threat of sorts to

Dominicans' "Latin personality," "physical features," and homeland because of their perceived differences -- they are undesired immigrants. Some of the same themes in the above commentary are also mentioned in official documents discussing the importance of "populating" the land, Spain being the primary source of immigrants, the growing importance of race, language and religion, and the Dominican Republic as "homeland." Memos later in this section show that Trujillo and other governmental officials actually articulated the "need" to "inject white blood" in the borderlands and to make Spanish language the official language and Roman Catholicism the official religion often in response to "Haitianization."

Haitianization is often viewed as type of "biological invasion" in terms of the potential "darkening" of the Dominican population over time as well as a "cultural invasion" because of perceived cultural differences in language, religion, and customs. In this way, Haitianization, as a process, is linked to ideas of social and cultural threats against Dominican people (e.g. language, religion, and practices). The idea of Dominicanization then is presented to counter Haitianization with regard to solidifying ideas of who Dominicans are in terms of "mixture," language, and religion within Hispanidad. These cultural practices and expressions, along with race and color, in sum, form distinguishing features of Dominicanness during this point in history.

Another example of the early formation of Dominicanness can be found in the following speech excerpt by Adriano Mejías, Director of Immigration, in April of 1932, (delivered by radio).[63] It illuminates the image that Trujillo created of the Dominican Republic when encouraging immigration from Europe:

In no other place in the world do foreigners find such consideration, friendship and help as in this hospitable country. We invite European and Spanish-American immigrants, taking of course, the neccessary [sic] restrictions, to come to our country and make an honest living in this beautiful and fruitful land, and help us at the same time in the development of agriculture, industry and commerce. Merchants with capital are also foreigners to whom we give most attention and at the same time try to give them protection and help as may be expected in a civilized country. Nowhere will their capital, invested or not, be more secure than in this country. The positive and evident fact that 95% of the busines [sic] community in this country is formed by foreign men and capital, is a proof of what we say (92). We are in need of factories of the following: dry goods, chocolate, bonbons, fish canning and preserving, milling plants to make flour from yuca to be mixed with wheat flour for baking bread of superior quality...Consequently, we have stated that the Dominican Republic is an ideal country for desirable foreing [sic] immigrants, for the following reasons: 1.-Because her climate is healthy and the sanitary services are governed by laws which are enforced. 2.-Because her inhabitants are hospitable. 3.-Because her soil is very rich and fruitful and uncultivated to a very large extent. 4.-Because her population is very small. 5.-Because she has a magnificent geographic location, with modern and rapid means of communications. 6.-Because her laws protect the immigrant worker and guarantees justice. 7.-Because the government is a protector of all those who work and produce. Immigrant farmers, experts in tropical cultivation, (we do not mean peons), of good habits and of desirable race, workers who are experts in their trades, skilled mechanics, manufacturers with technical knowledge in certain industries, merchants with cash capital for investment in the Republic, are invited to come to our country and share with us the hazards of life, assuring them that they will soon feel at home" (92-93).

It is clear here that while there is consensus that the population is "small" and needs to be increased, there is growing concern over how to increase the population in terms of who is encouraged/discouraged to settle and contribute to the population. What emerges here, and in other archival documents, is a reference to desirable race and work ethic. The assumptions were that Europeans, and Spanish in particular, were not only of desirable race but were good workers and had a great deal to contribute to society, while Haitians were of an undesirable race and were considered to be less than good workers and had little to contribute to Dominican society. The "desirable" immigrants were guaranteed certain rights and privileges under "Dominican law" while the "undesirable" immigrants were not ensured the same type of treatment and protection under the law.

In theory and practice, the Dominicanization process sought to define the nation in terms of its members, affirm the importance of Roman Catholicism (religion), and assert the importance of Spanish language. This next section explores three memos from the archives, in a collection assembled by a Dominican scholar, Bernardo Vega, who was recently the Dominican Ambassador to the United States. Dominicanization is articulated in these memos along the lines of race, nationality, religion and language.

Three Memos
Memo #1 Original Text[64]

REPUBLICA DOMINICANA
SECRETARIA DE ESTADO DE LO INTERIOR Y POLICIA

Cuidad Trujillo, D.S.D.
9 de julio de 1943

14484

Al: Señor
Secretario de Estado de la Presidencia,
SU DESPACHO.

Asunto: Medidas para evitar que se hable creole
en la región fronteriza dominicana.

Ref.: Su oficio No. 10304, de feche 7 de mayo
prómimo pasado

1.-- En relación con su atento oficio de referencia, cúmpleme informar a Ud. que, a pesar de que esta Secretaría de Estado ha realizado un cuidadoso y detenido estudio acerca de la posibilidad de dictar mediad que tiendan a evitar el uso del creole en la región fronteriza dominicana, ha encontrado que ni por vía legal ni por vía administrativa es posible en la actualidad impedir el uso de este dialecto.

2. -- El deseo expresado por el Excelentísisimo [sic] Señor Presidente de la República de desterrar de la región fronteriza el uso de una lengua extraña en absoluto a nuestra idioma, no puede ser más plausible por su elevado sentido patriótico. Entendemos, sin embargo, que ello más bien podría obtenerse como resultado de un constate esfuerzo didáctico y educacional.

Le saluda muy atentamente,

M.A. PEÑA BATILLE,
Secretario de Estado de lo Interior y Policía.

PB/dhp

Memo #1 Translation

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
SECRETARY OF STATE OF THE INTERIOR AND POLICE

Cuidad Trujillo, D.S.D.
July 9, 1943

To: Mr. Secretary of State of the Presidency,
YOUR OFFICE.

Matter: Measures to avoid that Creole is spoken
in the border region of the Dominican Republic.

Ref.: Number 10304, dated May 7

1.-- In relation to your attentive engagement with indices, I would like to inform you that, in spite of the fact that Secretary of State has carried out a careful and detailed study about the possibility of preventing the spread of and avoiding the usage of the Creole in the border region of the Dominican Republic, he found that neither legal nor administrative means is possible at the present time to prevent the use of this dialect.

2.--The desire expressed by the Excelentisimo Mr. President of the Republic to banish of the use of a strange language in the border region in absolute to our language, that is recommended for their high patriotic sense. We understand, however that it could be obtained as a result of an didactic and educational effort.

Very sincerely,

M.A. PENA BATILLE,
Secretary of State of the Interior and Police

The above memo shows that there was an attempt at the national level to monitor the usage of Creole and to determine whether or not its usage could be stopped in the border areas. Here, Creole is described as both a strange language and a dialect. There is a direct comparison to Spanish being the "superior" language to Creole as well as being the

preferred language. Speaking Spanish suggests that there is a stronger sense of patriotism in the Dominican Republic. This memo shows how language, and in particular, Spanish, became part of the national fabric in terms of defining certain characteristics of national belonging or nationness. The next memo speaks to the issues of language and religion in the Dominicanization process focusing on a particular community in the Dominican Republic.

Memo #2 Original Text[65]

Núm.

Ciudad Trujillo,
Distrito de Santo Domingo,
8 de julio de 1944.

Del: Secretario de Estado de la Presidencia.

Al: Señor Secretario de Estado de lo Interior y Policía

Asunto: Dominicanización de Samaná

1. -- En cumplimiento de instrucciones que me ha dado el Honorable Señor Presidente de la República, transcribo a usted, para su conocimiento y fines de lugar, los sigueintes párrafos de una información que, en relación con el asunto, le ha sido rendida a Su Excelencia:

"Desde hace tiempo viene ocupando la atención del Excelentísimo Señor Presidente de la República, el problema que representa el uso de idiomas, dialectos y prácticas que entrañan un morbo en la cultura del país. Este caso tipico y extremadamente original que ofrece la Común de Samaná, podria conjurarse, rápida y efectivamente, es mi creencia, cuando mi querido e Ilustre Jefe quisiera iniciar en las Cámaras Legislativas, estas dos Leyes:

Ley de Cultos, por virtud de la cual se reglamente la forma en que podrán establecerse Iglesias en el país, Prédicas y Cultos en español; fijación de días y horas para la celebración de estas; cantidad mínima de adeptos necesaria para obtener permiso de instalación, etc.

Ley sobre el uso de idiomas adulterados y dialectos, por medio de la cual se reglamente el uso de éstos en el país. Punto fundamental de estas reglamentaciones deberá ser la prohibición absoluta para los dominicanos del uso de dialectos o idiomas adulterados. Sanciones fuertes y ejecución en forma drástica, completarían el cuerpo de esta ley.

En la ciudad de Samaná funciones en la actualidad las siguientes Iglesias:

- sigue-

- #2 -

Iglesia Católica Apostólica Romana
" Evangélica Dominicana
" de Pentascotés
" de Dios
" Fé Apostólica
" Adventista del Séptimo Dia.

Otras tantas Iglesias, dependientes de éstas, funcionan en los campos. En la Común de Sánchez ocurre lo mismo, no obstante la pequeña población que caracteriza a estas dos poblaciones de la Penisula y el considerable daño que estas prédicas y oficios, múltiples y constantes, producen a la agricultura.

Entiendo que en nada puede colidir la Ley de Cultos a que hago referencia, con el Cánon Constitucional que consagra la "Toleracia de Cultos". Se trata simplemente de una reglamentación, tal como se hace cn el Comercio y con el derecho al voto, cuyas libertades garantiza la Constitución.

Ningún precepto constitucional se le podría oponer, tampoco, es mi creencia, a la Ley sobre uso de dialectos etc. - Estamos obligados a defender la pureza de nuestro bello y rico idioma, y esta ley llenaría a cabalidad esos propósitos.

Con la promulgación de las dos leyes citadas, y con la actividad de las autoridades encargadas de ejecutarlas, la dominicanización de la Provincia de Samaná puede hacerse rápidamente".

Muy atentamente,

R. Paíno Pichardo

Memo #2 Translation

Number

Ciudad Trujillo,
District of Santo Domingo,
July 8, 1944

From: The Secretary of State of the Presidency

To: Mr. Secretary of State of the Interior and Police

Matter: Dominicanization of Samana

1.-- In response to the instructions that the Honorable Mr. President of the Republic gave me, I reproduce here, for your knowledge, the following paragraphs, in relationship with this matter, that have concerned His Excellency:

"For some time now this has come to occupy the attention of His Excellency Mr. President of the Republic, the problem and malady that the use of languages, dialects and practices represent in the culture of the country. The Community of Samana presents this typical and extremely unique case, it could be plotted, quick and indeed, it is my belief, when my dear one and Boss wanted to initiate in the Legislature, these two Laws:

Law of Worship, for virtue of which regulated the form in which one can establish churches in the country, sermons and worship in Spanish; fixing of days and hours for the celebration of these; minimum number of necessary followers to obtain permission to establish, etc.

Law on the use of adulterated languages and dialects, which are regulated in the country. The fundamental point of these regulations is the absolute prohibition for Dominicans to use such dialects or adulterated languages. Strong sanction would be carried out in drastic form, and would complete the body of this law.

In the city of Samana the following churches exist at the present time:

- continued -

-2-

Roman Apostolic Catholic Church
Evangelical Church of the Dominican Republic
Pentecostal Church
Church of God
Apostolic faith
Seventh Day Adventists

Other such churches exist in the rural areas. The same thing occurs in the Community of Sanchez, nevertheless the small numbers of these two populations of the Peninsula and the considerable damage that they preach and occupations, on an ongoing basis, take precedent over agriculture.

I understand that nothing can conflict with the Law of Cults to which I make reference, with the Constitutional Canon that consecrates the ' Tolerance of Worship'. One tries a simple regulation, just as one makes in trade and with the right to the vote, whose freedoms are guaranteed by the Constitution.

No constitutional precept could be opposed either, it is my belief, to the Law on use of dialects etc. - we are forced to defend the purity of our beautiful and rich language, and this law would fulfill this purpose.

With the promulgation of the two mentioned laws, and with the activity of the authorities in charge of executing them, the Dominicanization of the Province of Samana can be made quickly."

Very sincerely,

R. PAINO PICHARDO

Here, we see how the use of language and worship practices are viewed by the Dominican government during this period in time. The religious plurality that was encouraged during the Haitian Occupation period in the Dominican Republic (1822-44) was now considered to be a threat to Dominican culture. In order to ensure that

Dominicans would speak only Spanish, new sanctions were put in place to keep people from speaking other languages. The letter states that the "fundamental point of these regulations is the absolute prohibition for Dominicans to use such dialects or adulterated languages." In other words, Dominicans could not speak any language other than Spanish -- the Spanish-only policy was put into place and enforced by sanctions. To be "Dominican" meant that one had to speak Spanish.

The other point raised here is that of religion. The domininations mentioned in the letter are called into question by the Dominican government. Claims are made that the religious practices in Samana take precedent over agricultural work and that there is "considerable damage" in what they preach. At the same time, the domininations are viewed as being "not from here." The suggestion here is that Dominicans not only speak Spanish but are (or should be) Catholic.

The next memo introduces the idea of "injecting new blood" into the border regions of the Dominican Republic as mentioned in an earlier discussion in this chapter.

Memo #3 Original Text[66]

EL JEFE SUPREMO Y DIRECTOR
DEL
PARTIDO DOMINICANO

MEMORANDUM

al Honorable Señor Presidente de
la República.-

Es evidente que las poblaciones ubicadas en o cerca de la línea fronteriza necesitan inyección de sangre nueva, especialmente de la raza blanca.

Me permito recomendar que los Secretarios de Estado de lo Interior y de Agricultura, Industria y Trabjo se pongan de acuerdo para enviar a esas poblaciones aquellas personas de raza judía o extranjeros de otras razas que deseen irse a trabajar tanto la agricultura como las ramas del comercio. Se podrían enviar también profesionales -médicos, etc. - quienes pudieran cooperar al levantamiento del nivel de esas poblaciones en lo que a patriotismo y desarrollo de sus riquezas naturales sea necesario.

Creo que esto puede ser muy beneficioso al pueblo dominicano, y creo además, que el Gobierno debe prestar toda clase de ayuda en el desarrollo gradual de este plan, el cual me permito recomendar a la consideración y compresión del señor Presidente de la República.

Rafael L. Trujillo

Ciudad Trujillo,
3 de abril, 1939

Memo #3 Translation

THE SUPREME BOSS AND DIRECTOR
OF THE DOMINICAN PARTY

MEMO

the Honorable Mr. President of
the Republic

It is evident that the populations located in or close to the border need injection of new blood, especially of the white race.

I recommend that the Secretaries of State of the Interior and of Agriculture, Industry and Work make an agreement to send to those populations people of Jewish race or foreigners of other races who want to leave in order to work in agriculture as branches of trade. They could also send professionals -- doctors, etc. who could assist in the rising of the level of those populations in patriotism and development of their wealth as necessary.

I believe that this can be very beneficial to the *pueblo* of the Dominican Republic, and I also believe that the Government should lend every type of assistance in the gradual development of this plan, the one which allows myself to recommend this to be considered by the President of the Republic.

Rafael L. Trujillo

Ciudad Trujillo,
April 3, 1939

This memo from Trujillo, in a "post-Haitian massacre" era, makes "a case" for immigration, and in particular, "White immigration" to the border areas. The language of "injecting new blood" and "white blood" illuminates Trujillo's ideas about race and race

mixture in terms of whitening, or lightening, the Dominican borderlands. The idea of "white blood" in the borderlands is directly related to the presence of Haitians in these same areas. Here, Trujillo is suggesting, in my view, that these areas have become "too dark" in terms of color and "too Haitian" in terms of language and worship practices, and the white blood is both a biological and sociocultural metaphor and strategy.

Trujillo's emphasis on injecting white blood in these areas was the precursor that led to his effort to not only increase immigration from Europe but also brutally decimate many Haitians residing in the borderlands. He specifically names people of "Jewish race" and foreigners of "other races" (compared to Haitians who were foreign and Black). He calls for doctors and other professionals to resettle in these communities to offer services and develop their wealth.

Trujillo mentions the Dominican *pueblo* in terms of something that would supposedly benefit an entire people or community. The idea of the Dominican *pueblo* exists today. The use of, and the idea of, *pueblo* falls within the construction of nationness as people associate themselves with particular places, being of a particular religion, speaking a particular language, and being of a particular "type." The *pueblo* brings to mind the people and the likenesses and connections between them that form a community with shared characteristics.

In combination, these three memos paint a picture of how Dominicanness was both constructed and policed during this time period. What emerges in these memos, in addition to the importance of language, religion, and "lightening," is the significance of the borderlands themselves. As an abstract idea, the borderlands become important in the

entire Dominicanization process in terms of identifying who is at the center of Dominicanness as well as who is on the border or periphery. As a peripheral space, both Haitians and newly arrived White immigrants have shared the borderlands which has kept them from being incorporated into the "Dominican mixture" in terms of who gets classified as "Dominican," on census forms, for example. In this respect, this sense of self, of being Dominican or non-Dominican, took root during the regime of Trujillo because of his attempt to define, implement, and educate people about their composition and history (the history was rewritten to reflect his views on the composition of the country). In other words, both Haitians and White immigrants fall outside of the *mestizo* and *indio* conceptualizations in large part because they are viewed as being "purely" Black or White, not mixed.

The census data presented in the tables earlier in this chapter show who was identified as *mestizo*, *negro*, as well as *blanco* during a time when Trujillo orchestrated both the European immigration efforts and the massacre of Haitians residing in the Dominican Republic (1937) as a biological whitening strategy. The following excerpt is taken from the book, *Sosúa: From Refuge to Paradise,* and provides insight into the lives of Jewish descendants, those invited by Trujillo, to settle on the northern coast of the Dominican Republic years after the Haitian massacre (Eichen 1995: 7-8):

The sad destiny of thousands and thousands of human beings, stripped of their properties, harassed from their homes, mistreated, tortured and sent to extermination camps, prompted the President of the United States of America, Franklin D. Roosevelt to convoke in the year 1938, and International Conference to discuss the immigrant Jews, in the city of Evian, France.

Thirty-two countries sent delegations. The result was depressing, none showed willingness to admit the Jews that were left without a country.

Only the delegation from the Dominican Republic, declared that their country was willing to give protection to One Hundred Thousand refugees, victims of the nazi persecution.

The Dominican Republic let the doors open to save thousands of innocent lives from the holocaust in Europe.

The noble gesture of its government and people constitutes a historic event of the XXth Century.

Meanwhile, at the other side of the Atlantic Ocean efforts were being made to make the promise a significant event, a reality.

After many meetings held in 1939, the American Jewish Joint Agricultural Corporation (AGRO-Joint) takes charge and supplies the initial capital to start the project and so the base for the foundation of the Dominican Republic Settlement Association, Inc. (called, *La Dorsa*) has been formed.

On January of the year 1940 Dr. James N. Rosenberg, President of La DORSA, moves to the Dominican Republic and on January 30, 1940 the Dominican Government signs an Agreement, ratified immediately by the National Congress.

The Generalísimo Dr. Rafael Leonidas Trujillo Molina, donated 26,000 acres of his property in Sosúa, in the Northern coast of the country, in the name of the Dominican Republic and as a personal contribution for a humanitarian project.

Eichen also mentions in the book that it was at the request of Trujillo's daughter (who had befriended a Jewish woman in Europe years earlier) that he granted permission for Jewish refugees to settle in Sosúa (in the northern part of the Dominican Republic). Not only did he grant permission for 100,000 Jews to settle in the Dominican Republic, he also gave them some of his own property to assist them in their resettlement efforts. He offered his own land and other resources for their settlement in the hopes that they could assist in his whitening efforts by intermarrying with Dominicans.

In Germany, Jews were viewed as "impure," "inferior," and "non-White," much like the Haitians were viewed in the Dominican Republic. There were two human tragedies here, both involving persecution and loss of life -- Germany witnessed the Holocaust, and the Dominican Republic witnessed the *matanza*. Archival documents raised questions about the relationship between Trujillo and Hitler -- Trujillo began to dress like Hitler and espouse similar ideas about racial supremacy. Trujillo seemed to be influenced by Hitler and his racist ideology. One could argue that Trujillo's acceptance of the Jewish refugees allowed him to redeem himself somewhat in the eyes of the international community after word had spread about the *matanza*. The irony here is that the Jewish refugees, once viewed as "non-White" in Nazi Germany, represented whiteness to Trujillo and *became* White in the Dominican Republic. The Dominican Republic was to be a refuge for the Jews while being a place of peril for many Haitians who were believed to pose a biological and cultural threat to the construction of Dominicanness.

The next chapter moves away from the dictatorship to more of a contemporary period that is directly influenced by Hispanidad and the ideas of *mestizaje*. After the assassination of Trujillo in 1961, there were uprisings and instability. The United States was very concerned about Communist sympathizes in the Dominican Republic and possible alliances with Cuba. After a period of turmoil, Joaquin Balaguer, a member of the Trujillo regime, emerged as President of the Dominican Republic and perpetuated the ideas of Hispanidad, but during this particular time period, the discourse moved into one of Mestizaje.

VI. Mestizaje: The Dominant Contemporary Discourse Surrounding Race and Racial Identity in the Dominican Republic (1961-1989)

In many ways, Mestizaje resembles Hispanidad in its articulation. The difference here is that while there is still an appreciation for Spanish contributions and influences, the Dominican Republic as homeland springs forth as one of Trujillo's legacies. In this way, Dominicans are linked to a particular land, a particular history, and are a particular "type" of people. The claim "We are Dominican," emerging from the ethnographic data, is significant in terms of linking people to a place, at different points in time, and web race and nation in a way that being Dominican means having a generational presence, roots, and *liga* that is particular to the Dominican Republic.

As Wade (1993) suggests:

> On the one hand, the glorification of the mestizo draws its meaning and force from the history of mestizaje and the emergence of a large set of mixed people in the country...One the other hand, blanqueamiento, by envisaging a future in which blackness and indianness are not only absorbed but also erased from the national panorama, giving rise to a whitened mestizo nation, smuggles in discrimination and turns the vision into an impossible utopia. Because, by definition, every whitening must also be a darkening, and if darkening is avoided by lighter people discriminating against the darker, then no ultimate progress towards a totally mestizo nation, let alone a whitened mestizo nation, is possible. This possibility of seeing in nationalist discourse about race mixture both a celebration of mixture and a discrimination against blacks and indians is a characteristic of the contradictory coexistence of mestizaje and discrimination in Colombian society (Wade 1993: 19).

There are a number of important points in what Wade posits here such as the ideas of absorption -- erasing people -- in the formation of something "new." The concept of whitening does not take into account a resultant darkening of a people -- people are

darkened while they are lightened. In the Dominican case, people try to hold on to ideas of being *indio*, and to a lesser extent *mestizo*, all the while expressing that they are "denying that they are Black and that they have African ancestry" (commonly expressed to me during interviews).

As I suggested earlier, mestizaje, as a conceptual framework, is difficult for me in that I find it problematic as it does not accurately reflect the "mixture" that we find in the Dominican Republic. Mestizaje implies *mestizo* not *mulato* as *mestizo* literally means European - Indigenous mixture. In this way, the Africans, the *negros*, have been erased and "absorbed" in order to configure and articulate ideas of mixture and Dominicanness. The concept of mestizaje maintains distance from African ancestry, and because there was an African presence in the Dominican Republic, I find that mestizaje doesn't quite anchor my analysis. I use it, however, because it loosely refers to race mixture, because the Dominican elite chose it because of its non-Black connotation, and because Dominicans themselves often talk about being *mestizos* in the sense of being mixed. I will return to this point in the final analysis, but for the purposes of this chapter, it is an overarching way of presenting the data on contemporary ideas of mixture.

Racial Views and Concepts

As expressed earlier, the current views during this time period are linked to the past, and in particular, the racial discourse of Hispanidad. The idea of mixture defines Dominicans as a *liga,* or mixture/combination, of Tainos, Spanish, and sometimes

Africans and their descendants. A way of talking about the *liga* is often associated with *sancocho*, the national dish, composed of various ingredients (meats and vegetables) very similar to a gumbo. As in Puerto Rico, the idea of *sancocho* is very important in terms of talking about mixture because it recognizes diversity in a common "stock" (the stock is the base that is prepared before the other ingredients are added). In this way, the stock represents a commonness of history and "like ancestry."

