

and respected our particular forms of English but helped us to render it accessible to English-speaking readers.

Our appreciation goes to George Yúdice, Juan Flores, and Jean Franco, who generously shared with us many insightful comments, particularly about the book's introduction, and also contributed financially to the translation of Raquel Rivera's essay "Rapping Two Versions of the Same Requiem" from the Spanish original. Our deep thanks to Marianne Negrón, who gracefully translated hip-hop from Spanish to English and back.

There are hardly any words to express our thanks to Lisa Freeman, director at the University of Minnesota Press. Her support, patience, critical insight, and invaluable advice transformed a potentially exhausting experience into an enjoyable process. Finally, we thank the book's collaborators for their patience, solidarity, and common interest in stimulating debate about Puerto Rico and Puerto Ricans.

INTRODUCTION

Beyond Nationalist and Colonialist Discourses: The *Jaiba* Politics of the Puerto Rican Ethno-Nation

Ramón Grosfoguel, Frances Negrón-Muntaner, and Chloé S. Georas

Ultimately, the native intellectual's life depends upon his ability to imitate the other perfectly, without a trace of parody; it depends, in short, upon his ability to mime without the perception of mimicry.

Diana Fuss, "Interior Colonies"

Americanicémonos, para no ser americanos.

Fernando Ortiz, *Orbita de Fernando Ortiz*

Intellectual Nomads

Like all anthologies, this collection of essays emerges within a specific set of personal and social contexts. The immediate context is the encounter of three island Puerto Rican graduate students during the late 1980s in Philadelphia, who shared a sense of intellectual and political isolation from both mainstream and "left" Puerto Rican cultural/political practices in the United States and the island.

Superficially we were undergoing what many middle-class intellectuals from the island already saw as routine—going up to *el norte* to buy a prestigious (or not so prestigious degree) *en inglés* and returning home to an always already present space in academia. But we knew that for different and complex reasons for each of us, we were not going back "home."¹ In fact, as Alberto Sandoval Sánchez points out in his essay "Puerto Rican Identity Up in the Air: Air Migration, Its Cultural Representations, and Me 'Cruzando el Charco,'" home, from now on, was going to be right here. Or, more accurately, here and there.

The motivation to produce this book stems from both an intellectual crisis of political orphanhood and a crisis for us as "national" intellectu-

als turned “ethnics” in the United States. We soon realized that this supposed “demotion”—so feared by many Puerto Rican intellectuals—was in fact one of the many effects of posing Puerto Rico’s political struggles as a colonial/national dichotomy, a framing that only allows political agency in terms of the consolidation of a nation-state (that is, national “liberation”). It seemed evident that the apparent transparency of signification of the nationalist/colonialist dichotomy had to be reexamined in order to map more effective strategies of political participation.

A useful starting point in articulating the inadequacy of the binary suggested here is José Quiroga’s essay “Narrating the Tropical Pharmacy.” In this text, Quiroga suggests that part of this conceptual *tranque* (dead end) within Puerto Rican historiography relates to a discursive tendency to construct colonialism as “illness” and nationalism as its “cure.” Within this logic, the illness and the cure are mutually implicated sides of the same coin that do not allow other potentially more “salutary” options to be articulated. In light of this historically consistent but currently limited understanding, we partially conceived this collection as a way of creating a dialogue that we hope will generate fresh ways of posing the political challenges faced by Puerto Ricans beyond the reverse discourses of colonialism and nationalism. Hence, the introduction’s title is not dismissive of these discourses’ effects. Instead, it extends an invitation to rethink the constraints imposed on Puerto Rican political and cultural possibilities by articulating complex histories and subjectivities as a unidimensional confrontation between colonialist and nationalist discourses and political projects.

Although this is the first anthology to explicitly challenge this dichotomy as an epistemological stumbling block, the line of questioning proposed here has produced over the last two decades some of the most insightful commentary on Puerto Ricans. Essays by José Luis González, Juan Flores, and Arcadio Díaz-Quiñones;² collective efforts such as the journals *Postdata*, *Bordes*, and *Nómada*; and a growing body of feminist criticism and women’s literature (e.g., Rosario Ferré, Ana Lydia Vega, Magali García Ramis) and gay and lesbian literature (particularly Manuel Ramos-Otero) have helped to create a context where a collective statement regarding the need to reimagine Puerto Rican history and expand or dismantle the hegemonic notion of the “national” is possible. Still, different from many of these writers, we are not necessarily suggesting a new “content” for a national project (under the guise, for example, of a new revolutionary subject). On the contrary, we are posing a set of ques-

tions that propose that the resistance to a nation-state project by the majority of Puerto Ricans partly speaks to a discursive terrain of heterogeneity that is alien to nationalism as a political strategy leading to the founding of a state. In other words, Puerto Ricans are bound by nationalist ideologies. Yet, the national often refers to ethnic culture and solidarity strategies, and rarely does it entail a mass demand to administer the chaos left behind by five hundred years of colonial and neocolonial relations.

The strategy of rethinking nationalist and colonialist discourses in a moment of “crisis” is, of course, historically consistent in Puerto Rican intellectual production during the twentieth century. In this sense, Kelvin Santiago-Valles’s “The Discreet Charm of the Proletariat: Imagining Early-Twentieth-Century Puerto Ricans in the Past Twenty-Five Years of Historical Inquiry” serves as a reflexive space for this collection. As Santiago points out, the project of rethinking historical relations in Puerto Rico is always a political endeavor that constitutes an intimate relationship between the way that Puerto Rico is historicized and the ways it is politically imagined. Our purpose here, however, is not to “solve” colonialism through a single political program (that is, “cure” the colony). Instead, we propose a critical stance toward the colonial/national discursive dichotomy through a variety of strategies that we hope will lead to other political and theoretical proposals. These textual strategies include the examination of events and processes ignored by previous scholarship, rereadings of “classic” historiographical topics by new social subjects and frameworks, and the articulation of radical democratic perspectives not assumed by either nationalist or colonial discourses. Within the book’s space we acknowledge Santiago’s provocative question: “What is the relationship between the way societies are organized and the ways they are studied?” We affirm that as Puerto Rican intellectuals, our theories are our politics, and this relationship must be critically examined.

Although the anthology constructs a dialogue among the texts, we acknowledge that not all participants share a common political project or necessarily share every point presented in this introductory text. It is important to emphasize that our reading of the essays can also be considered a “misreading” that neither represents nor fixes the multiple implications of each text. We consider the potential of these essays as important interventions in other fields and contexts by no means exhausted by this space and encourage further reading, writing, and debate about the different perspectives included here.

The Crisis of Colonial and Nationalist Discourses

The current urgency of rearticulating Puerto Rico's colonial/nationalist dichotomous paradigm to facilitate the mapping of a fresh course is partly linked to the current ongoing process of Caribbean restructuring and U.S. economic decline. Historically, Puerto Rican intellectuals have adopted one of two discursive poles (supportive of the colonial relationship or anticolonial/nationalist). However, as the island's economy continues to deteriorate, intellectuals and other sectors supporting the colonial status quo have faced a crisis of legitimation. For the first time in fifty years, state intellectuals have publicly accepted that the *Estado Libre Asociado* (ELA, or literally Free Associated State)³ is obsolete as an institutional framework to promote the island's economic "development."

During the 1950s and 1960s, the ELA was able to supply U.S. industries with cheap labor, to grant federal tax exemption to American corporations, and to stimulate free trade between the island and the mainland. Today these incentives have lost all bargaining power. The shift to labor-intensive industrialization in peripheral regions with cheaper labor forces, such as the Dominican Republic, as well as the creation of the North American Free Trade Agreement (institutionalizing Mexico's northern border as a low-wage haven for U.S. transnational corporations) has displaced Puerto Rico as a central location for U.S. capital investments. Moreover, the fiscal crisis of the metropolitan state has forced significant cuts in programs favoring corporate investments in Puerto Rico.⁴ The effect has been a fast deindustrialization of the island, structural unemployment, deterioration of basic infrastructure, and massive migration. Simultaneously, the state's fiscal crisis has reduced the amount of federal transfers to the island. Hence, the processes that allowed a relative improvement in the quality of life for most island residents during the past decades are at their limits. The notion that islanders have a radically different insertion into the American political and economic structures than U.S. Puerto Ricans is increasingly questionable as Puerto Rico threatens to become the shining "scar"—not star—of the Caribbean.⁵