During interviews, the general acknowledgment of the *liga* was typically followed by a discussion of the mixture, in terms of ancestry, and the resultant phenotypic variation and social importance of skin color. Often, the *liga* is presented in various ways although the most prevalent way of talking about the Dominican *liga* is to evoke a sense of triangular mixture resulting from miscegenation between the above mentioned groups. However, the *liga* has also been presented as a bi-polar type of mixture between the Tainos and Spanish as well as a multi-race mixture resulting from the presence of various immigrant groups residing in the Dominican Republic over time (as presented in the census data tables in the previous chapter). It is important to mention that while the triangular concept includes Africans, the Mestizaje discourse maintains distance from African ancestry and blackness, as the historical discourse did, and purposefully links Haitians with African heritage and practices as well as with a *Negro*/Black racial category.

As the dominant contemporary discourse in the Dominican Republic, Mestizaje comprises *mestizo, indio,* and the overall sense of being a *mezcla* (of being mixed) because of the historical *liga* between groups. Mestizaje is thus linked to historical memory and national pastness as it has firm roots in the historical discourse that witnessed the

formation of Dominicanness with ideas of mixture firmly planted. While *mestizo* was the racial category that categorized the majority of Dominicans, with regard to the official census categories presented in the last chapter, *indio* soon replaced *mestizo* as a way of describing color as well as the racial "in-betweenness" and *liga* of Dominicans.

While racial classifications are no longer recorded or used on the census in the Dominican Republic, there are similar color categories on the national identification/voter election card, the *cédula*. In this chapter, I will review text books and present data from interviews as well as from observations made during the "cedulazation" process (where *cédulas* were issued) in order to explore the socialization process and the way in which Mestizaje is used to anchor Dominicanness, in terms of the *indio* color category, and its embodiment and expression on a daily basis.

Racial Discourse and the Articulation of Racial and National Identities

Importantly, Mestizaje continues to retreat from notions of African ancestry in favor of a national identity that encompasses a variation of skin color, referred to as *indio*. Many participants said that "we deny that we have African ancestry -- that we are Black." This points to a knowledge of African ancestry and a concurrent and conscious distancing from it. Statements such as "we all have some 'Black' behind the ear" also reveal an acknowledgment of African ancestry, but, in this case, it is something that can be "hidden behind the ear," or simply "tucked away."

Indio is the preferred category that captures a sense of mixture without reference to blackness and/or African ancestry. By this point in time, "*indio*" has been well established as descriptive and used by people to describe themselves and others -- this is due to history and the configuration of Dominicanness along the lines of race and color. In relation to White, *indio* is non-White, and in relation to Black, *indio* is non-Black. It was created to distinguish the majority of Dominicans, who were mixed, from White and Black, and at the same time, with a distance away from blackness in large part because of Haitians' association with Africa and blackness.[67]

Much of the articulation of race and nation during this period can be found in school text books, newspapers, as well as on the *cédula*. The following excerpt is taken from a third grade social studies textbook that is widely used in the Dominican Republic:

Al Alumno[68]

A tí niño dominicano.
¡Has pasado de curso! ¡Ya estás en tercero!
¡Cuántas cosas conoces ya! Y, sin embargo, ¡cuántas te faltan por conocer! Cuando estudies cada tema de los que aquí se te presentan irás descubriendo y aprendiendo nuevas cosas de tu país. Sabrás de sus montañas y ríos; de sus hermosos valles y ciudades; de sus riquezas y productos más importantes. Conocerás cómo y de qué vive el hombre de nuestro pueblo; de las luchas y hazañas de sus grandes hombres para forjar el país en el cual vives. Para recorrer ese camino que hoy empiezas queremos ir contigo, ser tu amigo, y enseñarte, a través de las páginas que forman este libro, esa pequeña y hermosa parte del mundo que es tu patria: la República Dominicana.

Translation

To the Student

To you Dominican child.
You have passed the course! You are already in third grade!
How many things you already know! And, however, how many things you have yet to learn! When you study each topic presented here you will discover and learn new things about your country. You will know about its mountains and rivers; of its beautiful valleys and cities; of its riches and products most importantly. You will know how Dominicans live; of the fights and feats of its greatest countrymen to shape the country in which you live. We want to go with you to travel the path that you begin today, to be your friend, and teach you, through the pages that form this book, that small and beautiful part of the world that is your homeland: the Dominican Republic.

This introduction to the student does more than introduce him/her to a new level of social studies. The words paint a picture of the Dominican Republic that reminds students that the Dominican Republic is their homeland with a past full of history and beauty. I conducted a brief interview with two young girls, in elementary school (who used this text book when they were in the third grade) focusing on what they learned in their social studies class about their history and the composition of the Dominican Republic. When I asked them what they remembered reading and discussing in class about their history in particular, they said that they learned about the Tainos and where/how they lived as well as about their Spanish ancestry. Interestingly, their first response was to talk about the Tainos. The interview continued along these lines, and I asked if they had learned about

Africans, and they said "no." They indicated that they had not been told about the African presence in the Dominican Republic and that the only time they discussed Africa at all was when they discussed Haitian immigration to the Dominican Republic. Here, the girls commented on what they read and learned about Dominican history. Such books are written by people who offer historical and sociocultural accounts of events and people.

The Tainos continue to have a "presence" in the Dominican Republic because they are the subjects of articles and books and are often depicted in museums such as the *Museo del Hombre Dominicano* (Museum of Dominican Man). Hispaniola was inhabited by Caribs[69] and Arawaks (e.g. Tainos) when Columbus arrived in the Americas, and they were soon decimated due to diseases, etc. (Henry 1994). This is significant as images and references of Tainos are, at present, (re)emerging. An example of this is the Taino word for the island of Hispaniola, "Quisqueya." Some examples of its usage include[70]: 1) referring to the Dominican Republic as Quisqueya; 2) Quisqueya Beer; 3) the article entitled "La Quisqueyana" (Tancer 1973); and 4) the monograph *Quisqueya on the Hudson: The Transnational Identity of Dominicans in Washington Heights* (Duany 1994). Also, the cover of *Caribbean Contours* (Mintz and Price 1985) contains an illustration of Taino art. This (re)emergence of the Taino is something that we see in the Dominican Republic and Puerto Rico (it is not as evident in Cuba perhaps because Fidel Castro once defined it as an Afro-Latin nation). Some anthropologists and other social scientists, possibly in response to how the images are used locally, have used the image of the Tainos to represent the Caribbean, especially the Hispanic Caribbean (e.g. Mintz and Price 1985; Hoetink 1985; Mintz 1974).

The interview with the girls prompted me to talk with educators about historical accounts and the "official" history of the Dominican Republic. I learned that the Department of Education had only recently formed a committee to revise the history to be more inclusive by writing Africans and the African presence "back into" Dominican history. I met one of the educators on that committee who told me that there was some resistance to the idea, but it was time to have a more accurate account and complete understanding of history (I discuss revisionist history and opposional efforts in the next chapter).[71]

Realizing that this socialization process extended beyond the schools, I examined some of the public reference materials to see how history was represented, how racial categories were named and defined, as well as the social significance/meaning of these categories. The *Enciclopedia Dominicana*, first published in 1976, like many other encyclopedia, contains historical facts and information about important events and people in Dominican history. Looking for contemporary definitions of some of the racial/color categories that are currently in circulation (e.g. social use and on the *cédula*), I examined the encyclopedia for definitions and examples. The most recent volume was published in 1997, however, the definitions of *mestizo*, *negro*, and *mulato* remained the same in 1997 and 1976.[72]

I begin here with the definition of Mestizaje:

> Si bien el mestizaje, como fusión de razas, fue un fenómeno donde concurrieron blancos, negros e indios, es importante resaltar que de todos esos estratos sociales, (los más bajos e inferiores, denominados *malas razas* o malas castas, eran los de

mayor pigmentación negra, resultando los negros puros ubicados en el último peldaño social). Cuando los grupos minoritarios blancos se percataron de la imposibilidad de detener o evitar la proliferación de castas y el empuje ascensional de éstas, intensificaron las medidas discriminatorias segregacionistas. La discriminación y el prejuicio racial contra el negro fue un fenómeno que estuvo -- y aún está -- presente en la historia del pueblo dominicano y en casi todo América (Enciclopedia Dominicana vol 5 1976: 93).

(Translation)

Although *mestizaje*, as coalition of races, was a phenomenon wherewhite, black and Indians converged, it is important to mention that those social strata, (the lowest and most inferior, named bad races or bad castes, had dark pigmentation, resulting in pure blacks being situated in the last social rung). When the white minority groups noticed the impossibility of stopping or avoiding the proliferation of castes and the advancement of these, they intensified the discriminatory segregationist measures. The discrimination and the racial prejudice against blacks was a phenomenon that was -- and still is -- present in the history of the Dominican Republic and in almost throughout America.

It is clear from the definition that mestizaje in general was defined as a *liga* or mixture of the races, with Blacks being the "inferior" race. There is an association of race and caste linking those with dark pigmentation with conditions of poverty, connecting race and social class. At the same time, this definition recognizes discrimination based on color, linking race and color. Also, mestizaje is linked to a discrimination practice -- a "blending" or incorporation of the "inferior" races or castes.

Mestizo, *mulato*, and *negro* are defined below and provide the sociocultural context for their contemporary usage (the definitions were the same in 1976 and 1997):

1) Mestizo[73] - En general nombre dado a la persona nacida de padre y madre de diferentes castas. En América aplicábase a los hijos de los matrimonios mixtos españoles e indios. Durante la colonización, que duró desde el siglo XVI hasta mediados del XIX, el mestizaje o fusión de raza fue un fenómeno que acopañó todo el proceso.

1) Mestizo - In general it is a name given to the person born of a father and mother of different castes. In America it applies to the children of the mixed marriages between Spaniards and Indians. During colonization, from the XVI century until half of the XIX century, mestizaje or fusion of race was a phenomenon that accompanied the entire process.

Mestizo is the result of mixture between Spaniards and Indians. Here, the idea of caste is used to talk about these two "distinct" groups. Caste is also used in other places (e.g. India) to refer to color. In different contexts, caste can mean race or color. The definition also states that *mestizo* was part of a larger process of race mixing throughout colonization. The definition of *mulato* follows:

2) Mulato[74] - Nombre dada en América a los hijos de español y negra. Los mulatos, tanto los nacidos en las colonias españoles o aquellos que por emigración habían nacido en la metrópoli, mantenían su condición de sometidos, aunque muchos llegaron a adquirir la condición de libres. Los mulatos llegaron a constituir una categoría étnica importante en tanto producto resultante de la mezcla racial (71)...Dentro de la categoría racial de mulato existían diversos tipos, a saber: a) el mulato propiamente dicho o mulato blanco, que resultaba del cruce del europeo y del negro; b) mulato morisco o simplemente morisco,

resultado de la mezcla de blanco con mulata blanca; c) mulato prieto, era el hijo de negro y mulata parda. Estos tendían a pasar por negro por su color bastante oscuro; d) los pardos *o* zambos, resultantes de la unión de negros con indias. Esta mezcla según tono de la piel sufría una gran subdivisión. Muchos mulatos casaban a su vez con blancos y otros mulatos (72).

2) Mulatto - Name given in America to the children of Spaniards and Blacks. The mulattos, many born in the Spanish colonies or those born in the city due to immigration, maintained their enslaved condition, although many ended up acquiring freedom. The mulattos ended up constituting an important ethnic category resulting from racial mixture (71) ...Different types exist within the racial category of mulatto: a) mulatto, or white mulatto, is the offspring of a European and a Black; b) Moorish mulatto, or simply Moorish, is the result of the mixture between a white man with a white mulatto woman; c) blackish mulatto, was the child of a black man and a brown mulatto woman. They tended to pass for black because of their dark color; d) Pardos or Zambos resulted from the union of blacks with Indians. This mixture according to skin tone sustained a large subdivision. Many mulattos married whites and other mulattos.

In the above Spanish language definition, one is a *mulato* if the father is Spanish and the mother is African. There are more gender-specific references within this definition than the others listed here. Interestingly, there are different "types" of *mulatos* based on color and ideas of ancestry. Presented here are various intermarriage possibilities with their offspring racially defined. The way that *mulato* is used here -- shades of *mulato* -- is very similar to how *indio* is used today. The definition of *negro* follows:

3) Negros[75] - Naturales de Africa, traídos a América como mano de obra esclava para trabajar en las minas y en las grandes plantaciones. La venta de los negros constituyó un

lucrativo negocio que en América estuvo regulado por licencias concedidas a través de la Corona española.

3) Blacks - Natives of Africa, brought to America as slave labor to work in the mines and in the large plantations. The sale of Blacks constituted a lucrative business in America that was regulated by licenses granted by the Spanish Crown.

Here, there is no mention of racial possibilities of offspring, only who people were, where they were from, and what they were brought to America to do. This is also the shortest definition of the three given here.

The definition and meaning of *mestizo* given in the *Enciclopedia Dominicana* refers to a specific type of mixture, Spanish-Indian. This is how *mestizo* has been, and generally is, defined throughout Latin America. If we take the meaning literally, there is no reference to Blacks or Africans in this mixture which brings me back to my previous point about *mestizo*, and mestizaje in general, constructed in a bi-polar way that excludes and distances Blacks. It was *mestizo* that was used first as a racial category then color category on the census in the Dominican Republic as we explored in the last chapter. The twist here is that while other countries claimed *mestizo* identities (e.g. Mexico, Equator, etc.), they were descendants of Spaniards and Indians, but in the Dominican Republic, the term came to represent mixture in general with a strong ancestral tie to the Tainos, "blood or no blood." The more important point, however, is the distancing away from blackness in terms of how mixture is cast in the Dominican Republic, from *mestizo* but *indio*. Interestingly and surprisingly, there were no definitions for *blanco* or *indio* in the *Enciclopedia Dominicana*. *Criollo* was defined as children of Spaniards born in the

Dominican Republic. Today, *criollo* often refers to Dominicans born abroad, typically residing in New York.

Again, within the Mestizaje discourse, *mestizo* and *indio* are used more frequently than *mulato* in terms of talking about being mixed (*mulato* in its definition and cultural significance includes blackness). Again, the everyday usage of *indio*, with skin color variation descriptions, tends to mirror the above definition of *mulato* (with attention given to different types of mulattos). Descriptions such as *indio/a claro/a* (light skinned) or *indio/a oscuro/a* (dark skinned) are common in everyday expression. Also, descriptions such as "la clarita" (the light-skinned one) or "la morena" (the dark-skinned one) are commonly used. At the same time, there are a number of color descriptions used in conversation that fall outside of the state sanctioned categories (e.g. *moreno/a*, *trigueño/a*, *prieto/a*, etc.).

By way of comparison, a person who is *negro*, according to the above definitions, is the only one in the group with a presumed "pure" quality with references to Africa. In this way, we begin to see images emerging of Dominicans vis-à-vis Haitians in terms of mixture and black purity (despite the prevalence of dark-skinned Dominicans and mixture among Haitians).

Individual Identities and State-Sanctioned Categories

Wanting to see how the state assigns racial/color categories based on the socio-cultural significance of racial/color categories as well as how the categories differ from earlier ones used on the census, I observed the "cedulazation" process (where *cédulas* are

issued), over the course of three weeks, at the Junta Central Electoral in Santiago.[76] It was announced in the newspapers that new *cédulas* would be issued with finger prints and a photograph (updating and verifying data in the computer system) as a way of preventing fraud during elections (as the *cédula* is used as a primary identification card as well as voter card).

Since 1995, I have wanted to observe the process of obtaining a *cédula*. Thinking that it was somewhat like applying for a driver's license in the United States where a person walks into an office, take a number, an when called, enters into a negotiation process with the employee of the state who then asks for the person's height and weight among other characteristics while performing vision tests, etc. For people who drive in the United States, a driver's license also serves as a primary identification card, like the *cédula*.

Unlike the driver's license scenario where race is no longer recorded (it used to be listed on my driver's license in Indiana, but many states have stopped listing race on the license itself), the *cédula* lists color as it is one of the characteristics that describes the person along with height, weight, and gender (according to an interview that I had with one of the Junta staff members). I wanted to see if the category was simply descriptive or if it served more as a racial category. I was particularly interested in seeing how representatives of the state enter into negotiation with people about their color. I was fortunate to be able to observe this process as well as interview some of the staff members about how they classify people and how some of the categories, especially *indio*, are becoming increasingly problematic.

In order to observe the process, I had to go through a series of introductions and meetings where I was introduced to people who were made aware of my research and intentions. This was done through a chain of social networks; a close friend introduced me to the President of the Junta Central (his cousin) who introduced me to the Secretary of the Junta Central, who then introduced me to one of his staff members, a woman who would be issuing the *cédulas*, Celia. Celia took me around the building and made other introductions. After a meeting with the Secretary and Celia, I was told that I could shadow Celia (sit with her, conduct interviews, etc.) and observe the cedulazation process.

Before the cedulazation began, I had the opportunity to interview Celia. An excerpt from that interview follows:

Interview with Celia
August 4, 1998

The *cedulazation* process was intended to update *cédulas* (to make changes to names, addresses, etc.) and to start a computer data base for all *cédulas* to prevent election fraud.

Kim Can we talk about the changes in the cédula? You told me before that *indio* was not going to be on the cédula this time. This is the first time that it won't be on the cédula.

Celia Right. We used *indio* before. *Indio* doesn't exist.

K What happened to suggest that *indio* doesn't exist.

C I don't know. I have the idea that *indio* means "indigenous," and I realized that we are not indigenous -- pure indigenous. We are mixed, but there are no Indians here.

K For the cédulazation, what are the color categories? *amarillo*...

C *amarillo*, *mulato*, *blanco*, *negro*, and *mestizo*

K Do you think that *mestizo* is a substitute for *indio*?

C It comes from *indio* and is a way of talking about mixture of *blanco* and *negro*, like *mulato* -- we don't think of ourselves as *mulatos* here. *Indio* used to refer to the Tainos -- they called them *indios*.

Celia suggests that *indio* and *mestizo* are interrelated -- that *mestizo* comes from *indio*. These two categories have often served as a substitute for the other (e.g. *mestizo* on the census, *indio* on the *cédula*, etc.). The idea of racial purity is mentioned here and follows throughout the interview. Purity means distinct groups. Her argument here is that Dominicans are mixed and that the categories are not racial but color descriptive. I'll return to this point later. The interview continues:

K Do you think there is a difference between *mulato* and *mestizo*? What is the difference?

C For us, *mulatos* are darker than *mestizos*, and *negros* are darker than *mulatos*.

K and *amarillo*?

C *Oriental*

K and *blanco*?

C Europe...Germany...

K The other day, someone said that *mestizo* refers to a mixture between Dominican and Haitian...

C No. Here the mixture of Dominican and Haitian is *mulato* or *negro* because they are very dark although there are Haitians of French ancestry (White). Many of them are descendants of enslaved Africans. But a mixture of Dominican and Haitian is *mulato* because we are "a little bit" lighter than they are.

K Do you think that the category *mestizo* is used because of influence from Mexico?

C Could be. Because Mexicans have a similar color -- not real dark, but not too light either.

Here, we begin to see how color plays a part in the naming process. According to Celia, *mulatos* are darker than *mestizos*. The definition of *mulato* in the Dominican Encyclopedia referred to mixture of Spaniards and Africans (with variations within the *mulato* category based on color and ancestry). For someone like Celia, who was charged with defining people on a state-sanctioned identification card, this visual naming exercise based on phenotype was all the more interesting to me as a researcher. Does everyone have the same definition? Can *mulatos* be lighter than *mestizos*? Who decides? I later asked these questions of Celia and others at the *Junta Central Electoral*. I return to these questions after the interview:

K I read that Rafael Trujillo institutionalized *indio* by placing it on the cédula.

C Yes. He "planted" everything. He "planted" (established) *indio* -- because he was racist. They were racist. They said *indio* to avoid saying *negro*.

K What will happen during the cedulazation when a person, who is used to being classified as *indio*, will not be classified in that way since *indio* will not be on the cédula this time? What do you think the reaction will be?

C You don't have to ask them what color they are. You have the option to look at them and choose a color. For the most part, they accept what you choose. There are many people with different backgrounds, classes, and they know that you are working, and they accept what you choose.

I began to see how the cedulazation process differed from the driver's license scenario I began with. Here, people are defined by state appointed staff who assign a color category

based on how people "look." While this may happen in certain situations in the United States, people tend to classify themselves at the present time (e.g. census, governmental forms, etc.). The interview continues with a focus on Dominicans in the United States:

K Do you think that the experiences that Dominicans have in the U.S. have an influence here in terms of the categories like *indio*?

C I don't know. There are *indios* there, real *indios* (Indians). There is the category *indio* there (U.S.) because there are pure Indians. In Mexico, there are pure Indians, and in many countries in Latin America, there are pure Indians. But here, no.

K Have your relatives talked about their experiences in the United States with respect to racial classifications?

C Yes. I have a cousin in the United States, and she told me that the United States is racist...when one wants to rent an apartment. There is racism against Latinos. They *saca* (cast aside) Latinos. The United States is, to us, a country that is very developed. Racism still exists there and here.

K How is racism manifested here?

C Against the Haitians because of their color. We *rechazamos* reject them. We don't *sacar* them (cast them aside), but we reject them because of their color -- they are dark -- even though many of us have the same color.

K Is there tension between light-skinned Dominicans and dark-skinned Dominicans?

C Yes. Sometimes. Although there are more light-skinned men (*claro*) with *india* women and more light-skinned women (*clara*) with dark-skinned men (*oscuro*). The color of one's skin does not change. We are human beings.

K Are the classifications on the cédula racial or color classifications?

C Yes, and they refer to color. *Blanco*, *negro*, *indio*, *mestizo*, come from races.

K Are these distinct groups?

C No...we are all mixed. There are no distinct groups like in the U.S. You can have a Chinese and Dominican, Colombian and Peruvian, Peruvian and Chilean. There

are no, as you say, groups. They come together, but there are no distinct racial groups. We are a mix.

K Can money change a person's classification? Does money whiten?

C Here no. You may be a millionaire, but if you are prieto (dark), you are *prieto*. You cannot change your color.

K Some people say that color is not race -- that color is descriptive. Or that Dominican, the nationality has more to do with race than color. What is the concept of race here in the DR?

C We start with color. *Oriental* is *amarillo*, that the *Mexicano* is *mestizo*, that the Haitian, the African, is *negro,* that there are *mulatos* -- from races. We are mixed from so much immigration. There are Japanese, Chinese, Spanish, Turkish -- everything that you can imagine is here. There is a tremendous mixture. We Dominicans are not pure.

This section of the interview highlights the importance of color (e.g. color of Haitians, money cannot change color or whiten, etc.) as well as the idea of racial mixture in relation to purity. Celia ends by saying that "we are not pure."

While there are a number of inter-related ideas presented in Celia's interview, I want to emphasize some of her comments that are relevant to the discussion in this chapter. She said that they (she and others at the *Junta Central Electoral*) used to assign *indio* as a category, although *indio* doesn't exist. It was when Celia reflected on the meaning of the word *indio* as Indian that she realized that Dominicans were not indigenous, pure indigenous. For Celia, *mestizo* comes from *indio* and is a way of talking about the Black-White mixture without using *mulato* because, in her view, Dominicans don't want to think of themselves as *mulato* -- this was also expressed by many other participants. *Mulatos* are darker than *mestizos*, and *negros* are darker than *mulatos*. Part

of her own reflection stems from her awareness of "pure" indigenous people outside of the Dominican Republic and a critical reflection on Dominican History. What follows here is an ethnographic account of my visits to the *Junta Central Electoral* to observe the cedulazation process. Much of what Celia said here in her interview was rearticulated during my visits.

The Cedulazation Process

When the cedulazation began, there was a buzz in Santiago as people wanted to obtain the new *cédula*. I went to the Junta Central on the second day and found a line of people extending out of the main door of the building and onto the sidewalk. In many ways, it was a frenzied process without much structure (e.g. extremely long lines, delays, etc., and it was common to wait 6-8 hours to get into the building to have the *cédula* issued). Inside the main building, the line moved slowly to the outside courtyard and finally to a large entrance to a side building where the *cédulas* were processed. Only a certain number of people were allowed in the room at one time, with approximately 200-300 people waiting outside without much to do but wait in line. In extreme heat and, at time, rain, people had to wait outside until they were instructed to enter the building by the police officers who were guarding the main doors.

On the first day, there were two police officers guarding the entrance, but as days passed, and the lines grew longer, more police were there (some with batons), keeping lines straight and dividing the courtyard groups into separate lines according to gender. I made my way to the courtyard and to the front of the line, by excusing myself and

assuring people that I was not cutting in front of them to obtain a new *cédula* for myself, and asked for Celia. I told the police officer that I was there to observe the process and that I had permission to be alongside Celia. He told me that Celia was on break and asked me to wait in front of the line for her. With everyone looking at me with my bookbag heavy on my shoulder, I thought I needed to introduce myself, at least to the people who, all of a sudden, were in back of me. As I waited for Celia, I talked to the women closest to me, Maria, in the line for women. Maria told me that she resides in Miami and was in Santiago visiting family and decided to get the new *cédula*.

Again, according to my earlier interview with Celia, I thought that *indio* was no longer going to be a color category on the *cédula* and would be replaced with *mestizo*. She and I both thought, for the first time since Trujillo's institutionalization of *indio*, that it was not going to be used, and that people used to being defined as *indio* on the *cédula* would be defined in a different way (this turned out not to be the case, however). Maria and I discussed this while we waited in line. Upon hearing that *indio* would not be a category on the *cédula*, Maria responded by saying that *indio* doesn't exist and that it was invented in the Dominican Republic. She also said that *indio* loses its meaning in the United States because everything is painted in Black and White.

Around this time, Celia was making her way back to the side building to enter the cedulazation area. Upon seeing me, she introduced me to the police officer and let him know that I had permission to be there and could come back at any time to observe the process; this was helpful during subsequent visits. I entered with Celia and continued my conversation with Maria after she entered the room.

The room was set up with a lot of hi-tech equipment such as computers, cameras, printers, and bright lights. There was only room for about 20 people at one time. After waiting outside, people had to wait in a line inside, seated against the wall until they were motioned come over to an open station. Normally, there were about seven open stations, at any given time, where people could renew or apply for a new *cédula*. After Celia introduced me to other staff members in the room, letting them know that the Secretary gave me permission to observe the process, I sat next to Aaron, who showed me the color categories, as he issued a *cédula*.

Again, based on the interview that I had with Celia previously, I thought that the "official" *cédula* color categories were going to be *blanco, negro, mulato, amarillo,* and *mestizo* (replacing *indio*) because she had indicated that the staff had been advised of this change in their training session. Despite what they were told, and despite efforts to remove it, *indio* remained on the *cédula*, and Celia didn't know it had not been removed. Not only was it to be dropped, but it was to be replaced by *mestizo* (which was earlier dropped in favor of *indio* on the *cédula*). On July 13, 1998, the president of the Partido de la Identidad Dominicana -- PID (Dominican Identity Party) was interviewed for an article entitled "El PID llama a sustituir el término "*indio*" de la *cédula*" (PID calls for a substitution of *indio* on the *cédula*):

> El presidente del Partido de la Identidad Dominicana, Aulio Collado Anico, sugirió una legislación para que cambie el calificativo de "indio" que se establece como color de la piel de la gran mayoría de los dominicanos en la cédula de identidad. El dirigente político considera incorrecta esa denominación, ya que obedece a prejuicios raciales históricos, cuando en realidad el color de la gran mayoría de los

dominicanos no es blanco, negro, ni tampoco indio, sino que la mejor representación es el mestizo. Collado sugiere a la Junta Central Electoral que se propone a promover reformas legales, incluyendo la confección de una nueva cédula de identidad personal, para que trate de corregir esa deformación racial en pos de que el calificativo de indio sea sustituido. (page 1 of the El Cibao section of Listin Diario by Ricardo Santana)

Translation

The president of the Dominican Identity Party, Aulio Collado Anico, suggested a legislation that changes the "*indio*" designation of skin color that describes majority of Dominicans on the *cédula*. The political leader considers this denomination to be incorrect, referring to historical racial prejudices, when in reality the color of the majority of Dominicans is not white, black, neither *indio*, however the best representation is mestizo. Collado suggests to the Junta Central Electoral that he intends to promote legal reformations, including the making of a new *cédula*, to try and correct the racial deformation after *indio* is substituted.

Here, Anico recommends *mestizo*, not *mulato* as a category that best represents the "majority of Dominicans" who are not White, Black, nor *indio*. Despite PID's efforts, however, *mestizo* was not introduced as a new category and did not subsequently replace *indio*. Thus, the five color categories were *blanco*, *indio*, *mulato*, *negro*, and *amarillo*. I sat as Aaron motioned to a woman to come to his station -- she then sat directly in front of us facing the computer. She was very light-skinned with light hair and blue eyes. As Aaron entered some of her personal information (e.g. phone number, address, etc.), he told me that the color categories were problematic and that they do not

always accurately describe the person's color. He then said, "Take her, for example, how would you classify her? Is she *blanco* or *indio*?" He said that she did not seem to "fit" in either category. She wasn't quite "white" and she wasn't dark enough (in combination with her hair and eye color to be *indio*). He then asked her if she considered herself *blanco* or *indio*, and without hesitation, she said "*indio*, put *indio*."

After her *cédula* was processed, Aaron said that there should be other categories that more closely describe a person's color since there are no variations of color (e.g. *indio claro* or *indio oscuro*) on the *cédula*; *indio* then represents a range of possibilities. He suggested *trigueño* (wheat color) which he said would have captured the previous woman's color more accurately, more than *blanco* or *indio*. *Trigueño* is a term that people use in daily expressions to refer to someone who is in-between *blanco* and *indio*.

The next woman who was motioned to Aaron's station was dark-skinned with shoulder-length black hair that was textured in appearance (natural style not chemically relaxed). Again, Aaron turned to me and said that she didn't seem to fit into one of the categories as she was darker than *indio* and almost *negro*, so he chose *mulato*. Unlike the woman before her, she didn't have an option as to what her color would be even as Aaron struggled to define her according to the five color options. When I asked if people could choose their color category, he said that they could define themselves in terms of color, but the *cédula* official had to agree with the self definition -- this is an example of identities needing to be affirmed -- and the category had to be an official one.

A young woman, upon seeing her picture on her new *cédula*, wanted to retake the picture, using more light. She said that she looked too dark, like a "Haitianita" (little

Haitian girl) on her picture. When I asked her what she meant by "Haitianita," she said that her pictures are usually lighter and she looked "too dark" in this picture. They didn't take her photo again, so she left.

Since *mulato* was a new category during this cedulazation, I wondered how people would react to being classified as *mulato* for the first time. However, the longer I observed the process, the more I realized that there was resistance to assign *mulato* as a category despite the fact that many of the *cédula* officials told me that "*indio* doesn't exist" and that it really "wasn't a color." *Indio* became the default category in most of the instances unless someone was extremely light-skinned with light eyes (*blanco*) or Chinese-Dominican (*amarillo*), etc.

Observing a large number of people, ranging from light to dark, being classified as *indio*, I asked Lena, another *cédula* official whose station was next to Aaron's, when she would classify someone as *negro*. She responded by saying that when someone is "'*negro negro*,' I put *negro*." I observed her station over the next hour and never saw her use *negro* or *mulato* to classify anyone (even when people were dark-skinned); she consistently used *indio*.

Another point is that people often didn't know when their color was being recorded. They were asked their height, if they had a phone, new address, etc., but color was a category that was filled simply by the *cédula* official looking out from behind their computer at the person in front of them and choosing one of the five categories, most often *indio*.

If people had major changes (e.g. an address, employment change, etc.), their *cédula* had to be processed in another center and picked up another day. If people were simply renewing their *cédula* with the same information, more or less, their *cédula* was processed in the room, and they could receive it the same day. Before the *cédulas* were printed, people had a chance to review a proof sheet. People seemed to look for mistakes in how their name was spelled, address information, etc. I never witnessed anyone with a dispute over color. At the same time, color was coded by the time the *cédula* was printed (*blanco*-b, *negro*-n, *indio*-i, *mulato*-m, *amarillo*-a).

Responses to questions dealing with color categories on the *cédula* during interviews hinted at the fact that people often use other categories to describe color, either by being more accurate in terms of attaching light or dark to *indio*, or by using terms like *trigueño* (wheat), *moreno* (brown) or *prieto* (dark). Interviews also revealed that people don't always know how their *cédula* defines them in terms of color. For example, one man told me that his *cédula* said *trigueño* when *trigueño* is not a category on the *cédula*. Another woman told me her *cédula* classified her as *india clara* when the *cédula* does not use *clara* (light) or *oscura* (dark). One man commented that "they just put what they want to."

Over time, I realized that this was the attitude of people obtaining their *cédula*, that the officials would simply define them however they chose to because "that's what they did." I asked Celia, if in her experience, anyone has ever insisted on one category over another, and she said that a man came in and wanted to change his color from *indio* to

negro (that was the only reason he came to obtain a new *cédula*), and she changed it for him.

Celia was the only official I observed using categories other than *indio*. In fact, Celia tended to use *mulato* and *negro* exclusively and told me that "We are not *indios*. There are no *indios* here. *Indio* is not a color. It was invented here. We are *mulatos* and *negros*, so I am going to use those categories." As I sat next to Celia, I observed her consistently using *mulato* and *negro* and wondered if there would be any confrontations as people reviewed their proof sheets. Because of the codes, some people might not have known how their color was classified. While *cédula* applicants might not have realized that they were being classified as *mulato* and *negro* at Celia's station, other *cédula* officials took notice. During a staff meeting, Celia was told that she uses *negro* and *mulato* too much as she responded by saying "That's what we are. We are not *indio*."

Celia's station became a site representing change in the face of resistance. This became apparent when an older dark-skinned man came to Celia's station wanting to renew his *cédula*. This process took about 25 minutes as the computer screen froze after taking his picture three different times. The situation grew to be more interesting as the man sat patiently, while making a few joking comments to the women around the station. Celia asked for his *cédula* number which retrieved his previous personal data. He indicated that he had moved, so Celia asked for his address and changed it in the system. When she got to the screen to choose a color, his "current/previous" category was in the system which was *indio*. Celia looked out from behind her computer and changed *indio* to *negro* and prepared to take the picture. The screen froze.

After re-starting her computer and the software program again, Celia re-entered his *cédula* number, changed the address, came to the screen with *indio* again, looked at him, and changed *indio* to *mulato*, took his picture, and the screen froze again. After starting the computer again, and entering all of his personal information, she came to the screen with *indio* again (as this had not been saved before because of the screen freezing), looked at him and changed *indio* to *negro* (as she did the first time), took his picture, and the computer froze again. This was an unusual circumstance as her computer hadn't done that before. This time, she called her supervisor who came over, re-started her computer as Celia walked away momentarily, sat in Celia's seat, asked the man his *cédula* number and when prompted, changed his address and other information. When he came to the color category (which still had him classified as *indio* from his previous *cédula*), he looked out from behind the computer and left him classified as *indio*, turned the light on high and took his picture. The interesting part is that this man came to get a new *cédula* and was classified as *negro*, *mulato*, *negro*, and back to *indio* and never knew it.

Another interesting case was when Aaron was processing a woman's *cédula* and had difficulties because the last name she provided didn't match what they had in the system from her previous *cédula*. He entered her information three times and had changed her existing *indio* classification from *indio* to *mulato*, back to *indio*, and finally to *mulato* on the third attempt to process her renewal. In total, I observed 150 *cédula* applications, and results are as follows:

Table XXI
Cédula Color Categories
n=150

Color Category	Women/Hembras	Men/Varones	Total
Indio	50	75	125
Blanco/White	4	6	10
Negro/Black	0	3	3
Mulato/Mulatto	6	6	12
Amarillo/Asian	0	0	0

As the numbers show, the most used category was *indio*. Even as the proof sheets were returned to one of the officials, at a glance, I could see that *indio* was the prevalent category. Of the three *negro*/Black and twelve *mulato* issued *cédulas*, Celia processed all but one of them. Even though there was tremendous color diversity in the processing area, *indio*, most always, was the default category. I did not witness any *amarillo* categorizations during any of my visits, but I was told that the category is used for people of Asian descent.

The next section moves outside of the *Junta Central Electoral* and away from the *cédula* to explore the ways in which people actually talk about color, race, and nationality and how these ideas are expressed in terms of Dominicanness and national belonging.

Dominicanness and National Belonging Expressed in Interviews

Claudio
30, taxi driver

I first met Claudio as I was leaving the archives in *El Centro* (the center) of Santiago. It was noon, and that meant going home for lunch, as most people do in Santiago (depending on their work schedules). Lunch is the "heaviest" meal of the day, and it is an important time for the family to gather.[77] Noon is also the time that the national anthem is played over all of the radio stations and in *El Centro* over loud speakers and often inside department and grocery stores.

The traffic out of *El Centro* around noon can be heavy, so I was lucky to find a taxi to get home. After I entered the car and greeted Claudio, we immediately began a conversation about the day and its course of events. He was on his way to take lunch to his wife who worked in one of the Free Trade Zone factories on the edge of Santiago. This first conversation actually led to subsequent interviews and a focus group with a group of young men that Claudio assembled to talk about race in both the Dominican Republic and in the U.S. using the Sammy Sosa/Mark McGuire homerun race in 1998 as a backdrop.

Claudio talked about how he almost made it to the United States to live and work:

> The land is for everyone. It should be for everyone. We have all of these borders. I went to the United States once, but they won't have me. I put my picture on my cousin's visa and made it out of the Dominican Republic, but when we landed at JFK, people were waiting for me. They took me to a room and questioned me and put me on the next plane back to the Dominican Republic. The only part of the United States that I saw was the airport. I don't know if I can go back. I was engaged to a woman who was a U.S. resident, but I didn't work out. Here (DR),

> you have a life but the future isn't certain, and in the United States, the future is certain but you don't have a life. I have family there, and they say that life is hard.

Claudio's mention of borders is revealing because while people can travel, their travel may be restricted especially at borders as they encounter customs officials and police who inspect documents for entry. There are laws in place that govern such movement. For Dominicans who to travel to the United States, a visa is required (immigrant or non-immigrant). The American Consulate in Santo Domingo, where visas are issued, is said to be one of the busiest in the world. It is becoming increasingly more difficult for people to get a visa. This was Claudio's experience. Since he was unable to obtain a visa legally, he chose to alter his cousin's passport (something other people talk about doing) for a chance to go to the United States.

For Claudio, it was worth the risk. What he wanted was a future -- he didn't expect to have a "life" in the United States because of work. We discussed not having a future in the Dominican Republic and his feelings of economic uncertainty. I asked him about Dominicans who leave the Dominican Republic to live and work in the United States -- they leave because they can earn more money, but "life" is harder, more difficult because of language, discrimination, and racism compared to "life" in the Dominican Republic:

> To be Dominican, and live here, means tranquillity. Economically, we are more or less stable. To me, skin color is not as important as nationality. Moreover, what is most important is the person.

For Claudio, nationality was more important than color -- being Dominican was more important than color. However, as we continued the interview, it was clear that he had firm ideas of "who he was" along the lines of race and color. He described himself as *trigueño* (color) and *mulato* (race). He commented that if he were in the United States, he would be a "person of color" and that he would continue "feeling" Dominican (this was a commonly expressed sentiment). Although Claudio considered himself to be racially *mulato*, he claimed having European and Indigenous ancestry, not African.

When I asked about skin color variation, he commented that the "climate can change a person's color, making them lighter or darker." This was another commonly held idea -- that while biology played a role in phenotype, the environment did too. The presence of the sun, cold weather, and other factors could change skin color from light to dark or visa versa -- this was the idea.

Samuel
28, taxi driver

Like Claudio, Samuel, 28, is a taxi driver. Unlike Claudio, he has not traveled to the United States but has family in New York City. I met Samuel through Claudio who suggested that he would be another person to interview about race and nationality in the Dominican Republic. When I had to travel a distance, I typically called and requested Claudio or Samuel to continue discussions on this topic. On the topic of identity, Samuel commented:

> To me, national identity is more important, to be Dominican. My family speaks of a hard life in the United States. There is discrimination there and a problem of acceptance. Here, we don't accept the Haitians. There is racism here against them. Their color and culture are different from ours. I'm proud to be Dominican. We have merengue music and the rhythm of life although it's a small and poor country.

Like Claudio, Samuel says that national identity is more important to him than any other identity -- being Dominican is important to him. And he also expresses his notion of the type of life experienced by many Dominicans in the United States -- the idea that life in the United States is hard for Dominicans. Samuel alludes to the idea of acceptance -- that Dominicans experience discrimination in the United States and may not be accepted by others. He likens this to the experience of Haitians in the Dominican Republic where Haitians often experience discrimination.

When we discussed the issues of race and color, Samuel said that he thought of himself as *indio* (color) and *negro*/Black (race). He was one of the first people to self-define as Black and to distinguish between *indio* as color and Black as race. He said that there were *blancos*, *negros*, and *mestizos* in the Dominican Republic and that Dominicans were the *liga* of *negros* and *blancos*. This led to the idea of ancestry. Samuel said that he had African ancestry stemming from when Haiti and the DR were unified as one country, Haiti (1822-44). Here, Samuel echoes what the two young girls said earlier -- that they learned about the African presence in the Dominican Republic when they learned about Haiti and Haitians residing in the Dominican Republic over the course of history.

Carmen
17, student

Carmen, works in one of the neighborhood pharmacies (family owned and operated), and I interviewed her during one of my visits to the pharmacy about identity:

> To me, Dominican identity is more important than color or race, but Santiago is very racist. My sister is light-skinned and is dating a dark-skinned man, and my parents don't like it at all. They don't want her dating him. He is Dominican, but a dark Dominican.

Again, nationality is expressed as the most important identity. Santiago is considered to be one of the "lightest" cities in the Dominican Republic -- Carmen refers to it as being racist. In Carmen's case, with respect to her sister's boyfriend, her parents were also thinking about grandchildren. If the idea is to "lighten," in a color conscious society, and they already have a "light-skinned" daughter, then they don't want their daughter to marry someone significantly darker than her. This is a good example of what Wade described earlier (that every lightening is a darkening). If this same couple were to marry and have children, the husband would be whitening his lineage because his wife was lighter-skinned, but the wife would be darkening her lineage because her husband was darker-skinned.

Here, the boyfriend's nationality is not important -- he is Dominican, but he is dark-skinned. It is his color and ideas of ancestry that are called into question. Carmen said that her parents would not change their viewpoint because they were "set in their ways" and did not want their daughter dating someone *so* dark. She presents an

interesting scenario -- the one of dark-skinned Dominicans being associated with either *being* Haitian, *looking* Haitian, or having Haitian ancestry. In the event that someone is uncertain if a person if Dominican or Haitian, they will listen closely to the Spanish -- it is thought that Haitians don't speak Spanish well. So, when color alone doesn't reveal "national origin," in this case, language does.

When I asked Carmen about her color and race, she described herself as *indio*/a and said that her race was also *indio*/a. She said that if she were in the United States she would be very proud of being Dominican and would remain *indio*/a. With respect to ancestry, she said that she has European, Indigenous, and Arab ancestry. For Carmen, her identity was something she could not change and would not change if she resided in the United States. She did say, however, that a change in identity depends on the person -- that for some people, this is possible. For her, she was proud of her Dominicanness and "indioness" and said she didn't see that changing.

As I was interviewing Carmen, her mother entered, listened for a while, and responded to some of the issues and said that Dominicans are "una mezcla, *mestiza*" (a mixture, *mestiza*) and commented that there are many blacks, "la raza negra en la frontera," (the black race near the border) and that the Dominican Republic was comprised of the descendants of indigenous people, Spaniards, and enslaved Africans. While her mother referred to Dominicans as being *mestizos*, she included Africans along with Spaniards and indigenous people in this racial equation.

Angela
44, mother, college-educated

I met Angela on a two-hour bus ride to Santo Domingo as we sat next to each other. At the time of our self introductions, I was reviewing some of the questions I had on my interview schedule. She asked me about my research, and after telling her about it, she agreed to an interview. After a brief conversation about our lives and travel experience, I began the interview. Angela is married, has one child and is a homemaker. She has a university degree and has been to the United States to visit family on various occasions. She spoke about race and color in the Dominican Republic:

> There are two classifications of *indio*, *claro* (light) and *oscuro* (dark). Dominicans are *mezclados* (mixed). Unlike the United States, there are no racial divisions here. Race means color here, not nationality. *Blanco*/White and *Negro*/Black produce the rare color *indio*. We don't have any distinct groups here because we are a mixture. *Indio* is a mixture of *blanco*/White and *negro*/Black, more or less a *mulato*. The majority of Dominicans are *indio*. *Indio* means color and indigenous. *Indios* are indigenous with a color between *blanco*/White and *negro*/Black.

Angela raises some interesting points here. She says that Black and White produce the "rare" color, *indio*. Angela's assertion that *indio* is "more or less *mulato*" is significant here because, like many other participants, she distances herself from the idea of *mulato* because of its direct reference to a Black-White liga, but, at the same time, she also recognizes it.

Angela links *indio* to indigenous in the since that *indio* has historical significance as we explored earlier in relation to the Taino Indians. To me, *indio* is also tied to a sense of being an indigenous Dominican, not an "Indian," but a person who has had, through ancestral ties, a generational presence in the Dominican Republic and can claim this *liga*.

When I asked her how she defined herself, she said that she was *india* with Spanish and German ancestry.

Lisa
20, business student

Lisa is a business student at the *Pontificia Universidad Católica Madre y Maestra* (PUCMM) in Santiago and has traveled to the United States several times. I met her at her parent's florist shop where she is employed on a part-time basis (when she's not at the university). She told me that she has given much thought to race and color based on her own experiences in the United States and the growing presence of U.S. educational exchange students residing in her neighborhood (living with host families).

With respect to the importance of national identity, Lisa commented that:

> National identity is the most important identity. It is like a card you carry that contains everything like color and race. Color and race fall within nationality. For example, when I think about an "American," I think of someone who is White, blonde, and speaks little Spanish even though I know there are different types of Americans. This is the image that comes to mind. This is how we are programmed to think. When I think about a "Dominican," I have an image of someone who is *indio* with curly or textured hair, etc. Dominican also refers to the culture and personality that a person has. It's also a fixed point of view that the person has -- it's complicated.

Lisa states something that is key throughout the dissertation -- that national identity is constructed in a way to encompass race and color -- that we are socialized to associate a particular "type" of person with a particular place even though, intellectually, we know there are different "types" of people in that place. Her perspective hints at homogenization in the effort to level out differences in the "imagining" of a "Dominican"

or an "American" of a certain type. Homogenization in this case is linked to how we are socialized to think in terms of images -- images that are perpetuated through the media, schools, families, and other institutions, linking race, nation, and national belonging.

Lisa defines herself as *india* in terms of color and said that when she is in the United States, she continues "feeling" Dominican and didn't think that neither her Dominican identity nor *india* identity would necessarily change if she lived there. When I asked her to define *indio* she said that it is a mix of *negro*/Black and *blanco*/White, a *mulato*, *indio* or *moreno*. When asked about her ancestry, she denied having any European, African, or Indigenous ties, claiming only Dominican ancestry.

Mixture here comes together in the categories of either *mulato*, *indio*, or *moreno*. While *moreno* typically refers to color, Lisa uses it to refer to a person of mixed Black-White ancestry. Lisa's response to the ancestry question that I raised was actually somewhat different from other people I interviewed (although it, too, was expressed in other ways). Like some other participants, Lisa said that she only had *Dominican* ancestry. So, while the idea of mixture exists, more importantly, here the *Dominican* national identity has been constructed as one ancestry and homeland.

Luisa,
48, *colmado* owner (small neighborhood grocery store)

Luisa and her husband own a colmado, a small grocery store, in one of the neighborhoods described as a somewhat exclusive professional, upper-middle-class neighborhood. Luisa lived in the United States (New York City) for thirteen years and

recently returned to Santiago to live after having left the Dominican Republic in search of a better life and more economic opportunities. She commented on being Dominican, social class, and the importance of knowing "where you come from."

> National identity is the most important as it defines where you come from. There is a difference between race, color, and nation with regard to identities just like there are different classes (middle, upper, and lower). La Zurza, where we are now, is different from Pequin. Pequin is a marginalized community. People in the lower class have to send their kids to public school. That's why we go there (United States) to have a better life, economically speaking. But this country (Dominican Republic) is very good. Dominicans in the U.S., even though they are there, raise their children with the same values and customs they had here in the D.R. Change depends on the person. You don't have to change your values. Your customs stay more or less the same. Some people change because they are in search of money. They are chasing the dollar, and chasing the dollar can change you. Dominicans there (U.S.) are marked because of color. White people mark other people. For that reason, there is racism.

Again, nationality emerges as the most important identity because it links you to a particular place, a place of origin. Having lived in the United States, Luisa could express the hardships and discrimination that Dominicans face there -- she clearly links this discrimination to color. Her comment "White people mark other people" is in line with an earlier discussion of the racial naming process in that the normative group identifies and names *Other* people in relation to themselves (while they remain unmarked and un-named). In the Dominican Republic, the normative group is *indio*, but in the United States, the normative group is White.

Luisa also speaks of resistance in terms of teaching children "Dominican values" and not allowing money to change one's attitude, customs, etc. She also talks about advantages and disadvantages that some people have based on their social class and where

they live (e.g. access to schools). For her, going to the United States, living and working, was an attempt to better her life economically although she faced challenges.

Another distinction that Luisa made during the interview (that was also made by other participants) was that "White" in the Dominican Republic has a different meaning than "White" in the United States. The difference is that a very light-skinned person in the Dominican Republic may be defined as *indio*/a *claro*/a, *trigueño*, or even White in terms of color, but in the United States, White represents more of a "pure" category with European origins and ancestry. So the same person who is considered to be *indio claro* in the Dominican Republic may be considered Black in the United States because of hypodescent ("the one-drop rule") which refers to the historical process where anyone "suspected" of having any African/Black ancestry was, and is, considered to be Black in the United States (Davis 1991).

As we talked more about color, Luisa said that she defined her color as *indio*, a mix of *blanco*/White and *negro*/Black), and with regard to race, she defined herself as a *mestiza* (*negro*/Black and *blanco*/White) with African and Spanish ancestry. Luisa uses the category *mestiza*, not *mulata*, to define herself racially.

Nelsa
30, domestic worker

Nelsa works two days per week, commuting from a semi-urban community outside of Santiago where she has no running water or telephone, and has scarce electricity.[78] I learned during the interview that she never learned to read. She is in a

consensual union with one child and has an 8th grade education. For her, life was very difficult, and it was hard to find work.

I asked her about the significance of *indio*. For her, *indio* meant "another class of person." It could also mean color, indigenous, and/or race depending on the context. She defined herself as Dominican, with only Dominican ancestry, saying her family never discussed having any other ancestry. She described herself as *indio* (color) and said that her race was *india oscura* (dark *indio*) because "that's what it says on my *cédula*."

Nelsa expressed to me that she didn't know much about history and that her family didn't talk much about this subject. Like in some of the previous interviews, Nelsa said that her ancestry is Dominican. She was the first person to say that she defines herself as her *cédula* defines her. In some of the other interviews, participants expressed that the *cédula* officials simply "put what they want to," without regard to how a person defines him/herself.

In sum, these interview excerpts speak to a number of issues. The first is an awareness of Dominicans' experiences in the United States as a minority. All of the interviews, while addressing issues of racial/color and national identities, also allude to life in the United States and point to a consciousness of Dominicans' experiences abroad. A male participant said "Here in the Dominican Republic, we discriminate against the Haitians, but in Puerto Rico and the United States, we become the Haitians." Many of the interviews shed light on the type of discrimination and "racism" toward Haitians and the type of discrimination that Dominicans face abroad because they are "darker" than some other Latino immigrant groups. In the Dominican Republic, since "being" Black

remains "behind one's ear," the issues surrounding having African ancestry and being labeled as "Black" become more salient in the United States where Dominicans are marked in multiple ways -- as Spanish-speaking and often as Black given the U.S. racial system where they become, for the first time, a racialized minority.

Transnationalism: Migration, Ideas, and Relocalization

As stated earlier, identities in general are becoming increasingly more important as people find themselves moving across regional, national, and international borders as well as being shaped by (and shaping themselves due to) global forces and processes. Just as important is how people define themselves while simultaneously being defined by others (e.g. other people, the state, etc.). It has been argued that global processes come to impact local actors' lives and circumstances in terms of reconceptualizing and understanding "localized" identities (Friedman 1994; Kearney 1995; Featherstone 1995; Long 1996). Statements such as "what is global is embedded in the local" continue to point to local processes within the global arena. Long's (1996) idea of re-localization speaks to this issue. He asserts that re-localization is the end result of globalization whereby new local social forms are either reinvented or created due to processes of globalization.

This is what is taking place, in part, in the Dominican Republic -- people and ideas are returning with "new" ideas of race that interact with the "present" ones. What takes place is a sifting of the influences, where the ideas are remade, and identities are

reconfigured. While globalization is not a new phenomenon, what is different here is that these processes involve increased numbers of people migrating across borders (to find work, etc.), the ways in which information is shared through different technologies such as fax machines, televisions, and electronic mail, and the proliferating presence of multinational corporations.

Also, nations, once viewed as bounded entities, are now conceptualized as unbounded as social actors cross and (re)cross boundaries and are a part of nation building processes in two or more nations (Basch *et. al* 1994). This involves multi-stranded or multi-layered relationships that link transnational migrants to both their society of origin and the society of settlement (Basch *et. al* 1994). This "in-betweenness" suggests that social actors maintain links with family and friends in their home societies which has implications for return or circular migration, migration of relatives and friends, as well as the flow of commodities and money (Basch *et. al* 1994; Duany 1994; Georges 1990; Grasmuck and Pessar 1991; Hendricks 1974).

This in-betweenness also translates into changing and homogenized identities as transmigrants continue to (re)cross borders and situate themselves in home and host societies. As immigration from Latin American countries increased, the United States found it necessary to classify this "group" of people. All of a sudden there was a flattening out of national differences in an effort to homogenize people from Latin America and the Spanish-speaking Caribbean as Hispanic (Oboler 1995) or as Black because of phenotypic similarities to African Americans and other groups.

One of my focus groups involved professional men and women in Santiago and explored the U.S. Customs aspect of immigration. An area of focus was the treatment of Dominicans at John F. Kennedy airport in New York City. One participant said "We always get questions about *indio* and what it means since there are no Indians here (in the Dominican Republic)." Someone else said, "They look at us and think we have plantains, coconuts, coffee, and other food with us because we are Dominican." Another participant said "some people wonder how I can be so light and Dominican. They ask if I'm Puerto Rican. They think all Dominicans are dark."

These three statements highlight the treatment of Dominicans on three inter-related levels. The first involves a series of questions involving race and the significance of *indio* as it is listed on the passport. In telling Dominicans that there are no Indians in the Dominican Republic, the customs official makes a claim not only about their identity claims but also on Dominican history, practice and race. The second is a marking due to nationality -- the idea that "they" are traveling with these goods. These items are stereotypical markers of being Dominican. The third level is one of color. Dominicans are thought of as darker than Puerto Ricans and Cubans, for example. So, some light-skinned Dominicans are questioned about "being" Dominican when they travel abroad.

In general, transnational migration is very characteristic of this time period to the extent that there are specialized courier services such as Taino Express, EPS, and Business Mail that service the Dominican Republic. This period witnessed an increase in emigration to the United States, in large part, because of the change in immigration policy that allowed Dominicans to leave in great numbers and because of a shift to import

substitution and a subsequent loss of jobs in the Dominican Republic (Torres-Saillant and Hernández 1998). In combination with the establishment of the free trade zones throughout the country, as part of the Caribbean Basin Initiative to stimulate growth and stability in the Caribbean, the United States flooded the marketplace in the Dominican Republic with all types of U.S. products. With the U.S. immigration Act of 1965 as a backdrop, the shift to import substitution and subsequent unemployment and poverty served as motivation to leave for the United States -- in search of employment opportunities and betterment (ibid.).

As stated earlier, New York City (NYC) has been the primary receiving community for Dominicans in the United States (Grasmuck and Pessar 1991; Duany 1994; Hendricks 1974). In fact, NYC has come to represent the United States in the Dominican Republic is so much as NYC means the United States to many people. The existence of a Dominican community in the United States along with their sustained efforts to maintain transnational relationships (e.g. remittances, travel, phone calls, letters, etc.) contributed to the construction of a type of Dominican diaspora in the sense that the Dominican Republic is viewed as the homeland and the place where their roots are. In many of the interviews, and in everyday conversations, there is the idea of a *aquí* "here" (Dominican Republic) and *allá* "there." This is how people talk about Dominicans in the DR and Dominicans in the U.S.

While in the United States, one way in which a "Dominican" identity is articulated in New York is through the merengue (the national dance in Dominican Republic). The majority of Dominicans in the United States live in the Washington Heights section of

New York. Given this clustering, Dominicans have long been defined as a transnational community (Austerlitz 1997; Grasmuck and Pessar 1991; Hendricks 1974). The statement "more 'Dominican' than Dominicans on the island" emerges from the literature as a way to describe the actions and practices of Dominicans in the United States (e.g. Dominican foods, music, dance, dress, etc.).

Indio has found its way into Dominican popular culture across borders. For example, Mery Hernández, a Dominican folk singer, is known as "India Canela." One of her albums has "India Canela" prominently on the cover, and there are two songs on the album with "*indio*" in the title: 1) "Las Indias de Baní" ("The Indias of Baní") and 2) "La India y su acordeón" (The India and her accordion). In fact, "la India Canela" is written on her accordion. Another example involves a favorite merengue song from the album, *A Caballo*, by Kinito Mendez. The song is entitled Ritmo Merembe with a second title of "Los Indios" and begins by calling out (against steady dance drumming) "los indios." The response is ululation (the stereotypical "war cry" of Native Americans in the U.S.). Also, on our way to Haiti via Dajabón (one of the border communities), we passed through a town named "Los Indios." These are just some of the ways in which *indio* has been incorporated into the social landscape of the Dominican Republic.

In sum, this chapter traces some of contexts in which Dominicanness is articulated. In particular, there is a sense of shared history and pastness, a Dominican ancestry and homeland, as well as shared sense of being and feeling Dominican, mixed, and *indio*. Here, *mestizo* identities have been recast as *indio* identities, moving away from, albeit not completely, race to color. There are still remnants of mestizo-ness in the sense

of mixture (representing the mixture of different races) with *indio* capturing color. While the Junta Central's category is labeled "color," it is more representative of a racial category as *indio* represents a "type" and range of colors. *Mulato*, as I was told, is darker than *indio* (darker than *indio oscuro* and lighter than *negro*).

The overall reluctance to use any other category other than *indio* during the cedulazation process points to a continued distancing away from blackness. It is in this vein that these identities have become generational and more place-specific. With the playing of the national anthem at noon combined with other patriotic symbols evoking images of the Dominican Republic as homeland, it becomes more clear as to why the image of the Dominican Republic is that of the *mestizo* and someone who is a gradation of *indio*.

The collective memory of Dominicans as a mixed people, historical points of reference, and on-going references to the "majority" of Dominicans being *mestizo* (in earlier census reports) and *indio* (on the *cédula*) continue to reaffirm Dominicans as a mixed people, not Black or White, but a combination of the two and yet quite distinct from both of them. People who are then defined as White or Black are on the periphery with respect to this contemporary articulation of Dominicanness. Over time, with a sense of pastness, Dominican peoplehood came to be expressed as a mixed status, as definitions and meanings were created in relation to whiteness and blackness, against the backdrop of Indio-ness.

I argue here that while this peoplehood grew out of an ideology and practice of race-mixing, and what the literature refers to a mestizaje, that mestizaje does not quite

adequately reflect the reality of the Dominican Republic. I agree with Wade above that as social scientists, we have come to understand that mestizaje represents any race mixture in Latin America, however, in its application, it has most commonly been used to explain the specific mixture of Spanish and Indigenous peoples (e.g. Mexico, Peru, etc.) with the category of *mestizo* coming from the word "mestizaje." Thus, the scholarly reproduction of this idea, combined with the continual research focus on the specific Spanish-Indian mixture, has to some degree contributed to the invisibility of people of African descent in Latin American in the theorization of mixture.

Unquestionably when *mestizo* is evoked in the social science literature, it is not the image of an Afro-Dominican, Afro-Peruvian, Afro-Mexican, etc. Even the definition of *mestizo* in the Dominican Encyclopedia reflects the definition, and academic consensus, that was used historically throughout Latin America to describe the offspring of Spaniards and Indigenous people; this definition was based on the literature. Consequently, while *mestizo* as a socio-racial term maintains distance from blackness, so does mestizaje.

By placing the Dominican Republic within the context of two diasporas, one "Dominican" and the other African, while exploring mixture, we see a recognition of African ancestry that is articulated in two similar yet different ways. The next chapter explores two contemporary emerging discourses in the Dominican Republic that move away from *mestizo* and *mestizaje* to express the sense of being *mulato* (Mulutaje) and/or Afro-Dominican (Africanidad).

VII. MULUTAJE AND AFRICANIDAD: EMERGING DISCOURSES SURROUNDING RACE, RACIAL EXPERIENCES AND ANCESTRY IN THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC (1989-Present)

While Mestizaje is still the dominant discourse during the present time, there are two emerging, often inter-related, discourses surrounding racial identities that consciously and purposefully assert African ancestry as an integral part of the Dominican mixture. The *liga* is still used as a way of conceptualizing the mixture over time, however, the African past and presence is reclaimed during this time period (1989 - present). Mulutaje and Africanidad both suggest that Dominicans have not learned their entire history as it has been a "partial" Dominican history that intentionally excluded Africans as well as their contributions to Dominican "culture" and society.

At the same time, there are claims that the previous and current racial/color categories have been, and still are, void of any reference to African ancestry. Consequently, for reasons that we will explore in this chapter, Mulutaje and Africanidad are emerging, and overlapping, racial discourses in the Dominican Republic and not only challenge the racial categories but also seek to articulate Dominicanness in new ways.

Mulutaje

Racial Views and Concepts

For some, the racial views are changing to reflect a *Negro-Blanco* mixture -- with assertions of being *mulato*. The *mulato* category has emerged, in part, due to Dominicans' experiences in the United States with race and racial categorizations and the lack of an "in-

between" category and a different meaning for "*indio*." Again, directly translated, "*indio*" means *Indian* or *indigenous*, and in the United States, Dominicans are not considered to be Indian, indigenous, or from India. It is through interactions with people and institutional structures that define Dominicans in new and different ways in the United States that facilitates this process of Mulutaje.[79]

Racial Discourse and the Articulation of Racial and National Identities

> "The whole world is laughing at us because we call ourselves *indio*. They know there are no Indians here." -- Maria, a participant

The racial discourse of Mulutaje forms in the United States and in other places where Dominicans redefine themselves based on the available categories. While *mulato* is no longer an official category in the United States (as it was dropped from the census in 1920), and has not been used for the majority of the 20th century, it is the in-between category that most represents *indio* in that it is "in between Black and White." According to Grasmuck and Pessar (1996), while some Dominicans self-classified as Black or White in terms of race, the majority of Dominicans in New York City wrote-in "mulatto" as an "other" category in the 1990 census.

As I expressed in the last chapter, ideas about living in the United States return to the Dominican Republic through correspondences and visits with family. In this case, Dominicans in the United States learn that it is difficult to assert an *indio* identity because 1) it translates into Indian and has different historical and contemporary meanings; and

2) people are confronted by others who define them as Black, "of color," and suggest that they are "denying who they are."

Chiqui Viciosa, an accomplished Dominican poet, spent numerous years in the United States and said that she considered herself to be *india clara* when she went to the United States in the late 1960s - early 1970s. I met Chiqui at one of her poetry readings in Santiago and saw her on another occasion in Santo Domingo. She spoke about her experiences in the United States at the poetry reading.

One of the most profound experiences that she had was when she went through U.S. Customs at J.F.K. airport in New York. "The customs officer asked me what *india clara* was, and I said "my race." He looked at me and said that there were no Indians in the Dominican Republic and that I was not *india clara* in the United States." Chiqui said that this was a defining moment for her because up until that point, no one had challenged her own racial concept and self definition. She was *india clara* in the Dominican Republic but was suddenly told that she was not *india clara* in the United States. This was just the first of many challenges that Chiqui faced that would prompt her to call into question her identity and history.

Chiqui attended Brooklyn College and was surrounded by other Dominicans, African Americans, and people from the Caribbean. In this context, she realized that the Dominican Republic was part of the Caribbean -- until this point, only Jamaica, Puerto Rico, Cuba, etc. were *part of the Caribbean.* Earlier in the dissertation, I talked about the Dominican Republic being conceptualized as part of the West Indies -- this changed during the Trujillo regime, when in an effort to link the Dominican Republic to Spain,

references to the West Indies and the Caribbean were not as prevalent as before. Chiqui said that her experience in the United States taught her a lot about herself and the Dominican Republic. She began to be more critical in her thinking and reflected on how she was socialized. "I really hadn't thought about bleaching creams and the emphasis on "marrying up" until I was in the United States."[80] Bleaching creams lightened one's complexion and were advertised in newspapers in 1918 and in subsequent years -- they were also marketed in the United States. Here, marrying up refers to the practice of marrying someone lighter in the attempt to have lighter-skinned children.

Chiqui was in the United States during the Civil Rights Movement and was influenced by everything that was happening around her with regard to racial and gender oppression. "I was influenced by Angela Davis and the Black Panthers and wanted to be like Angela. I learned a lot from the Black community in the U.S." When she signed my book, she wrote "Kimberly Simmons: Because I have learned so much from your country and your women. Thanks." Chiqui said that because of her experience in the United States, she defines herself most often as *mulata* and says that the Dominican Republic is comprised primarily of *mulatos* and *negros*. Her experience illustrates how identities are articulated in various contexts. While Chiqui considers herself to be *mulata*, she knows that others might not affirm that identity in the Dominican Republic -- they instead define her as *india clara*. Thus, among other *mulato*-identified people, she is *mulata*, and among *india*-identified people, she is *india* -- her socioracial identity depends on which group she's with and how they define her although she claims both identities at different points in time.

Mulutaje also found expression during a recent presidential election in the Dominican Republic in May of 1996. The public discourse that surrounded the two candidates from opposing political parties, Leonel Fernandez (the current president of PLD), and the late Francisco Peña Gomez (PRD), was both racial and national. Leonel Fernandez was residing in the United States prior to the election while Peña Gomez was residing in Santo Domingo. Fernandez was new to public service, while Peña Gomez had served as mayor of the capital city, Santo Domingo. The debate had little to do with their histories in public service and more to do with race and national origin.

The debate advanced the idea that Peña Gomez was Black and of Haitian descent while Fernandez was mixed and Dominican albeit living in the United States. The opposition to Peña Gomez grew as fears were generated that, if elected, the island would be unified again and the borders would open to let Haitians enter the Dominican Republic freely -- thus a renewed fear of Haitianization ensued. Most of the accusations were traced to the outgoing president's party (Balaguer). I closely followed the election, and during that time, Peña Gomez had won the most votes (46%), however, because none of the three candidates had received a majority vote, a change was implemented from Balaguer's "camp" -- that a candidate had to win by a majority in order to be elected. This was the first time such an initiative was made and passed. In effect, what this meant was that the "people" had elected Peña Gomez, but the Balaguer regime did not want to relinquish "control" of the government to him -- Balaguer, from the third major political party, along with former president Juan Bosch, endorsed Fernandez for the "run-off"

election with Peña Gomez, and subsequently Fernandez won by a slight margin (51.25%) albeit a "majority."

There were two currents running through the election campaign: 1) Balaguer and others linked Peña Gomez to Haiti, defined Dominicanness along the lines of race and national belonging, and tried to create fear among voters; and 2) the "people" despite the racialized context during the election, voted for Peña Gomez in large numbers during both elections. Before the election, Fernandez made a comment about the issue of race in the election. In a New York Times article before the election in 1996, he commented on the discourse surrounding Peña Gomez being Black and the insinuation that he was non-Black -- he said that while Peña was *Black*, he himself was not *White* -- he was a *mulato*, and all *mulatos* in the United States were *Black*. *Mulato* was subsequently placed on the *cédula* during Fernández' presidency -- this is the first time that *mulato* has been an official state-sanctioned category in the Dominican Republic since the first national census was taken in 1920.

The above statement, Fernández is claiming dual socioracial status, as a *mulato* and as Black. He identifies as being *mulato*, but asserts that *mulatos* in the U.S. are Black -- he first uses a category that isn't "popular" in the Dominican Republic, then uses the U.S. definition of blackness to illustrate that he, like Peña Gomez, is Black. The racial systems of the Dominican Republic and the United States are put alongside one another to make the point of likeness of Peña Gomez' being Black in the Dominican Republic and his being *mulato*/Black in the United States.

Individual Identities and State-Sanctioned Categories

Within the Mulutaje discourse, *mulato* replaces *indio* as a way of describing and capturing a sense of mixture between Black and White. Again, *indio* is still the most prevalent category as we explored during the cedulazation process, but it was *mulato*, not *mestizo* (as proposed by PID) that found a place on the list of color categories in 1998. In terms of replacing *indio* in everyday conversations about race and color, *mulato* is gaining popularity in part because of 1) the ways in which return migrants and their children talk about their experiences in the United States and; 2) the media and popular culture descriptions of Dominicans and their relationships with other groups in the United States.

Cable television makes U.S. images more accessible to viewers in the Dominican Republic. The following example is taken from my fieldnotes when we attended a birthday party:

September 3, 1998

> We went to Stella's Christening this morning and returned from her birthday party this evening with Asha. There were about 20 adults and 15 children in the apartment. I said that I would take pictures and videotape the party. It didn't take long for the party to divide along gender lines, with the men sitting outside and the women in the kitchen preparing the snacks and sitting with the kids in the living room. I sat by a woman I didn't know and began talking to her when her

daughter came up and asked her if she could go outside. She responded, "You can go outside and sit with your father, Kenia." I was curious that her daughter was named Kenia because it is a common name in the African American community and wondered how she decided to name her daughter Kenia. When I asked her, she said "I didn't know what to name her, and I asked my husband. He was watching t.v. one day, a program from *allá* (the U.S.) and saw a woman whose name was "Kenya" -- she looked like us, and we both liked the name." I told her that I too liked the name and that it was common in the U.S. and that "Kenya is a country in Africa." At this point, she looked at me and said "I didn't know that." On our way home, I found out that David had had the exact same conversation with Kenia's father about her name, and the father said he didn't know that Kenya was a country in Africa.

Shortly after the birthday party, I read in a newspaper that one of Sammy Sosa's daughter's is also named "Kenya." The point here is that within both the Mulutaje and Africanidad discourses, there is increased interaction between Dominicans and African Americans, and other groups of African descent throughout the Americas, in part because of perceived similarities and racial awareness in the United States -- this was a recurrent theme in the interviews among participants who had traveled to the United States. As Torres-Saillant and Hernández (1998) state:

> When Dominicans come to the United States, however, they escape the ideological artillery that sustains negrophobic thought in the homeland, and they have a greater possibility of coming to terms with their real ethnicity. In North America, a racially segregated society where the color of one's skin has often mattered more than the content of one's character in obtaining jobs and opportunities, Dominican may find it expedient to assert their blackness. Cognizant that the larger white society does not differentiate racially between them and Haitians or other dark-skinned Caribbeans, Dominicans become accustomed to speaking of themselves as a "people of color" and ally themselves with the other peoples of color in the struggle for survival (143-44).

The above statement links Dominicans with a larger homogenization process of blackness in the United States. While there may be language, social class, and other differences, some of these features are flattened due to phenotype and "who they are" in this place. Here, Torres-Saillaint and Hernández hint at a larger Black community that forms in the daily struggles for survival, and while I agree with this, I think that Black ethnic groups also form as a result of the differences along the lines of nationality, language, cultural practices, etc. Nonetheless, the United States is a place where Dominicans and Haitians have more in common than not and where the distinctions that were made in the Dominican Republic are not made in the United States -- the United States is also a place where connections are made with other peoples of African descent based on perceived similarities in experience and history.

Again, one of the differences in the United States is the lack of an in-between racial category that defines people of mixed African and European descent. As discussed earlier, similar color categories exist within the African American community (e.g. light-skinned, dark-skinned, etc.), but these are color descriptors similar to *indio*, but in a socioracial sense, there is no intermediate category at this point in history. Thus, since

this category doesn't exist, it means that Dominicans then are in a position to negotiate White, Black, or *mulato* socioracial identities in the United States (Grasmuck and Pessar 1996).

In a larger "Black" space, there is room for exchange, mutual influencing, and increased interactions between groups. Such interactions and exposure through media have a mutual influencing effect on socioracial categories as discussed above as well as naming practices, hair styles (e.g. twists and curly locks, etc.), music (e.g. merengue hip hop/house, Latin jazz, etc.):

> ...Proyecto Uno has succeeded in creating an aesthetic of its own by drawing from Dominican and Latin sounds and mixing them with elements of rap, house, and other musical modalities from hip-hop urban culture in the United States (Torres-Saillant and Hernández 1998:138).

Merengue house and hip-hop are very popular musical forms. On Proyecto Uno's album entitled *New Era* (1996), there is a song, *Latinos*, that combines merengue with hip-hop and rap in a song about Latinos. The song itself in musical form and style is representative of transnational experiences -- the song is partly in Spanish and English. Here are some of the lyrics from the song:

> You keep it tight right
> Or what
> All night
> Latinos making noise cause it's only right
>
> Son Latinos, because son Latinos, because son Latinos, because son Latinos
> (They are Latinos)
> Say it loud
> Hell yeah
> Say it loud

Both of them are dark...
Both of them are Black...
Both of them are light
Both of them are White

La fiesta no quiere parar... (The party doesn't want to stop)

Both of them are dark...
Both of them are Black...
Who the hell are you?
Proyecto Uno...Dominican

Son Latinos, because son Latinos, because son Latinos, because son Latinos (They are Latinos)

We've got it going on
We wreck the party, baby
We've got it going on
We wreck the party, baby
On and on and on...

Now when I say Alpha you say "ho"
When I say "yes yes" you say "yo"

Presente mi gente... (my people are present)
Merengue hip hop...

Venga con suya (Come with yours)
No one can flip it like these four guys
Merengue hip hop...
Adelante (Let's go -- forward)

Espana
Puerto Rico
Venezuela
Santo Domingo
Honduras
Guatemala
Mexico
Nicaragua
Chile
Panama...

Mi gente esta caliente (My people are hot)

Son Latinos, because son Latinos, because son Latinos, because son Latinos (They are Latinos)

This song speaks to a number of issues that are relevant to the dissertation and combines a number of complexities. First is the weaving of Spanish and English -- the English is in rap form, using both U.S. and Jamaican style of rapping. The second is a recognition of *mi gente*, or my people and the diversity that exists among Latinos (light, dark, and other references in the song). From the inside of the CD cover, the artists provide what they term a "Proyecto 1" dictionary where different terms are defined. There are two that are of particular interest here: 1) "Dominiqueño which is a "mezcla de un Dominicano y un Puertoriqueño -- mixture of a Dominican and Puerto Rican (Dominicans and Puertoricans who drink out of the same mug)" and 2) "Chocolate" Por lo regular un dulce, pero en este caso se refiere a la gente morenita. Por ejemplo: Magic y Nelson son los hermanos chocolate por ser los "Negritos" de Proyecto. The Brothers of the Crew." (Normally something sweet, but in this case it refers to brown people. For example: Magic and Nelson are the chocolate brothers for being the "Blacks" of Proyecto. The Brothers of the Crew).

This last definition leads me to the third issue that's raised in the song, and that is the assertion of blackness and being Black. Light is contrasted to dark (light being White and dark being Black). All of a sudden, the socioracial continuum that is often presented among Dominicans and Puerto Ricans, among others, shifts to Black and White in the

United States. Also of note is that the two who are "dark" are Dominican, while the two who are "light" are Puerto Rican. Also of interest here is that "brother" is a term that is used among African Americans for Black men. Finally, the song has as its finale a roll call of "Latino" countries beginning with Spain. Spain is thus linked with Latin America in the formation of "mi gente." All of this is done to an African derived rhythm and sounds.

Transnationalism: Migration, Ideas, and Relocalization

The Mulutaje discourse emerged because of an increase in transnational migration, access to U.S. images via cable and internet, etc. Based on interviews, there is also tremendous migration within the Dominican Republic as people from the rural communities migrate to Santiago and surrounding areas (semi-urban) for employment opportunities -- especially in the free trade zones. In addition, there is a sizable Haitian community working in the sugar cane fields, in construction, and in other areas around the city.

With respect to the experience of Dominicans in the United States, Torres-Salliaint and Hernández confront the issues surrounding racism in the United States along the lines of class:

> Ironically, it is neither the unskilled nor blue-collar workers who most dramatically suffer the oppressive weight of racial discrimination. Their own social segregation, their confinement to labor markets populated mostly by their own people, keeps them or the most part from stepping outside their immediate ethnic milieu. As they hardly ever get to interact with people from the dominant sectors of society, they stay largely away from the settings where the drama of racism can be felt directly. It is really the professionals and those most qualified

> to compete for employment, education, and commercial opportunities in the mainstream who feel it in their flesh. It is they who get the chance to experience personally the extent to which their phenotype can limit their aspirations (Torres-Saillant and Hernández 1998: 157).

While Dominicans in general may experience some forms of racism in the United States, they suggest here that it is the middle class, or at least those individuals with human and social capital that most often confront racism. For this reason, I presume, we find more Dominicans entering into civil rights organizations such as the NAACP and historical African American sororities and fraternities in U.S. colleges and universities.[81] The issue of social class is interesting here in that Torres-Saillant and Hernández suggest that early studies (e.g. Grasmuck and Pessar 1991; Georges 1990; Hendricks 1974) relied primarily on ethnographic studies of small communities in the Dominican Republic and suggested that the post-1965 Dominican migrants to the U.S. were primarily rural, uneducated, poor, unskilled, and jobless (Torres-Saillant and Hernández 1998: 34). They argue instead that most migrants actually came from the urban middle-class, and were neither poor nor uneducated. They were Dominican doctors and other professions who "became" entrepreneurs to supplement their incomes in the United States because of practices that kept them from fully participating in their professions without further training and education. This ties into the earlier discussion on the middle class being confronted with racist practices in the United States (alongside others in without as much social and human capital).

Returning to Ong's (1996) idea of "blackening" and "whitening," it becomes clear that Dominicans, despite educational level and professional preparedness, are subject to

blackening processes in the United States. During a recent visit to Michigan State University (1999), Dominican sociologist Ramona Hernández suggested that Dominicans in the United States do not follow the same trajectory as other Latinos because they tend to be darker. Instead, their experiences tend to mirror those of similarly positioned African Americans in terms of discrimination they face and employment options.

An article written by Dominican journalist Aristófanes Urbáez in *El Siglo* (July, 1995), described a fourth of July celebration in New York City involving Dominicans and African Americans. Although he is not directly referenced in the article, there is a photo of Rev. Jesse Jackson, who according to two of my cultural consultants, is a "symbol" representing the African American community. The title of the article is "Bailando con los negros" ("Dancing with the Blacks") and is interesting in that it paints a picture of life in the United States -- one involving a shared social space of Dominicans and African Americans and the question of race in the United States:

> Compartiendo con aquellos negros, que celebraban al igual que los blancos, la Independencia de su país, los Estados Unidos, una barrera de prejuicios rodaron por el suelo y comprendimos más los intereses y los sentimientos de los negros nortetamericanos, que contrario a muchos de nosotros, nacionalistas postizos, se sienten orgullosos de ser negros, de sus costumbres y tradiciones, incluidas sus diferentes manifestaciones de religiosidad. Ningún norteamericano negro -- ahora lo sabemos más que nunca -- se cambiaría por un blanco, porque en la negritud está su raza, su cultura y la fuerza de sus raices. ¡Qué grata experiencia! Creemos que tanto Peña, como Leonel Fernández, porque allá todo mulato es "negro", deberían acercarse a la comunidad negra norteamericana en busca de recursos y apoyo a sus aspiraciones.

Translation

> Participating with the blacks there (U.S.), who celebrated the Independence of their country, the United States, the same as whites, a barrier of prejudices surrounding us and we better understood the interests and the feelings of North American Blacks, that contrary to many of us, nationalists, they feel proud of being black, of their customs and traditions, including their different manifestations of religion. No North American Black -- we now know this more than ever would change to be White, because in blackness is their race, their culture and the force of their roots. What a welcome experience! We believe that both Peña and Leonel Fernandez, because all mulattos are black there, should be closer to the North American black community in search of resources and to support their aspirations.

The author, writing for a Dominican audience in the Dominican Republic, informs the readers that Dominicans shared in the fourth of July celebration in New York City. More than that, he conveys a sense of experience in the U.S. and the idea that Dominicans "now understand" the interests and feelings of Black Americans and that Black Americans are proud to be Black, unlike Dominicans. Importantly, he suggests that both Peña Gomez and Leonel Fernández (a "*mulato*") are Black in the United States and that much could be learned and gained by Dominicans and African Americans joining forces. This article is an example of a transnational project, and more specifically, transnationalism embedded in the "local." Dominicans in the Dominican Republic learn of the experiences of Dominicans abroad, and in particular, about changing ideas of race and community building.

Another example of the "there" within "here" can be found at the *Museo del Hombre Dominicano* (Museum of the Dominican Man). I was struck by a wing of the

museum depicting life of Dominicans in New York City. There were two large mural-type paintings showing various aspects of the city (taxi cab, movie theaters, traffic, people sitting on benches, "peep shows," etc.). The marquee of the movie theater lists the following movies: Embassy, Airplane, Dressed to Kill, and Egyptian Film Festival). Of interest are Embassy and Airplane which are representative of the Dominican experience of obtaining visas to travel to the U.S. and the actual travel experience via airplanes as well as remittances that are sent from NY to the Dominican Republic.

The other painting depicts a letter written to a relative in the Dominican Republic and says that it is cold in New York and that the work is hard. She says it's like living in a jail but she is there (in New York) out of necessity. The letter ends with the question of whether or not the relative has received the money she sent. This painting represents what some participants said during interviews -- that many Dominicans are in the U.S. out of economic necessity and send money and other items such as clothes and shoes to family members in the Dominican Republic. Traveling back and forth, people are often met with questions about working abroad and what they are bringing with them.

Each time I went to the Dominican Republic, I had similar experiences in the airport. In 1995, with my U.S. passport in hand, I was asked questions about being Dominican and coming back to the island (e.g. what I was bringing for family, if I was born there, etc.). When I left the customs area and main doors of the airport, I noticed a group of college-aged students from the U.S. An African American student seemed upset about something. I walked over to the group and said hello, and spoke to him in particular. He looked at me and said "They think I'm Haitian. When they saw my U.S.

passport, and noticed that I spoke English, they said that I must be Haitian-American." In similar, yet different ways, we were both defined and labeled before we left the airport -- I was defined as Dominican, and he was defined as Haitian. We were both dressed in a similar fashion, spoke English, and had U.S. passports. However, it was our color that set us apart. Because he was dark-skinned, he was defined as a Haitian American, and because I was light-skinned, I was defined as Dominican American (even though we are from the same "community" in the United States).

As I stated in the beginning of this chapter, Mulutaje, and claims of being *mulato* often stems from experiences one has in the United States interacting with the U.S. racial system. Africanidad, and claims of being "Afro-Dominican," also stems from experiences had outside of the Dominican Republic. The two overlap in many ways, but there are some particularities that arise within Africanidad that I review in the next section.

Africanidad

Africanidad transcends nation as it links people on a macro-level, across borders and nationalities. In this way, Africanidad refers to the African diaspora which Hamilton (1990) defines as:

> a type of social grouping characterized by a historical patterning of particular social relationships and experiences. As a social formation, it is conceptualized as a global aggregate of actors and subpopulations, differentiated in social and geographical space, yet exhibiting a commonality based on historical factors, conditioned by and within the world ordering system (Hamilton 1990: 18).

Like Mulutaje, Africanidad is a fairly new discourse surrounding race and nation and the articulation of "new" identities based on experiences outside of the Dominican Republic, a critical reading of history, and reflection on the past. In relation to the historical construction of Dominicanness, Africanidad, as a discourse, is less concerned with an intermediate category and defining mixture as much as it is the reclaiming of an African ancestry and linking the Dominican "nation" with an African past.

Racial Views and Concepts

Again, Africanidad and Mulutaje overlap in the sense that they both recognize African ancestry and emerge after having an experience "a fuera de" (outside of the) Dominican Republic that causes a "period of reflection." While Mulutaje is linked to the *mulato* race/color category, Africanidad asserts a *Negro*/Black and/or *Afro-Dominicano*/Afro-Dominican identity. The main difference here is that Mulutaje still captures a sense of racial "in-betweenness," and Africanidad extends beyond mixture per se to address issues of ancestry and similarities throughout the African diaspora. *Mulato* is also more wide-spread in its use in the Dominican Republic than "Afro-Dominican." This will be discussed at the end of this chapter.

Racial Discourse and the Articulation of Racial and National Identities

The racial discourse of Africanidad is in reference to the African diaspora. I later discuss some recently formed Dominican organizations that are making claims about being

Black and/or Afro-Dominican, linking themselves and their experiences in the Americas with African Americans and others in the diaspora (e.g. Minority Rights Group 1995). Africanidad involves reclaiming of African ancestry, organizing efforts with other peoples of African descent (e.g. Casa por la Identidad de la Mujer Afro--Identidad) to articulate a new discourse of race and nation -- one that springs forth due to increased transnational migration and personal and group "reflections" on history.

By way of example, October 12 is Columbus Day in the Dominican Republic, and in recent years, various individuals and groups have attended celebrations or presentations to discuss Christopher Columbus and the legacy of the "encounters" that followed. The following commentary is taken from Identidad's newsletter and discusses the significance of Columbus Day[82]:

En octubre se conmemora una feche importante para las y los latinoamericanas/os y caribeñas/os. Para los sectores tradicionales y conservadores de nuestros países en la fecha del 12 de octubre constituye la celebración del día de la raza, el encuentro de culturas, para otros sectores Octubre nos recuerda la masacre, la explotación de que fueron objeto grandes poblaciones indígenas y negras esclavas traídas desde el Africa como fuerza de trabajo para la acumulación de riquezas de la colonia española en el proceso de la mundialización del capitalismo.

Fruto de este proceso de colonización que se ha impuesto hace hoy 506 años, la identidad de nuestros pueblos se presenta confusa, con tendencias a asumirnos solo como una parte de lo que somos, resaltando únicamente la herencia histórica de la cultura española, no así de la indígena y africana, lo que se nos revela en la cotidianidad en manifestaciones racistas que van desde las formas más sutiles ("en mi casa negro el caldero") hasta las más complejas ("se busca joven de buena presencia").

Octubre debe servir para seguir profundizando sobre el tema de la identidad y el racismo, recordando nuestro pasado histórico para poder construir un presente sin confusiones.

Translation

An important date is commemorated in October for Latin Americans and Caribbeans. For traditional and conservative sectors of our countries October 12 constitutes the celebration of race day, the encounter of cultures, for other sectors in October we remember the massacre, the exploitation of large populations of indigenous and black slaves brought from Africa like a work force for the accumulation of wealth of the Spanish colony in the process of world capitalism.

Because of this colonization process that began 506 years ago, the identity of our communities is confused, with tendencies to assume only a part of who we are, only referring to the historical inheritance of the Spanish culture, not the indigenous and African, that is revealed to us daily in racist manifestations from the more subtle (in my house the pot is black) to the most complex (looking for a young person of good presence) forms.

October should continue to serve as a time to intellectualize about the topic of identity and racism, remembering our historic past in order to be able to construct a present without confusions.

The name of Identidad's newsletter is as revealing as what they discuss here in this issue about Race Day. "Cimarrona" literally means runaway slave woman and not only brings attention to a "forgotten" slave society in the Dominican Republic but also a form of resistance used by the slaves themselves. For them, Race Day represents an "encounter" of cultures and exploitation of indigenous and enslaved Africans in the process of "world capitalism." They also suggest here that there is a national confusion about "who they are" which is made evident by the constant reference to Spanish origins. Along with other groups and individuals that meet and submit essays to the newspapers and make television appearances on Race Day, they claim that this day should be a day for

reflection and consciousness raising to create a socio-historically accurate identity "without confusions."

Individual Identities and State-Sanctioned Categories

Within Africanidad, people define themselves as *Negro*/a or *Afro-Dominicano/a*. While the state recognizes *Negro* as a category on the *cédula*, it is seldom used for Dominicans as we explored in the previous chapter. Afro-Dominican is the identity that women in *La Casa por la Identidad de la Mujer Afro (The House for Afro-Dominican Women's Identity*--Identidad) promote.[83] Afro-Dominican is also an identity that some Dominicans in the United States claim.[84] I have worked with *Identidad* since 1993 and have witnessed change within the organization in terms of leadership and mission.

La Casa por la Identidad de la Mujer Afro (Identidad)

Identidad, comprised of approximately twenty core members, is located in Santo Domingo.[85] The leadership is comprised of women with a college education although the general membership is quite diverse. Most of the women reside in urban areas and are involved with other organizations for women's economic and social betterment. *Identidad* strives to "reach" women across social class lines as these women often don't have the educational training and experiences abroad from which contestation and consciousness often arise.

While most of the members reside in the capital, others live in Santiago, as well as in other parts of the Dominican Republic. Their meetings were held periodically, in part because of members' schedules -- women often traveled to conferences, went to the United States to work or visit family, conduct research, and facilitate workshops. These workshops provided a forum to reflect and discuss race-, color-, and gender-related topics. Women members in Santo Domingo frequently traveled to Santiago and other cities in order to bring these ideas to women. By facilitating workshops with women throughout the country, *Identidad* reaches out and raises awareness across social class lines to the extent that claiming a Black identity, and later an "Afro-Dominican identity," extended beyond women in the middle class.

When I left in 1993, I left my copies of *Essence* magazine with them (as they had requested African American women's magazines). At the time, I didn't realize the impact this popular Black women's magazine would have on the organization with regard to an image. When I returned in 1995 for further research, *Identidad* was using the image of Susan L. Taylor (the editor-in-chief of Essence at that time) on the cover of their newsletter. The title of the newsletter read "Red de Mujeres Afrocaribeñas y Afrolatinoamericanas" (Meeting of Afro-Caribbean and Afro-Latin American Women, dated Year 1, No. 5, 1994).[86] The director of *Identidad,* at that time, explained that Taylor and her cornrowed hair (braided hair) represented their ideal of beauty and strength.[87]

In 1995, *Identidad* identified five organizational objectives: 1) promote a broad process of reflection that serves as a premise in the search of identity; 2) help other

women become aware of the relationship between racial and gender discrimination and oppression; 3) reveal the contributions of Black women in the formation of the nation; 4) demythologize the dominant stereotypes about Black women; and 5) convey ideas that advance accurate models of identity with regard to Black women.[88]

During this same year, a rupture occurred within the organization over its name and the terminology used to describe women's experiences within the group. In particular, a small contingent of lighter-complexioned women questioned the exactness and accuracy of the term *Negra* in the organization's name to capture their experiences -- *negra* was a category usually attributed to Haitians, Africans, and extremely dark-complexioned Dominicans. The label "Black" -- with its contentious historical and contemporary meanings -- became the focal point of what amounted to a protracted exercise in identity politics. Other phenotypic traits also came into question, namely hair and its presentation -- women rejecting the use of hair relaxers and straighteners and instead wearing their hair "natural" (e.g. afro, braids, curly locks, etc.). Color, as a distinguishing feature, was also interrogated by the women as light-skinned women were made to feel that they were not "Black enough."[89] Light-skinned Dominican women in *Identidad*, while they defined themselves as Black, were, at times, met with looks of disapproval by darker-skinned women in the organization.

The end result of this rupture was the founding of *Cafe con Leche*, (Coffee with Milk), a new, albeit short-lived, organization which articulated new notions of race, mixture, color, and gender in the Dominican Republic. *Identidad* did not have a large membership, so when *Cafe con Leche* formed with some of the original members of

Identidad, it had an impact on the organization not only in terms of members but also in terms of focus. In effect the co-existence of *Identidad* and *Cafe con Leche*, divided these Dominican feminists into *negra* and *mulata* camps. In response to this newly formed and competing organization, *Identidad* underwent reorganization and redefinition after what was termed a "period of reflection" and renamed itself by replacing *negra* with *Afro-Dominicana*. The purpose was to recreate *Identidad* and reunite the group by bringing women from *Cafe con Leche* back into *Identidad* -- which is what happened. One of the founding members of *Identidad*, and former member of *Cafe con Leche*, Carmen, became the new director of *Identidad*.

As demonstrated here, moving away from Black as a *color* marker as well as a *racial* one, women redefined themselves as "Afro-Dominican," focusing on African heritage, recognizing the African diasporic experience with regard to mixture, and linking themselves with other women of African descent in the Americas and throughout the Diaspora. Carmen commented that "they began to question the significance of Black as a descriptive category and decided, after a period of reflection, that they were of African descent, with mixture, and it was important to claim an Afro-Dominican identity which includes all *mulata* and *negra* Dominican women."[90]

At present, *Identidad* is working to raise awareness about racism and sexism, making claims that race and gender, along with class and sexuality, need to be focal points in research and articulations of Dominicanness. Part of this means that they align themselves with Haitian women and other women of the African Diaspora as a response to the marginalization they experience in the Dominican Republic -- expressing their

identity as "Afro-Dominican." The use of *Afro-* as a way of reclaiming and embracing African ancestry is radical in the Dominican Republic, because while ideas of mixture persist, they are not typically explained with reference to Blacks as many Dominicans maintain distance from both blackness and having an African ancestry and past.

Since their inception in 1989, *Identidad* hosted the first meeting of Black Latin American and Caribbean women in the summer of 1992. They also participated in the Cross-Cultural Black Women's Studies Summer Institute, in Venezuela in 1993. Most recently, they held a feminist workshop, that I attended in Santiago in May of 1998, and they used this forum to discuss plans for an upcoming meeting of Latin American and Caribbean feminists in 1999. They also sponsored a workshop on combating racism in 1998. Along with a reorganization came a new mission and revised objectives:

> Es una organización de mujeres de origen afro que enmarcamos nuestro trabajo en la transformación de las estructuras sociales y políticas reproductoras y transmisoras de ideologías que fomentan los prejuicios raciales y por condición de género...La misión de Identidad es enfrentar todo tipo de discriminación étnico racial, rescatar y promover los aportes de la cultura afro a nuestra conformación social. Los lineamientos estrategicos parten de: a) empoderar a las mujeres negras en el rescate de su identidad afro a traves de lo simbólico, lo artistico, y lo religioso; b) la denuncia de todo tipo de discriminacion a cualquier persona por su condición étnico racial o de género; c) la investigación; d) la articulación-para combatir el racismo y el sexismo...[91]

Translation

> It is an organization of women of African origin that frames our work in the transformation of the social structures and political reproducers and transmitters of ideologies that evoke the racial prejudices and for the condition of gender...The mission of *Identidad* is to confront all types of racial/ethnic discrimination, to rescue and promote the contributions of the African culture to our social fabric.

> The strategic boundaries consist of: a) empowering Black women in the rescue of their Afro-identity through the symbolic, the artistic, and the religious; b) denouncing all types of discrimination of any person based on their racial/ethnic status or gender; c) doing research; d) speaking out against racism and sexism...

The above objectives highlight the point that it is necessary to "rescue" or recover their Afro-Dominican identity as this has been buried in the historical memory. They link their recovery with a mission to combat sexism and racism in their objectives while combining research and action.

These views were further articulated when I attended a public forum that *Identidad* organized entitled "Que Somos Etnicamente las Dominicanas y los Dominicanos," (What We Dominicans are Ethnically) in July of 1998, at the public library, in Santo Domingo. During the course of the discussion, Carmen explained why *Identidad* is advancing an "Afro-Dominican" identity:

> ...yo pienso que hay una identidad más global que es la caribeña, y yo pienso que ciertamente independiente de las diferencias que podamos tener y ahora que estamos haciendo estudios sobre eso, no podemos pensar en el Caribe como una unidad porque inclusive dentro del Caribe hay una diversidad increible. El Caribe es ya una construcción histórica que hemos ido creando a través de los años y que es parte de nuestra identidad, aunque no la asumimos, a pesar es desde esa óptica que se nos ve desde fuera. Qué sucede aquí en este pedazo de isla?
> Cómo definirla etnicamente, sea un proceso de construcción, sea una cuestion de que estrategicamente sea más válido asumir certa categoría u otra? Yo me inclino evidentemente por la propuesta Afro-Dominicana en el sentido de que para mi, y yo no soy una estudiosa del tema, sino que es una opción más sentimental y militante que otra cosa, la propuesta de la categoría *Afro-Dominicana* me resuelve la mezcla, es decir lo dominicano es una construcción historica de mezclas de culturas: hispana, africana e indígena -- aunque por opción política optamos por destacar aun que otra o eliminar una y otra. Ahora bien yo creo que hay un predominio de la cultura africana que se ha adaptado a los tiempos. Aquí, y hay

evidencias, el elemento afro es fundamental -- por eso Identidad de las Mujeres Afro.

Translation

I think a more global identity is that of the Caribbean, and I think independent of the differences that can have, and we are now conducting research on that, that we cannot think of the Caribbean like a single unit because there is incredible diversity within the Caribbean. The Caribbean is already a historical construction created through the years, and it is part of our identity, although we don't assume it, and it is from that lens that we are viewed by the outside. What happens here on this island? How to define someone ethnically -- is it a process of construction, a question of what category is more strategically valid to assume? I am inclined to lean toward the proposed Afro-Dominicana in the sense that for me, and I am not an expert on the topic, but rather it is a sentimental and militant option more than anything else; the proposal of the category Afro-Dominicana resolves for me the mixture, that is to say that Dominican is a historical construction of mixtures of cultures: Spanish, African and indigenous -- although for political preference we opt to highlight one over another. Now, I believe that there is a predominance of the African culture that has adapted over time. Here, and there is evidence that the African element is fundamental -- for that reason [we call ourselves] Identidad of the Afro Women.

Carmen expands on a number of ideas in the above section. She suggests that there is tremendous diversity within the historically formed Caribbean -- constructed in somewhat a homogenizing way that flattened out differences. She also suggests that a "Caribbean" identity is one that Dominicans don't typically assume. Chiqui also mentioned this as well -- that it wasn't until she was studying in the U.S. that she came to realize the Dominican Republic was "in" the Caribbean.

Carmen explains the rational for using "Afro" when articulating women's identities. She combines ancestry with a strategic positioning that runs contrary to the ways in which women (and men) are typically defined. For her, this identity calls for

militancy to rescue of the African past in the articulation of mixture with a reference to Africa. While not designed to describe the mixture, Afro-Dominican takes into account the processes of mixture stemming from slavery and the colonial period (and post-colonial era). "Opting" to highlight one ancestry over another for "political reasons" is similar to the African American experience in the United States (and the historical formation of the one-drop rule). Again, while the one drop rule recognizes mixture, one ancestry is highlighted over the others for legal, economic, social, and political purposes. Carmen recognizes that the historical adoption and institutionalization of *indio* erased the African past and ancestral ties and also kept dark Dominicans on the extreme side of the *indio* continuum.

Enrique, a Dominican scholar who lives in the United States and Canada commented:

No se puede hablar de la identidad sin tener en cuenta la cultural. Que es lo que diferencia una cultura de la otra, es precisamente la significación que nosotros tenemos sobre la vida, la muerte, relación hombre-mujer, la enfermedad. Eso es lo que diferencia una cultura de otra...Si nosotros ponemos por ejemplo el caso de la gente que construye su identidad en un contexto multicultural, el caso de los dominicanos y dominicanas en los Estados Unidos, ellos y ellas tienen que lidiar con dos sistemas culturales distinctos...Otro aspecto que ha resurgido muy ligado a lo primero es el carácter dinámico de la identidad o sea la identidad no es una constante, no es una cosa pegada sobre la pared, es por el contrario es unidad de continuidad y cambio -- el mismo ejemplo de los dominicanos en Nueva York nos sirve. Nosotros llegamos a los Estados Unidos con una identidad, con una idea de lo que somos, y cuando llegamos a los Estados Unidos de America, yo que nunca me he definido ni sentido negro -- de repente yo aprendo por primera vez que soy negro y aquí yo soy un indio, entonces el individuo tiene que lidiar con todas estas asignaciones, con patrones con modelos diferentes y coger y dejar.

Translation

One cannot speak of identity without keeping culture in mind. What is different from one culture to another is precisely the ideas that we have about life, death, the relationship between men and women, illness. That is what differentiates one culture from another. If we use the case that people constructing their identity in a multicultural context, for example the case of Dominican men and women in the United States, they have to struggle against two different cultural systems. The dynamic part is that identity is not a constant, it is not something stuck on a wall; on the contrary it is of continuity and change -- the same example that Dominicans in New York provides. We [Dominicans] arrive in the United States with an identity, with an idea of what we are; when we [my family] arrived in the United States of America, I, who had never defined myself or felt black, all of a sudden learned for the first time that I am black, and here (in the Dominican Republic) I am an *indio*; the individual has to then struggle with these categories, with standards with different models.

Here, Enrique uses a personal experience to illustrate what happens when two racial systems collide -- it is the struggle to define who one is while being defined by others in a different place. The reconfiguration of identities is located in this site of struggle and negotiation. He suggests that Dominicans arrive with a sense of who they are and that self of sense changes in the United States because they are often defined as Black. On an individual level, it is a struggle of sorts, but on a much larger level, these same actors interact with both racial systems, and indirectly, and perhaps directly, play a part in transforming the racial system in the Dominican Republic. This is an example of ideas that come to reshape categories and definitions in the "relocalization" process.

Transnationalism: Migration, Ideas, and Relocalization

Again, this period is marked by increased transnational migration. Unlike the experiences abroad within the Mulutaje discourse, Africanidad is less concerned about asserting an "in-between" racial category that "makes sense" across borders. Instead, it views Africa as an ancestral place that links the Dominican Republic to other places and Dominicans to other peoples of African descent. Thus, groups organize around such objectives as combating racism, asserting identities, raising awareness, and revising history and align themselves by traveling to attend meetings around these issues.

By way of example, the poster that *Identidad* used in 1992, when they hosted the first international conference of Afro-Caribbean and Afro-Latin American women, in Santo Domingo, was used on the cover of a book entitled Connecting Across Cultures and Continents: Black Women Speak Out on Identity, Race and Development (Pala 1995). The book contains papers that were given at the Fifth International Interdisciplinary Congress on Women, in Costa Rica in 1993. Sergia Galvan, a member *Identidad*, participated in the meeting in Costa Rica and discussed the relationship between race and gender oppression in Latin America in her paper and in the book:[92]

> The economic and structural adjustment policies in most of the countries in Latin America, instead of supporting participation of Black women in the labour market, actually increase their poverty, marginalization and exploitation. Black women are found in the worst-paid jobs in housework and agriculture, and continue to be among the poorest in society (Galvan 1995: 50).

It is often the case that social race, as a factor in shaping women's lives, in the Dominican Republic, is often ignored in favor of a social class analysis. Is a simply a coincidence

that those who occupy the lowest rung of the socio-economic ladder "happen" to be dark-skinned? Identidad is concerned with this question as it relates to Dominican women at home and abroad. One of the ways in which Dominican women are racialized abroad is through the traffic of women as commercial sex workers in Europe:

> At the regional level, the traffic of women (and girls) is increasing dramatically day by day, especially of Black women. The myths and prejudices surrounding Black women's sexuality are used to promote and support the trafficking of Black females in order to satisfy men's sexual fantasies (Galvan 1995: 50).

The traffic of women is a major concern in the Dominican Republic, especially among Black feminists. *Identidad* is among one of the women's groups that suggests that Dominican women are lured away under the premise that they will work by performing artistic acts in Europe (e.g. singing and dancing, etc.), but after their arrival, they realize that the work is actually sex work that may involve singing and dancing -- this is one of the few options, however, that they have to cover their airfare and other related expenses (the fine print on the signed contracts -- travel expenses have to be paid by them). More work is currently being conducted on this, but according to Identidad and CIPAF[93], a well established feminist research organization in Santo Domingo, half of the sex workers in the Netherlands are Dominican women -- and there is evidence that sexual tourism is becoming more racialized as German and other European men request the "companionship" of Black women when they visit the Dominican Republic.

Combining research and activism, women in *Identidad* conduct research and travel to local, regional, and international meetings and conferences that deal with racial

oppression of women in order to form alliances with other Black women and to make visible their plight in the Dominican Republic. From the trafficking of women, sexual tourism on the island, the prevalence of violence in the factories of the free trade zones, to the role of women as mothers, as primary socializing agents of children (Safa 1995), *Identidad* is rallying around a number of issues while promoting an "Afro" identity.

Through their efforts, and along with other women's groups, they have been able to bring about some change in the Dominican Republic. And as they continue to make connections with other Black women and recognize the similarities and differences in terms of their experience, they play a part in reconfiguration of racial identities, and redefinition of the Dominican Republic as part of the African Diaspora.

In a more general sense, at this point in time, there is continued transnational migration from the Dominican Republic to the United States and visa versa. There is migration to/from Haiti, and there is tourism in the major tourist centers in the Dominican Republic (e.g. Puerto Plata, La Romana, Santo Domingo, etc.). The Amber Museum in Puerto Plata showcases some of the finest amber in the country as well as fine wood carvings of Taino-like figures. Haitians are known more for their wood carvings as this is associated with "African art." I asked one of the sales clerks if there was a Dominican artist working with the carvings, why they were using "indigenous" figures, and why they had carvings alongside the amber, and he responded by saying "No. They are Haitian artists, although some of them are working with Dominicans to show them how to do the carvings. The Tainos were the first people here -- they were indigenous like the amber -- so we have their images here in the museum. Tourists are really interested in the carvings

-- that's what they want." Thus, in addition to their labor in the sugar cane fields and construction projects throughout the Dominican Republic, Haitians are now being summoned for their cultural production. Because of tourists' interest in carvings, Haitian artists are asked to create "Dominican" images and produce something "indigenous" utilizing their skills and tradition of woodcarving. This is one of the outcomes of increased tourism.

Another aspect of tourism involves Dominicans who return for vacation and stay at one of the resorts often frequented by Europeans, Canadians, and Americans (a symbol of status and "wealth"). By way of example, David, Asha, and I went to Puerto Plata (a coastal community) one weekend. The hotel where we stayed had recently opened and already had a number of tourists from Germany and Canada. On this particular weekend, there were a few Dominicans there as well -- from the DR and from the U.S. What unfolded there was interesting and illustrates some of the complexities in the dissertation involving Dominicans abroad. There is an expectation that Dominicans should speak Spanish when interacting with the "local" hotel staff. This was evident as we witnessed a number of exchanges between staff and hotel guests. When the hotel staff interacted with European guests, they attempted to speak German or English. The language of choice by the hotel staff was Spanish, even with Dominican guests who spoke English more than Spanish. When David went to get a towel, the attendant only spoke to him in Spanish. David explained that he was learning Spanish and wasn't fluent, at which point the attendant told him to be proud of being Dominican and speak Spanish -- so they

continued in Spanish. When David walked away, he overheard the same attendant speaking fluent English to a Canadian guest.

We continued having similar experiences throughout our stay there. The issue of being "Dominican" vs. "Dominican Dominican" also emerged during this time. Being from here (DR) or there (U.S.) translated into a type of "authenticity." Those born in the U.S. or having resided there over a number of years was considered "Dominican," but those who were born in the DR, and lived and resided in the Dominican Republic, were considered "Dominican Dominican." It was something about the experience of never leaving or leaving temporarily but continuing to reside in the Dominican Republic that meant that one was "truly" Dominican. "Dominican Dominican" claimed a particular identity, history and experience.

Another interesting manifestation of transnationalism involves meeting the "needs" of tourists, and in particular, appropriating racialized images from the United States -- images that have been lifted out of their sociohistorical context and could take on a different meaning. Later that night at the same hotel, we attended a variety show. Many of the staff that we had been interacting with during the day were performing in the show. Some of the acts were impersonations of Michael Jackson, Whitney Houston, etc., but the one that was "curious and disturbing" was done in blackface with stereotypical images and "slurred black speech" (in Spanish). The predominantly White audience laughed and clapped during the blackface performance. I wondered if the shock we felt was shared by anyone else. Then I wondered if the same racial attachments and significance, that this type of performance had in the United States years ago, were linked

to these images in a similar way to be considered racial images and stereotypes in the Dominican Republic. I wondered how the audience interpreted the show -- what was its significance in the Dominican Republic? Was this an "import" from the U.S. without the racial connotations? It's difficult to know, but I suspect that on the one hand, the performance could have been viewed as a "U.S." comedy form, thus stripped of its sociohistorical racial overtones, but on the other hand, it could have been performed at the request of guests who wanted a certain "type" of show.[94]

This reminds me of what Wright (1990) expressed about Afro-Venezuelans -- that despite not recording race on the census, Afro-Venezuelans were often reminded of their "status" with negative images in cartoons. They were reminded of their slave history, and that despite having money and education, they still were descendants of slaves. The Dominican Republic does not have this particular "memory." Dominicans are not reminded that they are descendants of slaves -- they are reminded that Haitians are descendants of slaves. And while there are racialized images of dark Dominican women as "mammies" and domestic figures associated with certain brands of foods (like "Aunt Jemima" in the U.S.), some of the other racialized and stereotypical images that might have been used in the United States or Venezuela were used to represent Haitians, not Dominicans, in the Dominican Republic. This is changing, however.

Thus, the articulation of Africanidad changes this perspective on Haiti, and of being of African descent. The linkage is one that connects people of African descent due to a sense of shared history, circumstance, and experience. The assertion of Black and/or "Afro" identities then links Dominicans with Haitians, African Americans, Afro-

Venezuelans, Puerto Ricans, etc. It is a stance that recasts history and the formation of the Dominican nation along the lines of a Black Atlantic experience (Gilroy 1993).

VIII. Conclusion

I began the dissertation by stating that the nation emerges as an important concern in the 20th century due to the massive movement of people and ideas across borders, wedding people in the formation of race and nation while co-constructing racial and national identities. This is the process of defining "nationness" over time and space. When people and ideas cross borders, they not only have an impact in the place of destination, but also in the place of origin as these ideas and people continue to recross borders and boundaries. This suggests that people interacting with racial systems within different national contexts may change how they define themselves and have an impact on social structures.

While ideas traveled between places, so did people. With local, regional, and international travel increasing over the century due to wars, voluntary and involuntary migration, and socio-economic reasons, borders became more salient as did the reconfiguration of nationness. In the Dominican Republic, there was migration from Haiti and other Caribbean nations as well as from the United States and Europe. The Dominican Republic would also witness a large exodus of people in the post-Trujillo era due to economic restructuring policies and a shift to import substitution that prompted more people to look to the United States as a place for economic and social advancement (Torres-Saillaint and Hernández 1998).

A nation once defined in one particular way can change over time as more people enter and leave its borders and as "new" ideas are introduced. I have focused here on the

Dominican Republic as a case study to illustrate how such change takes place. In particular, I traced the importance of the idea of mixture (the *liga*) and used it as a point of entry to examine Dominicanness as mixture links race, color and nation in the articulation of Dominicanness. Socioracial categories changed over time as people made new, and competing, claims about "who they were." Color and ideas of race continue to be an important criterion in both the Dominican Republic and in the United States in the configuration of racial identities.

Dominicanness, Race and Nation

This dissertation examined the ways in which Dominicanness, in both racial and national terms, were articulated over time in the Dominican Republic. I demonstrated how racial and national identities are reconfigured as people immigrate to and emigrate from the Dominican Republic. While categories have changed to some extent, what has remained constant is the idea of mixture.

The five discourses -- Gente de Color, Hispanidad, Mestizaje, Mulutaje, and Africanidad -- illustrate the changing significance of Dominicanness. The discourses themselves reflect the "ideas of the time" as well as the ideas of people and the state at given points in time and history. The socioracial categories themselves were reconfigured due to immigration and emigration and the relationships between people across borders. Thus, the discourses all recognize some level of inter-connectivity between states and individuals where ideas and resources are often exchanged -- this is why there tends to be some overlap between them.

The Gente de Color discourse (1900-30) expressed a belief in races as distinct biological groups that made race mixture possible. During this time, there were three state sanctioned racial groups (*blancos*, *mestizos*, and *negros*) -- *mestizo* described the majority of the population in racial terms. Importantly, during this time, Dominicans considered themselves, and were considered by others, to be "of color."

The Hispanidad discourse (1930-61) moved away from being "of color" toward a more Spanish ideal (Hispanidad). The ideal racial type was conceptualized with a distance to Blacks and Africans. Hispanidad embraced "all that was Spanish" in appreciation of Spanish culture and society. Spain became the point of reference and a link to understanding Dominican life, people, and practices (e.g. the church, language, etc.).

The Mestizaje discourse (1961-89) is the dominant contemporary discourse and resembles Hispanidad in its articulation. While there is still an appreciation for Spanish contributions and influences during this time, the Dominican Republic as homeland emerges as one of Trujillo's legacies. Dominicans are linked to a particular land, a particular history, and are a particular "type" of people due to homogenization practices in imagining the nation. The claim "we are Dominican" is significant in terms of linking people to a place at different points in time and webs race and nation in a way that being Dominican means having a generational presence, roots, and *liga* that is particular to the Dominican Republic.

The Mulutaje discourse (1989 - present) is one of the two emerging discourses challenging Mestizaje. It articulates a new racial view and reflects a *negro - blanco* (Black

- White) mixture with assertions of being *mulato*. The *mulato* category has emerged due to Dominicans' experiences in the United States with race and racial categorizations and the lack of an "in-between" category in the United States. This is combined with the experience of learning that "*indio*" has a different meaning in the United States and refers to different "types" of people (e.g. Native Americans, Indians from India, etc.). It is through interactions with people and institutional structures that define Dominicans in new and different ways in the United States that facilitate this process of Mulutaje.

The Africanidad discourse (1989 - present) overlaps with Mulutaje in the sense that they both recognize African ancestry and emerge after having an experience outside of the Dominican Republic that cause a "period of reflection." While Mulutaje is linked to the *mulato* socioracial category, Africanidad asserts a *negro* (Black) and/or Afro-Dominican identity. The primary difference is that Mulutaje still captures a sense of racial "in-betweenness," and Africanidad extends beyond mixture to address issues of ancestry and similarities throughout the African diaspora.

With the exception of Mulutaje and Africanidad, the discourses begin at the state level with governmental elite defining people and creating categories and policies that have a direct impact on how the nation is imagined. Mulutaje and Africanidad discourses, however, challenge the state and the historical and dominant ideas about ancestry, "accurate" identities, and history itself (although the state seems to be moving toward Mulutaje). These two inter-related discourses emerge during a time when Dominicans enter (and often reside in) the United States and learn that they are defined in different ways due to a different set of social and historical circumstances. There are competing

notions of *indio* and what Black means, all prompting them to reconsider "who they are" and how they define themselves in this new environment.

In general, the Dominican Republic was not unique in its creation of racial/color categories as we see this throughout the Americas. What is especially peculiar here is the ways in which the state created categories that were outside of the social history of the country in terms of insinuating Indian-Spanish mixture with *mestizo*, for example. While the elite, at various points in time, were negrophobic, I suspect that racial thinking in the United States (and elsewhere) may have played a role in perpetuating those beliefs especially during the early part of the 20th century when the U.S. Marines occupied both the Dominican Republic and Haiti. The so-called "mulatto escape hatch" (Safa 1998; Degler 1971) could have played a role in the distinction between Dominicans and Haitians on the part of the United States:

> Degler (1971) has termed this the "mulatto escape hatch" because it makes mulattos more acceptable to whites than blacks and distances them from blacks by offering them greater opportunities for social mobility.

Strategically, the United States was in a position to make these distinctions between the Dominican Republic and Haiti.

Another point of interest is the shift from race to color (demonstrated in the change in census categories) in that race mixture becomes a presumption -- with resulting "color" variation. If race mixture is presumed, and if being mixed is a characteristic of Dominicanness, then historically and at present, certain "groups" have been, and still are, excluded from this particular construction of nationness. Those groups defined as "pure"

in the Dominican Republic, without much intermarriage and mixture, find themselves on the ends of a bi-polar racial/color system that defines the majority of Dominicans as being distinct from these groups.

Within the realm of transnational migration, we see other types of reconfigurations in terms of delimiting territories and defining membership along national lines. With the incorporation of different national groups, the national memory of the Dominican Republic actually consists of competing views of history -- some place emphasis on the Spanish, others place emphasis on the Tainos, and yet others place emphasis on the "encounters" between groups. In the homogenizing practices surrounding these histories, the African presence was, in effect, erased from the historical record and memory -- this is being rescued, however, at the present time, as the emerging discourses show. Along these lines, several grassroots organizations in the Dominican Republic are currently working to rescue the African past and form alliances with Haiti and with other groups in the African diaspora.

Racial and National Identities in the Dominican Republic on the "Ground"

In sum, I found that racial and national identities are often linked to each other in the expressed consensus that *indio* was "invented" in the Dominican Republic and is tied to being Dominican in a national sense. In this way, the configuration of Dominicans as a "mixed" people is then characterized by the in-between category of *indio*. As I have presented here, *indio* as a concept and category, has been contested by people being

reflexive as a result of experiences abroad or rethinking the course of history in the Dominican Republic.

The more historically "accurate" category, *mulato*, officially entered the discourse due to its inclusion on the *cédula* and because of individual claims of being *mulato* (articulated in interviews, in newspapers, etc.). Despite this, however, there is still resistance to self-defining as (and assigning) *mulato* because it denotes African ancestry and blackness which is often "denied." I think, however, that *mulato* will gain more widespread acceptance within the next few years simply because of the consensus that "*indio* does not exist" and the need to replace it with something that captures a racial in-between status. However, I don't think that *mulato* will be the only in-between category in circulation because *indio* has a long-standing tradition of usage -- I think that *indio* will still be used if only in conversations between people to describe color. The political party PID may continue to advance the idea of *mestizo* instead of *indio*. And *Identidad* will work to advance Afro-Dominican. Without doubt, there are a number of agentive forces in place challenging these categories and how they articulate the sense of being Dominican.

Some Dominican scholars are examining issues surrounding racial identity by reviewing historical claims and making new assertions about the need to revise history and to have a more accurate representation of the past as the past relates to Haiti and socioracial categories. Such works include *La Identidad Social y National en Dominicana: Un Análisis Psico-Social* (Záiter Mejía 1996); *Al Filo de la Dominicanidad* (Mateo 1996); *La Presencia Negra en Santo Domingo* (Andújar Persinal 1997); *Sobre Racismo y*

Antihaitianismo (Franco Pichardo 1997); *Los Negros, Los Mulatos y la Nación Dominicana* (Franco Pichardo 1989); *Ensayos Sobre Cultura Dominicana* (Vega et. al 1997); *Cultura Popular e Identidad Nacional* (Tejeda Ortiz 1998); *Mujer y Esclavitud* (Albert Batista 1993); *Memoria del Foro: Por Una Sociedad Libre de Prejuicio Racial* (Identidad 1997); *El Otro del Nosotros* (Onè Respe 1994); and *Azucar y Haitianos en la Republica Dominicana* (Manuel Madruga 1986).

In addition, in recent years, Dominican organizations have been created in an effort to organize around issues of identity and coalition building with Haitians and other people of African descent. *Identidad* is one of the primary organizations involved in the conscientization effort. Other groups include the Women of the *Altagracia* Church, the women at the *Coordinadora de Mujeres de Cibao* (Women's Coordination Effort of Cibao), and the organization *Onè Respe*. They all work to combat racism, create coalitions with Haitians, and assert Black, *mulato*, or Afro-Dominican identities. There is another group in Santo Domingo closely linked to *Identidad*, and includes men and women, in the celebration of the African past and legacy in the Dominican Republic.

In the final analysis, mixture is a distinguishing feature linking a sense of shared history and pastness, "Dominican" ancestry, as well as a sense of "being" and "feeling" Dominican throughout the discourses in the dissertation. Mixture has been translated into the construction and usage of *mestizo/indio/mulato* and is at the center of "Dominican" national identity along the lines of color, mixed-race, religion, and language. I agree with Duany (1998) and Torres-Saillant (1998) when they suggest that Dominicans in the United States negotiate a Black identity based on how they are perceived given the

history of the United States with hypodescent. However, I disagree with Duany when he states that "[r]egardless of the exact demographic composition of the Dominican Republic, the dominant discourse on national identity defines it as White, Hispanic, and Catholic" (1998: 150). In my assessment, the dominant discourse (Mestizaje) espouses a non-White, non-Black, "in-between" identity -- thus, while most Dominicans would not say they are Black, they also would not say they are White either. This is the point of the *liga* -- it represents a combination/mixture and the sense of a "new" people. However, the liga, and articulations of Dominicanness will continue to change as long as people and ideas continue to cross borders and interact with other people and different racial systems -- redefining the system and its categories while being defined by the system and other actors.

Returning to the points I made in chapter two, this research suggests that race and nation are wedded in the co-construction of racial and national identities in the process of defining "nationness," and in this particular case, Dominicanness. To an extent, homogenization takes place to create common history, "like" people and characteristics. At the same time, however, homogenization only encompasses certain "traits," histories, and "types" of people in the formation of peoplehood. As a result, with the increased movement of people across borders, a homogenized "we" forms in relation to a not-yet homogenized "they."

I state that nationness is changing in Latin America and the Caribbean due to global, transnational, and African diasporic forces, as mentioned throughout the dissertation, serving as an impetus for new ideas, new forms of identities, and alliances.

More specifically, the ways in which people are defined and are defining themselves are changing. Thus, defining the nation is an ongoing process depending on who is entering and leaving national borders, prompting (re)definitions, changing categories and new identities. For that reason, the issue then becomes one of interaction between "local" and "global" forces, the movement of people and ideas, as well as interactions between racial systems that have an impact on how people are making sense of who they are along the lines of race and nation with mixture as a "given."

Another point is that *mestizaje* has long been associated with nationness in Latin America and the "Hispanic" Caribbean. Defined as a process of race mixture, it suggests a beginning point of newness. In the dissertation, I illustrated how mestizaje becomes a foundational theme, and a "given" in the Dominican Republic where Dominicanness is defined in terms of newness but also in terms of a long-standing history of mixture. Thus, the Dominican case illustrates a micro-level and place-specific process within a larger process of "race mixing" which defines certain mixtures and identities along the lines of Mulutaje within a larger Africanidad discourse.

I suggest here, by way of an anthropological contribution, another conceptual framework to examine issues of race and race mixture in those places where there are people of African descent, particularly in the Americas. While the concept of *mestizaje* offers a useful way of presenting ideas of mixture among *mestizo* populations, it falls short in the case of the Dominican Republic where the majority of the population is *mulato*. Instead, I suggest the usage of the conceptual framework of Mulutaje (parallel framework to *Mestizaje*), as described in the previous chapter as a discourse, as it more

"accurately" reflects the mixture in the Dominican Republic (African/Black - European/White). Importantly, Mulutaje is rooted in the context of the African diaspora of Africanidad.

Endnotes

[1] I define Dominicanness as the sense of being Dominican.
[2] I use 'socioracial' as a way of talking about different racial categories that emerged within different social contexts. Wade (1997) and the African Diaspora Research Project (ADRP) at Michigan State University also use socioracial categories as a way of describing categories that are based on ideas of biological differences and skin color variation.
[3] The dissertation does not examine the reasons for transnational migration or the social consequences and experiences due to migration.
[4] Dominicanness is tied to ideas of nationness and a sense of national belonging.
[5] It is important to mention here that while I often refer to 'competing' discourses, there is, at times, overlap between them.
[6] I capitalize the discourses throughout the dissertation.
[7] I realize that Santiago may be different in comparison to the rest of the country. While there are some overarching ideas about socioracial categories, in the Southern region, more people may claim a 'Black' identity based on the fact that there are more 'Black' Dominicans in the south (see the census data). Also, immigrants from other Caribbean countries tended to settle in that region (working in the sugar cane fields) and were often assigned to the 'Black' category (see the census data) along with Haitians.
[8] Mestizaje refers to "race mixture" and has been used as a way of conceptualizing such mixture in Latin America and the Caribbean. In its application, however, it is most always used, and closely associated with, the specific 'mixture' of Europeans and Indians. I discuss this at a later point in the dissertation.
[9] Mulutaje refers to the specific mixture of Europeans and Africans (and their descendants). According to my literature review, mulutaje has not been applied in previous research, since in theory, *mestizaje* is supposed to represent all 'types' of race mixture.
[10] Africanidad refers to the acknowledgment and articulation of African ancestry (alone or with other ancestries). In this way, those who choose to define themselves as ***mulato*** and/or *Afro-Dominicano/a* fall within the Mulutaje and Africanidad discourses because each claim African ancestry. Africanidad also implies a conscientization process and organization around African ancestry. I will explore this later as I link Africanidad to the African Diaspora.
[11] Generational presence and/or history, refers to a long-standing generational experience (parents, grandparents, great-grandparents, etc.) in the Dominican Republic and the sense of Dominican roots.
[12] *Indio* literally means "Indian" in Spanish, but its usage is more closely associated with skin color variation and represents a category in-between Black and White.
[13] At times, I will write "race/color" when examining race and color simultaneously or when color functions as race or visa versa.

[14] The idea of mixture is closely associated with Dominicanness and ideas of race in the Dominican Republic. In other words, to be Dominican is to be "mixed." This was a common comment during interviews and focus groups.

[15] I use periods as a way of linking ideas of race, nation, and identities to a particular point in time, and they function as reference points and provide a way a tracing ideas. They are not strict time periods defined by critical moments in history, but they are defined, in a sense by prevalent ideas of the time and the people who are articulating those ideas. The Gente de Color discourse (1900-1930) is a precursor to the Trujillo regime; in order to discuss Trujillo's anti-Haitianism and anti-Black stance, I found it necessary to demonstrate what he was 'changing' and reacting against from an earlier time period. The Hispanidad discourse (1930-1961) is directly linked to the regime of Trujillo. What follows is the Mestizaje discourse (1961-1989); this is the dominant discourse and extends to the present, but I created another time period for the present (1989-present) because of the emergence of Mulutaje and Africanidad marked by the founding of the Black Women's Identity Movement in Santo Domingo in 1989.

[16] This is based on an unpublished paper that Karen Sacks gave at the 1996 AAA meetings.

[17] Even when anthropologists shifted to the idea of cultures (Boas), there were still references to biology and inherited "cultural" characteristics. In this sense, the shift from races to cultures continued to advance ideas of biological difference.

[18] In the April (1997) issue of the *Anthropology Newsletter*, race was raised as a topic of importance on the front page. In an effort to discuss race throughout the discipline, the editor encouraged submissions during the academic year.

[19] Much of the debate surrounded race as a biological construct and the need to move away from the idea of differences based on biology.

[20] The term relational here refers to how people are often labeled in relation each other. In this way, Black and White are relational racial categories involving actors, relationships, social circumstances, and lived experiences.

[21] I capitalize "Black," "Blacks," "White," and "Whites" throughout the dissertation when referring to 1) race and 2) individuals or groups of people who define themselves (or are defined) racially in this way due to sociohistorical circumstances. This suggests that people embody these categories. I do not capitalize "black" and "white" when used in a descriptive way. Whiteness and blackness, as processes, are also not capitalized.

[22] This section is based on my chapter entitled "A Passion for Sameness: Encountering a Black Feminist Self in Fieldwork in the Dominican Republic" and is part of *Black Feminist Anthropology: Theory, Praxis, Politics and Poetics*. Edited by Irma McClaurin. Published by Rutgers University Press, 2001.

[23] See Glenn Hendricks, *The Dominican Diaspora: From the Dominican Republic to New York City-Villagers in Transition* (New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1974), Eugenia Georges *The Making of a Transnational Community: Migration, Development, and Cultural Change in the Dominican Republic* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1990), Sherri Grasmuck and Patricia R. Pessar, *Between Two*

Islands: Dominican International Migration (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991) for more on the history of Dominican migration to the United States, and Jorge Duany *Quisqueya on the Hudson: The Transnational Identity of Dominicans in Washington Heights*, Dominican Research Monographs (New York: The CUNY Dominican Studies Institute).

[24] The idea of a "Dominican Dominican" emerged during interviews as a way of talking about a person who has not emigrated (but may have traveled outside the Dominican Republic and returned). This idea also suggests having ancestral ties in the Dominican Republic that can be traced back over generations.

[25] My husband, David had very similar experiences and was defined in "local" terms and socioracial categories . Like me, he was considered to be Dominican, from "there" (the United States). Our daughter, Asha, was often referred to as "la Dominicanita" (little Dominican girl) followed by references to her apparent "Dominican blood."

[26] I use nation here to refer to the people of a particular place and a sense of community. Later, I introduce the concept of the state (the government) in relation to the nation.

[27] I am using the ideas of race and nation as they are reflected in the discourses surrounding identity in the Dominican Republic as the discourses contain ideas of race and nation. Thus, the dissertation does not focus on race and nation per se but rather how these ideas have been expressed in creating and maintaining Dominicanness over time.

[28] Medina (1997: 760) defines a nationalist project as one that "defines and delimits membership in a nation, links that nation to a particular territory, and organizes and explains the distribution of state resources among its members."

[29] From another vantagepoint, there could be a competing "we" that emerges.

[30] Here the state (and the nation-state) refer to the government and governmental agencies.

[31] While I find Higginbotham's definition of race useful, I would add that it is important to remember that the social categories are peopled and that the power between social categories involve actors as well.

[32] I use social status here to refer to a particular social location or position within the society.

[33] Again, when I use the term social class status, I am referring to a particular social location based on socio-economic factors (e.g. income, education, etc.).

[34] In the larger Black community in the United States, it is common to use color categories as a way of describing someone's skin tone/color. "Light-skinned," "dark-skinned," "high yellow," etc. are used within the community to talk about color. There are some similarities between these categories and the ones used in the Dominican Republic (e.g. claro - light and oscuro - dark). See Russell et. al. 1992 for a discussion of color in the United States among African Americans.

[35] Here, Spanish Creoles refers to the children of Spanish parents born in the Americas.

[36] This section is based on a paper I gave in 1996 at the 95th Annual AAA meetings in San Francisco, CA, entitled "There is No Racial Democracy Here: Exploring Afro-Venezuelan (Re)Emerging 'Community of Consciousness' and Action" (with Dr. Ruth

Simms Hamilton as co-author). This paper is also being prepared for publication for a forthcoming series on the African Diaspora, by the African Diaspora Research Project, at Michigan State University (co-authored with Dr. Ruth Simms Hamilton).

[37] Despite the fact that these categories are no longer state sanctioned, some of them are used socially among actors themselves to describe each other.

[38] In this section, I refer to how countries are imagined in terms of how they are portrayed in the literature.

[39] However, there has been recent work done on Ecuador to explore the experiences and identities of Afro-Ecuadorians (e.g. Whitten and Quiroga 1998).

[40] While it can be said that all of the categories, including *blanco* and *negro*, represent "new" groups of people in the Americas, I am focusing on the "newness" of intermediate categories and ideas of mixture.

[41] This is in reference to the one-drop rule where mulattos became Black in the United States. Before the one-drop rule, mulatto was an intermediate racial category. When mulattos became Black, a bi-polar racial system emerged that we still see today (with the exception of the "multiracial" category).

[42] As I suggested earlier, the racial/color categories took root during the different colonial periods. The categories defined people, work, and access to resources.

[43] When I was in high school, in Gary, Indiana, I was a member of a mayoral task force involving the youth of the city. Mayor Richard Hatcher (at the time) was part of the group that decided to change the group reference name Black to African American. There was discussion of this in newspapers and urban magazines at the time.

[44] The Black Power Movement of the 60's and 70's also had an impact on the region as well as other movements in the Caribbean.

[45] While conducting research, I experienced one of the Dominican Republic's worst natural disasters in nearly twenty years, Hurricane Georges. Toward the end of my fieldwork experience, I became enveloped by the preparation for the hurricane and eventual relief efforts. Having a family in the field amplified this experience in terms of overall preparations and concern. While the entire island was in Georges' path, Santiago was fortunate in that there was little structural damage (except for some of the "marginal" communities living by the river and in dried river beds in the city). Nonetheless, this experience became a focal point for the rest of my research experience until I left the Dominican Republic in November of 1998. The hurricane was an overwhelming preoccupation of many people who were living in its aftermath (e.g. concerns about potable water, electricity, transportation and communication problems, scarcity of staple foods, and rising food costs). Many of my post-Georges encounters dealt with the hurricane and its impact on peoples' lives.

[46] The ideas presented here on gender and gender roles are taken from my master's thesis research I conducted in the Dominican Republic during the summer of 1993. My MA thesis (1994) is entitled "The Cultural Construction of Gender and Female Identity in the Dominican Republic," from Iowa State University, Department of Anthropology.

[47] The Dominican Republic is experiencing tremendous growth in terms construction projects (apartments, homes, and strip malls). These projects, while they create more jobs, also contribute to the widening gap between socioeconomic classes in terms of being able to afford housing and purchase items from these new stores.

[48] I use *mestizo*/mulato to suggest that while the majority of Dominicans were defined as *mestizo*, I chose to describe them as mulato within the context of this historical period. The combination here represents their category along with my own. I will later link the category *mestizo* to mestizaje and the ways in which both of these prove to be problematic in the Dominican case.

[49] See Nelson (1988), Harry Hoetink (1982), and Moya Pons (1995) for an in-depth account and analysis of the Spanish-descended Creole emigration from the Dominican Republic.

[50] This particular advertisement was for a hair product on May 20, 1918 (running on numerous days) in *El Diario* (The Daily) in Santiago.

[51] "*El Diario*" is followed by "Santiago de los Caballeros, República Dominicana, W.I." (taken from the masthead in 1918).

[52] This census predates the first national census in 1920. See Hoetink (1982) for more of a historical description of transnational migration during this time period.

[53] See Moya Pons (1995) for an in-depth account of the occupation.

[54] See Hoetink (1982), Knight (1978), Rout (1976), and Williams (1970) for a more thorough discussion of migration throughout the Caribbean.

[55] From reading declassified documents, it is evident that the United States maintained a relationship with Trujillo (after the U.S. military occupation ended and into Trujillo's presidency).

[56] Many participants expressed these views of Haitians and the 'racist' treatment that Haitians received in Santiago.

[57] Hispanidad is the foundation of the dominant contemporary discourse surrounding Dominicanness today, Mestizaje.

[58] The idea that Haitians were, and are, closely associated with Africa, African practices, and blackness was prevalent throughout the interviews.

[59] This was from a letter dated December 17, 1937, in The Department of State Press Releases, Saturday, December 25, 1937, Vol. XVII: No. 430, Publication No. 1106, page 494.

[60] This was from a letter dated December 20, 1937 in The Department of State Press Releases, Saturday, December 25, 1937, Vol. XVII: No. 430, Publication No. 1106, page 495.

[61] These translations, as well as all of the others in the dissertation, are mine.

[62] Some participants with French surnames in Santiago claim 'French' ancestry. The unification of the island from 1822-44 brought together many peoples (French and Spanish Creoles, Black and mulatto Haitians and Dominicans, former slaves from Haiti and newly emancipated slaves from the Dominican Republic due to the unification of the island).

[63] This is taken from La República Dominicana (The Dominican Republic), Propaganda Pro-Turismo (Propaganda in Be Half [sic] of Tourism)1932 (Habana [sic] Cuba) Empresa Editorial Cubana, Inmigration [sic] and Touring Section (in Spanish and English) Archivo Histórico de Santiago.

[64] Source: *La Vida Cotidiana Dominicana: a través del Archivo Particular del Generalísimo*. Bernardo Vega 1986: 139. Santo Domingo: Fundación Cultural Dominicana. Archivo Histórico de Santiago

[65] Source: *La Vida Cotidiana Dominicana: a través del Archivo Particular del Generalísimo*. Bernardo Vega 1986:143-4. Santo Domingo: Fundación Cultural Dominicana. Archivo Histórico de Santiago

[66] Source: *La Vida Cotidiana Dominicana: a través del Archivo Particular del Generalísimo*. Bernardo Vega 1986:145 Santo Domingo: Fundación Cultural Dominicana Archivo Histórico de Santiago.

[67] These assertions are based on participants' responses during the interviews I conducted.

[68] Source: Luz Almánzar de Escovar, Estudios Sociales, 3 grado, Texto Básico, Editora Centenario, S.A. Santo Domingo. page 3.

[69] The Caribs were described as "cannibals," and the Arawaks (e.g. Tainos) were defined as "gentle." The "Caribbean" was named in reference to the Caribs.

[70] These examples are based on preliminary research.

[71] A colleague in Santiago Domingo, Maria Filomena González, and her husband received permission from the Department of Education to write a history text book for public schools (with a new emphasis on the African presence).

[72] The Archivo Histórico de Santiago had the 1976 volume, and I compared these definitions with those in the 1997 volume from the library at PUCMM.

[73] Source: Enciclopedia Dominicana, 1976 Publicaciones Reunidas, S.A.: Barcelona. vol 4, page 240.

[74] Source: Enciclopedia Dominicana, 1976 Publicaciones Reunidas, S.A.: Barcelona. vol 5., page 72.

[75] Source: Enciclopedia Dominicana, 1976 Publicaciones Reunidas, S.A.: Barcelona. vol 5, page 90.

[76] The cédula can be issued at age 16 (with no voting rights until the person reaches 18). This particular cédula was valid until 2004.

[77] The afternoon lunch and siesta follows a Spanish tradition, although this is changing slightly since more people have to work (as grocery stores and specialty shops typically remain open during the lunch period).

[78] Nelsa helped us around the house on occasion.

[79] I use the United States as the place where *indio* is contested and reconsidered. In actuality, it happens throughout the Americas as well as Europe.

[80] Bleaching creams have been used by women in Africa and in the African diaspora as a way of 'lightening' the skin. Such creams were advertised in Dominican newspapers in 1918 and beyond. This was a practice in the Dominican Republic and in the United

States. "Marrying up" refers to the practice of marrying someone with lighter skin in an attempt to have lighter-skinned children. Again, this was/is a practice in the Dominican Republic, among some people, as well as in the United States in the larger Black community. In the United States, one discourse surrounds racial prejudice and the hope that children with lighter skin won't have to contend with as much racism. Another discourse involves internalized racism and the belief that 'lighter' is better. See Russell et. al. 1992 for a more thorough discussion.

[81] Perusing popular magazines targeting the African American community, I have seen the wife of former NAACP Chairman Ben Chavis (who is Dominican American) being referred to as "Afro-Dominican." Also, *Black Issues in Higher Education* had an article on Dominican 'Deltas' (Delta Sigma Theta (DST) Sorority, Inc.). DST is an historically African American women's public service sorority.

[82] Source: Cimarrona, Octubre 1998, Año 2, No. 7, p. 1.

[83] When the group formed in 1989, they were known as *El Movimiento por la Identidad de la Mujer Negra* (The Black Women's Identity Movement). I later talk about the division in the organization around issues of color and a subsequent reorganization to include all women of African descent in the Dominican Republic.

[84] This section is based on two papers I gave at professional meetings: 1) "Becoming Afro-Dominicanas: (Re)Negotiating *Indio* in the Company of Sistahs." Paper presented at the 94th Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association. Washington, D.C., 1995; and "Las Mujeres Negras: A Grassroots Approach to Collective Identity in the Dominican Republic." Paper presented at the 118th Annual Meeting of the American Ethnological Society. San Juan, Puerto Rico, 1996.

[85] Again, this section is based on the 1995 AAA paper cited above as well as my chapter "A Passion for Sameness: Encountering a Black Feminist Self in Fieldwork in the Dominican Republic" mentioned above.

[86] I offered to be an ally and to help them tell their story, to facilitate the visibility of *Identidad* in the Dominican Republic and in the United States, and to assist them in ways that would contribute to their growth and sustainability as an organization (e.g. identifying funding sources, participating in workshops, donating magazines that deal with African American women's issues, etc.).

[87] Nica, the previous director, had moved to the United States.

[88] I translated these objectives, from some of Identidad's earlier publications for the AAA and AES papers cited above.

[89] Here again is another similarity between Dominicans and African Americans.

[90] This is my translation from an interview with Carmen.

[91] In Casa por la Identidad de las Mujeres Afro "Memorias del Taller Sobre Estrategias y Metodologias para Combatir el Racismo" ("Memories of a Presentation about Strategies and Methodologies to Combat Racism") Santo Domingo, 1998.

[92] This quote by Galvan, is from the paper she presented at the meeting in Costa Rica. Some of the papers have been published in the edited volume, *Connecting Across*

Cultures and Continents: Black Women Speak Out on Identity, Race and Development, Achola O. Pala, editor, 1995, published by Women, Ink. for UNIFEM.

[93] CIPAF is Centro de Investigación Para la Acción Femenina (Research Center for Feminine Action) is an NGO and self-defined feminist organization based in the capital, Santo Domingo.

[94] I plan to explore these issues in the future. The performance was disturbing on a personal level, and it wasn't until I processed it that I began to wonder about its significance and relevance in the Dominican Republic.

APPENDIX A

Formal Interview Schedule

Santiago de los Caballeros (Santiago), República Dominicana
Investigación Doctorado 1998

ID#_____
Género_____

Hola. Buenos/as dias/tardes. Me llamo Kimberly Simmons, y soy una estudiante de nivel doctorado en antropología cultural, en la universidad del estado de Michigan, en los Estados Unidos. Estoy haciendo una investigación sobre identidades culturales (colores, raciales, nacionales), género, y migración hacia los Estados Unidos. Me gustaria hacer una intrevista con Ud sobre esta tema. Su cooperación es completamente voluntaria, y si Ud. decide participar, puede sentir segura de que las respuestas que me da serán completamente confidencial. Muchas gracias por su asistancia. Su participación es importante para el éxito de este investigacíon. Lo aprecio mucho. Puede hacer preguntas de mi cuando quiera.

Información General

1. ¿Cúando nacio Ud? _____
2. ¿Dónde nacio Ud? _____
3. ¿Cuál es su estado civil? _____
4. ¿Cuál fue el último grado de escolar que Ud. completó?_____

5. ¿Tiene hijos/hijas? ____ sí ____ no
   b. ¿Cúantos? _____
   c. ¿Cúantos viven con Ud? _____
   d. ¿Cúantas personas viven en su casa? _____

6. ¿Tiene trabajo a fuera de la casa? ____ sí ____ no ____ a veces
   b. ¿Qúe tipo de trabajo hace? _____
   c. ¿ Cúantos horarios trabaja Ud. durante el dia? _____
   d. ¿ Cúanto gana? _____ mensual

7. ¿Ha viajado a los Estados Unidos? ____ sí ____ no
   b. ¿Dónde? _____
   c. Cúal fuel el razon por su viaje? ____ visitar familia ____ vacaciones
      ____ buscar trabajo ____ colegio/universidad ____ otro _____

d. Era la primera vez? ____ sí ____ no
e. Incluyendo este viaje, ¿cúanto tiempo ha viajado a los Estados Unidos? _____

8. ¿Ha vivido en los Estados Unidos? ____ sí ____ no ¿Cúanto tiempo? _____

9. ¿Tiene familia en los Estados Unidos? ____ sí ____ no
b. ¿Quién? _____
c. ¿Dónde viven en los Estados Unidos? _____
d. ¿Cúanto tiempo han vivido en los Estados Unidos? _____
e. ¿Cúantas veces le han visitado aquí? _____

Identidad Cultural: Color, Raza, y Nación

10. ¿Cúantas clasificaciones de colores hay aquí en la República Dominicana? _____
¿Cómo son? _____

11. ¿Cúal es más importante en términos de identidad cultural (en su vida)?
____ identidad de color ____ identidad de nación ____ identidad de raza
____ otro _____ ¿Por qúe?_____

12. ¿Existe el concepto de en:
a. la República Dominicana? ____ sí ____ no ____ no sé
b. los Estados Unidos? ____ sí ____ no ____ no sé

13. ¿Significa raza:
a. el color de la piel? ____ sí ____ no ____ no sé
b. la nacionalidad? ____ sí ____ no ____ no sé

14. ¿Hay grupos distinctos (como blancos, negros, indios, etc.) en:
a. la República Dominicana ? ____ sí ____ no ____ no sé
b. los Estados Unidos? ____ sí ____ no ____ no sé

15. ¿Existe racismo:
a. en la República Dominicana? ____ sí ____ no ____ no sé
b. en los Estados Unidos? ____ sí ____ no ____ no sé
c. ¿Ha experimentado racismo? ____ sí ____ no ____ no sé ¿Cómo?

16. ¿Ha oido la palabra indio? ____ sí ____ no
b. ¿Qúe significa? _____

c. ¿Cúantas clasificaciones hay? _____

d. ¿Es cada dominicano/a indio/a? ____ sí ____ no ___ no sé
e. ¿Son los/las dominicanos/as en los EE UU indios? ____ sí ____ no ___ no sé

17. ¿Significa indio/a:
a. dominicano/a? ____ sí ____ no ____ no sé
b. el color de la piel? ____ sí ____ no ____ no sé
c. indígena? ____ sí ____ no ____ no sé
d. la raza? ____ sí ____ no ____ no sé

18. ¿Es posible ser:
a. haitiano/a y dominicano/a? ____ sí ____ no ____ no sé
b. chino/a y dominicano/a? ____ sí ____ no ____ no sé
c. judio/a y dominicano/a? ____ sí ____ no ____ no sé
d. americano/a y dominicano/a? ____ sí ____ no ____ no sé
e. negro/a y dominicano/a? ____ sí ____ no ____ no sé

19. En términos de sus orígenes, Ud. diria que su familia proviene de:
Europeos ____ sí ____ no ____ no sé
Africanos ____ sí ____ no ____ no sé
Indígenas ____ sí ____ no ____ no sé
Otro _____

20. ¿Cómo describe:
a. los/as haitianos/as?
b. los/las Dominicanos/as que viven en los Estados Unidos?

21. ¿Cómo se define a si mismo/ma? _____
a. ¿Cómo se define en la cédula? _____

22. ¿Cómo me define? _____
b. ¿Cómo piensa que me definiria en la cédula? _____

Gracias por su tiempo y cooperación. Lo aprecio mucho.

Comentas/Preguntas

APPENDIX A

Interview Schedule
(Translation from Spanish)

Santiago de los Caballeros (Santiago), Dominican Republic
Dissertation Research, 1998

ID#_____
Gender _____

Consent

Hello. Good morning/afternoon. My name is Kimberly Simmons, and I am a doctoral candidate in cultural anthropology at Michigan State University, in the United States. My research explores the construction of cultural identities (e.g. color, racial, national), gender, and international migration to the United States. I would like to have an interview with respect to this topic. Your cooperation is completely voluntary, and if you decide to participate, you can be assured that the responses that you give me will be completely confidential. Thank you very much for your assistance. Your participation is important for the success of this research. I really appreciate it. Feel free to ask me any questions at any time.

General Information

1. When were you born? _____
2. Where were you born? _____
3. What is your marital status? _____
4. What is the last grade level you completed? _____

5. Do you have any children? ____ yes ____ no
   b. How many? _____
   c. How many live with you? _____
   d. How many people live with you? _____

6. Do you work outside the home? ____ yes ____ no ____ sometimes
   b. What kind of work do you do? _____
   c. How many hours per day do you work? _____
   d. How much do you earn? _____ monthly

7. Have you traveled to the United States? ____ yes ____ no
   b. Where? _____
   c. What was the reason for your trip? ____ visit family ____ vacation
      ____ look for work ____ college/university ____ other _____
   d. Was it the first time? ____ yes ____ no
   e. Including this trip, how many times have you traveled to the United States? __

8. Have you lived in the United States? ____ yes ____ no How long? _____

9. Do you have family in the United States? ____ yes ____ no
   b. Who? _____
   c. Where do they live in the United States? _____
   d. How long have they lived there? _____
   e. How many times have they visited you? _____

Cultural Identity: Color, Race, and Nation

10. ¿How many color classifications are there in the Dominican Republic? _____
    What are they? _____

11. What is most important in terms of cultural identity (in your life)?
    ____ color identity ____ national identity ____ racial identity
    ____ other _____ Why?_____

12. Does the concept of race exist in:
    a. the Dominican Republic? ____ yes ____ no ____ don't know
    b. the United States? ____ yes ____ no ____ don't know

13. Does race mean:
    a. skin color? ____ yes ____ no ____ don't know
    b. nationality? ____ yes ____ no ____ don't know

14. Are there distinct groups (e.g. Whites, Blacks, Indians, etc.) in:
    a. the Dominican Republic ? ___ yes ____ no ____ don't know
    b. the United States? ____ yes ____ no ____ don't know

15. Does Racism exist in:
    a. the Dominican Republic? ____ yes ____ no ____ don't know
    b. the United States? ____ yes ____ no ____ don't know

c. Have you experienced racism? ____ yes ____ no ____ don't know
How?

16. Have you heard of 'indio/a'? ____ yes ____ no
b. What does it mean? _____
c. How many classifications are there? _____
d. Is every Dominican 'indio/a'? ____ yes ____ no ____ don't know
e. Are Dominicans in the United States 'indio/a'? ____ yes ____ no
____ don't know

17. Does 'indio/a' mean:

a. Dominican?	____ yes	____ no	____ don't know
b. skin color?	____ yes	____ no	____ don't know
c. indigenous?	____ yes	____ no	____ don't know
d. race?	____ yes	____ no	____ don't know

18. Is it possible to be:

a. Haitian and Dominican?	____ yes	____ no	____ don't know
b. Chinese and Dominican?	____ yes	____ no	____ don't know
c. Jewish and Dominican?	____ yes	____ no	____ don't know
d. American and Dominican?	____ yes	____ no	____ don't know
e. Black and Dominican?	____ yes	____ no	____ don't know

19. In terms of ancestry, would you say that your ancestors were:

European	____ yes	____ no	____ don't know
African	____ yes	____ no	____ don't know
Indigenous	____ yes	____ no	____ don't know
Other	_____		

20. How do you describe:
a. Haitians? _____
b. Dominicans living in the United States? _____

21. How do you define yourself? _____
a. How do you define yourself on the cédula? _____

22. How would you define me? _____
b. How would I be defined on the cédula? _____

Thank you for your time and cooperation. I really appreciate it.

Comments/ Questions

APPENDIX B

INFORMAL INTERVIEW SCHEDULE
(Translation from Spanish)

Date _____
Gender _____

Consent

Hello. Good morning/afternoon. My name is Kimberly Simmons, and I am a doctoral candidate in cultural anthropology at Michigan State University, in the United States. My research explores the construction of cultural identities (e.g. color, racial, national), gender, and international migration to the United States. I would like to have an interview with respect to this topic. Your cooperation is completely voluntary, and if you decide to participate, you can be assured that the responses that you give me will be completely confidential. Thank you very much for your assistance. Your participation is important for the success of this research. I really appreciate it. Feel free to ask me any questions at any time.

Questions about Racial, Color and National Identities

1. For you, what is most important between national, racial, and color identities?

2. Is there a difference between national, racial, and color identities? Explain.

3. For you, what does it mean to be Dominican?

4. When you think of your cultural identity,
    a. What is your nationality?

b. What is your color?

c. What is your race?

5. If you were in the United States, do you think that some of these identities would change? Why?

6. In terms of ancestry, would you say that your ancestors were:

European	____ yes	____ no	____ don't know
African	____ yes	____ no	____ don't know
Indigenous	____ yes	____ no	____ don't know
Other	_____		

Discussion of These Issues
Comments/Questions

LIST OF REFERENCES

Albert Batista, Celsa

1993 *Mujer y Esclavitud en Santo Domingo (Woman and Slavery in Santo Domingo).* Santo Domingo: Editora BUHO.

Anderson, Benedict

1991 *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism.* New York: Verso.

Andújar Persinal, Carlos

1997 *La Presencia Negra en Santo Domingo.* Santo Domingo: Impresora Búho.

Appadurai, Arjun

1991 "Global Ethnoscapes: Notes and Queries for a Transnational Anthropology" in Richard Fox (editor) *Recapturing Anthropology.* Pp. 191-210. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press.

1990 "Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy" in *Public Culture.* 2(2): 1-24.

Austerlitz, Paul

1997 *Merengue: Dominican Music and Dominican Identity.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Baker, Lee D.

1998 *From Savage to Negro: Anthropology and the Construction of Race 1896-1954.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Baker, Lee and Thomas Patterson

1994 "Race, Racism and the History of U.S. Anthropology" in *Transforming Anthropology,* 5(1,2).

Balibar, Etienne and Immanuel Wallerstein

1991 *Race, Nation, Class: Ambiguous Identities.* New York: Verso.

Basch, Linda, Nina Glick Schiller and Christina Szanton Blanc

1994 *Nations Unbound: Transnational Projects, Postcolonial Predicaments and Deterritorialized Nation-States.* Amsterdam: Gordon and Breach Publishers.

Blakey, Michael L.

1994 "Passing the Buck: Naturalism and Individualism as Anthropological Expressions of Euro-American Denial" in Steven Gregory and Roger Sanjek (editors) *Race.* New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, pages 270-284.

1987 "Skull Doctors: Intrinsic Social and Political Bias in the History of American Physical Anthropology; with Special reference to the work of Ales Hrdlicka" in *Critique of Anthropology.* 7(2): 7-35.

Bueno, Lourdes

1995 "Experiencias de migración de retorno de mujeres dominicanas: historias de vida de cinco mujeres" ("Return Migration Experiences of Dominican Women: Life Histories of Five Women") in *Género y Sociedad (Gender and Society)*, 2(3), January-April, 1995. Santo Domingo: Editora Buho.

Davis, F. James

1991 *Who is Black? One Nation's Definition.* University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press.

Degler, Carl N. (cited in Safa 1998)

1971 *Neither Black nor White: Slavery and Race Relations in Brazil and the United States.* New York: Macmillan.

Domínguez, Virginia R.

1994 *White by Definition: Social Classification in Creole Louisiana.* New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Duany, Jorge

1998 "Reconstructing Racial Identity: Ethnicity, Color, and Class among Dominicans in the United States and Puerto Rico" in *Latin American Perspectives,* issue 100, vol. 25 No. 3, May 1998 pp. 147-172.

1996 "Imagining the Puerto Rican Nation: Recent Works on Cultural Identity" in *Latin American Research Review.* 31 (3): 248-267.

1994 *Quisqueya on the Hudson: The Transnational Identity of Dominicans in Washington Heights.* Dominican Research Monographs, The CUNY Dominican Studies Institute.

1985 Ethnicity in the Spanish Caribbean: Notes on the Consolidation of Creole Identity in Cuba and Puerto Rico, 1762-1868. Ethnic Groups 6:99-123.

Eichen, Josef David
1995 *Sosúa: From Refuge to Paradise* (translation by J. Armando Bermúdez) Santo Domingo: Amigo del Hogar

Eriksen, Thomas Hylland
1993 *Ethnicity and Nationalism: Anthropological Perspectives.* London: Pluto Press.

Foster, Robert J.
1991 "Making National Cultures in the Global Ecumene" in *Annual Review of Anthropology.* 20:235-60.

Foucault, Michel
1979 *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* New York: Vintage Books.

Franco Pichardo, Franklin J.
1997 *Sobre Racismo y Antihaitianismo (y otros ensayos).* Santo Domingo: Impresora Vidal.

1989 *Los Negros, Los Mulatos y la Nación Dominicana (Blacks, Mulattos and the Dominican Nation--eighth edition).* Santo Domingo: Editora Nacional.

Frankenberg, Ruth
1993 *The Social Construction of Whiteness: White Women, Race Matters.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Georges, Eugenia
1990 *The Making of a Transnational Community: Migration, Development, and Cultural Change in the Dominican Republic.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Gilroy, Paul
1993 *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Gold, Steven J.
1996 *Transnationalism and Vocabularies of Motive in International Migration: The Case of Israelis in the United States.* East Lansing: Population Research Group.

Grasmuck, Sherri and Patricia R. Pessar

1996 "Dominicans in the United States: First- and Second- Generation Settlement, 1960:1990" in Silvia Pedraza and Rubén G. Rumbaut (editors) *Origins and Destinies: Immigration, Race, and Ethnicity in America.* Pp. 280-292. Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

1991 *Between Two Islands: Dominican International Migration.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Gregory, Steven

1994 "We've Been Down This Road Already" in Steven Gregory and Roger Sanjek (editors) *Race.* Pp. 18-38. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Hamilton, Ruth Simms

1990 *Creating A Paradigm and Research Agenda For Comparative Studies of the Worldwide Dispersion of African Peoples.* Monograph No. 1. African Diaspora Research Project, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI.

Harris, Marvin

1964 *Patterns of Race in the Americas.* New York: Walker and Company.

Harrison, Faye V.

1995 "The Persistent Power of "Race" in the Cultural and Political Economy of Racism" in *Annual Review of Anthropology.* 24: 47-74.

Hendricks, Glenn

1974 *The Dominican Diaspora: From the Dominican Republic to New York City -- Villagers in Transition.* New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.

Higginbotham, Elizabeth

1992 "African-American Women's History and the Metalanguage of Race," in *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society,* 17(2): 253-4.

Hoetink, Harry

1985 "'Race' and Color in the Caribbean" in Sidney W. Mintz and Sally Price (editors) *Caribbean Contours.* Pp. 55-84. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

1982 *The Dominican People 1850-1900: Notes for a Historical Sociology.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

1970 "The Dominican Republic in the Nineteenth Century: Some Notes on Stratification, Immigration, and Race" in Magnus Mörner (editor) *Race and Class in Latin America.* Pp. 96-121. New York: Columbia University Press.

1967 *Caribbean Race Relations: A Study of Two Variants.* London: Oxford University Press.

Houk, James

1993 "The Terminological Shift from "Afro-American" to "African-American": Is the Field of Afro-American Anthropology Being Redefined?" in *Human Organization* 2 (3):325-328.

Identidad (Casa por la Identidad de la Mujer Afro)

1997 *Memoria del Foro: Por una Sociedad Libre de Prejuicio Racial.* Santo Domingo: Editora Búho.

Jackson, Peter and Jan Penrose (editors)

1993 *Constructions of Race, Place and Nation.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Judd, Karen (cited in Medina)

1992 'Elite reproduction and ethnic identity in Belize', PHD dissertatin, City University of New York.

Kahn, Hilary E.

2001 "Respecting Relationships and *Día de Guadalupe*: Q'eqchi' Mayan Identities in Livingston, Guatemala" in *The Journal of Latin American Anthropology.* 6(1):2-29.

Kasinitz, Philip

1992 *Caribbean New York: Black Immigrants and the Politics of Race.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Kearney, Michael

1995 "The Local and the Global: The Anthropology of Globalization and Transnationalism" in *Annual Review of Anthropology.* 24: 547-65.

Knight, Franklin W.

1978 *The Caribbean: The Genesis of a Fragmented Nationalism.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Lee, Sharon M.
1993 "Racial classifications in the US census: 1890-1990" in Ethnic and Racial Studies vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 75-94.

Long, Norman
1996 "Globalization and Localization: New Challenges to Rural Research" in Henrietta L. Moore (editor) *The Future of Anthropological Knowledge.* pp. 37-59. New York: Routledge.

Manuel Madruga, José
1986 *Azucar y Haitianos en la Republica Dominicana.* Santo Domingo: Editora Amigo del Hogar.

Martínez-Echazábal, Lourdes
1998 "*Mestizaje* and the Discourse of National/Cultural Identity in Latin America, 1845-1959" in *Latin American Perspectives,* issue 100, vol. 25 No. 3, May 1998 pp. 21-42.

Martinez, Samuel
1999 "From hidden hand to heavy hand: Sugar, the state, and migrant labor in Haiti and the Dominican Repubic in *Latin American Research Review.* 34 (1): 57-84.

Martinez-Alier, Verena
1989 *Marriage, Class and Colour in Nineteenth-Century Cuba: A Study of RacialAttitudes and Sexual Values in a Slave Society.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Mateo, Andrés L.
1996 *Al Filo de la Dominicanidad.* Santo Domingo: Libreria La Trinitaria.

McClaurin, Irma
1996 *Women of Belize: Gender and Change in Central America.* New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

McKee, James B.
1993 *Sociology and the Race Problem: The Failure of a Perspective.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Medina, Laurie Kroshus
1997 "Defining Difference, Forging Unity: The Co-Construction of Race, Ethnicity and Nation in Belize" in *Ethnic and Racial Studies.* 20(4):757-780.

Minority Rights Group (edited volume)
1995 *No Longer Invisible: Afro-Latin Americans Today.* London: Minority Rights Publications.

Mintz, Sidney W.
1974 *Caribbean Transformations.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

1971 Groups, Group Boundaries and the Perception of Race. Comparative Studies in Society and History 13:437-43.

Mintz, Sidney and Richard Price
1976 *The Birth of African-American Culture: An Anthropological Perspective.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Mörner, Magnus
1967 *Race Mixture in the History of Latin America.* Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

Moya Pons, Frank
1995 *The Dominican Republic: A National History.* New Rochelle: Hispaniola Books.

1979 *Historia Dominicana Para Niños Cuarto Curso.* Barcelona.

Nelson, William Javier
1988 "Dominican Creole Emigration: 1791-1861" in *Centro de Investigaciones del Caribe y América Latina (Caribbean Institute and Study Center for Latin America--CISCLA)* Working Paper Series, paper #32. San Germán: Inter-American University of Puerto Rico.

Oboler, Suzanne
1995 *Ethnic Labels, Latino Lives: Identity and the Politics of (Re)Presentation in the United States.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Omi, Michael and Howard Winant
1994 *Racial Formation in the United States.* New York: Routledge.

Onè Respe
1995 *El Otro del Nosotros.* Santo Domingo: Editora Búho.

Ong, Aihwa
1996 "Cultural Citizenship as Subject-Making: Immigrants Negotiate Racial and Cultural Boundaries in the United States" in *Current Anthropology* 37 (5): 737-762.

Pala, Achola O. (editor)
1995 *Connecting Across Cultures and Continents: Black Women Speak Out on Identity, Race and Development.* New York: UNIFEM.

Portes, Alejandro and Rubén G. Rumbaut
1990 *Immigrant America: A Portrait.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

1990 "Introduction: Who They Are and Why They Come" in *Immigrant America: A Portrait.* Pp. 1-27. Berkeley: University of California Press.

1990 "From Immigrants to Ethnics: Identity, Citizenship, and Political Participation" in *Immigrant America: A Portrait.* Pp. 94-142. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Rodríguez, Clara E.
1994 "Challenging Racial Hegemony: Puerto Ricans in the United States" in Steven Gregory and Roger Sanjek (editors) *Race.* Pp. 131-145. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Rout, Leslie B. Jr.
1976 *The African Experience in Spanish America, 1502 to the Present Day.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Russell, Kathy, Midge Wilson and Ronald Hall
1992 The Color Complex: The Politics of Skin Color Among African Americans. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Safa, Helen I.
1998 "Introduction" in *Latin American Perspectives.* Issue 100 vol 25 no 3. May, 1998 pp. 3-20.

1995 *The Myth of the Male Breadwinner: Women and Industrialization in the Caribbean.* Boulder: Westview Press.

Simmel, Georg
1950 "The Stranger" in Kurt H, Wolff (editor) *The Sociology of Georg Simmel.* Glencoe: The Free Press.

Smedley, Audrey
1993 *Race in North America: Origin and Evolution of a Worldview.* Boulder: Westview Press.

Smith, Carol A.
1997 "The Symbolics of Blood: Mestizaje in the Americas" in *Identities* vol 3 (May '97), pp. 495-521.

Steward, Julian
1965 *The People of Puerto Rico.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Tejeda Ortiz, Dagoberto
1998 *Cultura Popular e Identidad Nacional.* Santo Domingo: Mediabyte, S.A.

Torres, Arlene
1998 La Gran Familia Puertoriqueña "Ej Prieta de Beldá" (The Great Puerto Rican Family is Really Really Black) in Normal E. Whitten, Jr. and Arlene Torres (editors) *Blackness in Latin America and the Caribbean.* Bloomingon: Indiana University Press. Volume II, pp. 285-306.

Torres-Saillant, Silvio
1998 "The Tribulations of Blackness: Stages in Dominican Racial Identity" in *Latin American Perspectives,* issue 100, vol. 25 No. 3, May 1998 pp. 126-146.

1995 "The Dominican Republic" in No Longer Invisible: Afro-Latin Americans Today. London: Minority Rights Publications. Pp. 109-138. Edited by Minority Rights Group.

Torres-Saillant, Silvio and Ramona Hernández
1998 *The Dominican Americans.* Westport: Greenwood Press.

Trouillot, Michel-Rolph
1992 "The Caribbean Region: An Open Frontier in Anthropological Theory" in *Annual Review of Anthropology.* 21:19-42.

Vega, Bernardo
1986 *La Vida Cotidiana Dominicana: a través del Archivo Particular del Generalísimo.* Santo Domingo: Fundación Cultural Dominicana.

Vega, Bernardo, Carlos Dobal, Carlos Esteban Deive, Rubén Silié, José del Castillo, and Frank Moya Pons
1997 *Ensayos sobre Cultura Dominicana.* Santo Domingo: Amigo del Hogar.

Wade, Peter
1997 *Race and Ethnicity in Latin America.* London: Pluto Press.

1993 *Blackness and Race Mixture: The Dynamics of Racial Identity in Colombia.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Wallerstein, Immanuel
1991 "The Construction of Peoplehood: Racism, Nationalism, Ethicity" in Etienne Balibar and Immanuel Wallerstein *Race, Nation, Class: Ambiguous Identities.* London: Verso. 71-85.

Watkins-Owen, Irma
1996 *Blood Relations: Caribbean Immigrants and the Harlem Community, 1900-1930.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Whitten, Norman and John Szwed (editors)
1970 *Afro-American Anthropology: Contemporary Perspectives.* New York: Free Press.

Whitten, Norman E. Jr. and Diego Quiroga
1998 "To Rescue National Dignity": Blackness as a Quality of Nationalist Creativity in Ecuador in Normal E. Whitten, Jr. and Arlene Torres (editors) *Blackness in Latin America and the Caribbean.* Bloomingon: Indiana University Press. Volume I, pp. 75-99.

Williams, Brackette F.
1989 "A Class Act: Anthropology and the Race to Nation Across Ethnic Terrain" in *Annual Review of Anthropology.* 18:401-44.

Williams, Eric
1970 *From Columbus to Castro: The History of the Caribbean 1492-1969.* New York: Harper & Row Publishers.

Williamson, Joel
1980 *New People: Miscegenation and Mulattoes in the United States.* New York: The Free Press.

Winant, Howard
2000 "Race and Race Theory" in *Annual Review of Sociology.* 26:169-85.

Winn, Peter
1992 "A Question of Color" in *Americas: The Changing Face of Latin America and the Caribbean.* Pp. 277-306. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Wright, Winthrop R.
1990 *Café con Leche: Race, Class and National Image in Venezuela.* Austin: The University of Texas Press.

Záiter Mejía, Alba Josefina
1996 *La Identidad Social y National en Dominicana: Un Análisis Psico-Social.* Santo Domingo: Editora Taller.