At the same time that pro-colonial discourses are in crisis, nationalist discourses in Puerto Rico (capitalist or socialist versions) are virtually defeated. The decline of popular support for independence or for measures that in any way create obstacles to American incorporation suggests that nationalism as a massive (not symbolic) political ideology is only

powerful among elite minorities. The popular rejection of nationalism as a pro-independence (separatist) ideology (only 4 percent of the votes were pro-independence in the "status" referendum of November 1993) can be read not as a symptom of a colonized "mind" but as a reaction against several regional and world processes that Puerto Ricans tend to be critically aware of.⁶

Contrary to other twentieth-century colonial experiences where the local elites hegemonized subordinated social groups against foreign powers, in Puerto Rico the latter have struggled against the interests of the local elites by mobilizing the democratic and civil rights discourses of the metropolitan center.⁷ From the moment of the American invasion of Puerto Rico in 1898, different social groups (organized around class, race, and/or gender categories) have attributed different meanings to U.S. colonialism on the island. Some sectors quickly understood the invasion as a disaster since it shattered (at least for nearly forty years) any hope of local political hegemony. Other sectors, particularly among the peasantry and working classes, welcomed the invaders as the agents of a new order that would extend democratic guarantees to all Puerto Ricans. In this sense, the invasion allowed an unprecedented "national" class struggle to assume public dimensions.

In "Surviving Colonialism and Nationalism," Mariano Negrón-Portillo details the paternalism (at best) of the creole elites, their autonomist political project during the nineteenth century, and the increased possibilities of political intervention by formerly marginalized groups after the invasion. Negrón-Portillo focuses on the discontent of most subordinated social groups (against both the creole elites and the Spanish regime) as one of the central elements in the lack of cohesion of a nationalist ideology during the early part of the century. Once the peasantry began its process of proletarianization and the urban working classes grew in number and organizational capacity, Negrón-Portillo stresses, large sectors of these groups articulated a political project of modernization in alliance with U.S. interests and in opposition to the local elites (their class enemies). For many among the organized working class, discourses anchored around *la puertorriqueñidad* (Puerto Ricanness) were often perceived as obstacles in the process of achieving a certain degree of social and economic protections such as the right to strike, freedom of speech, and a minimum wage. Also, the Hispanicist orientation of the elites' nationalist discourse overlooked the social resentment that many among the peasantry and working classes still held against the

Spanish regime, its allies, and its descendants. Contrary to what the majority of island intellectual opinion during this century sustains, most Puerto Ricans did not (and still do not) perceive the central political contradiction to be one between colonizer/colonized but rather to be between different class/race/gender interests not mechanically determined by nationality.

Although most political conflicts were publicly played out by men of different class and cultural identities, one of the groups that sought to take advantage of the new regime were women (of all classes). While many working-class women advocated feminism (including suffrage) within (mostly pro-American) worker's organizations, middle-class women were also articulating strategies to deploy American colonialist discourse in winning some basic rights for themselves. One of the most provocative essays in this collection regarding the often contradictory effect of American colonialism in Puerto Rico is Gladys Jiménez-Muñoz's "So We Decided to Come and Ask You Ourselves: The 1928 U.S. Congressional Hearings on Women's Suffrage in Puerto Rico." In this account, Jiménez-Muñoz traces the complexities of gender, ethnicity, and colonial administration in an attempt to explore the interplay of power relations within that context. On the one hand, Puerto Rican feminist suffragists sought an alliance with American feminists, who in turn appealed to American congressmen (white and male) to intervene on behalf of Puerto Rican women by extending them the vote in local elections. At the same time, this strategy (against Puerto Rican men) articulates an alliance between middle-class (Puerto Rican and white American) women and a call for further colonial (imperial) intervention in local matters (on behalf of some women) by American men. In this sense, the suffragists used the same discourse circulated by the metropolis (the imperialist notion that the United States came to bring progress to the island) and pitted colonized versus colonialist men in a struggle to gain the vote for middle-class women. The intricacies of the strategy and its effects suggest that totalizing categories such as nationality and gender do not exhaust the complexity of colonial power relationships experienced in Puerto Rico.

The fact that different groups saw U.S. colonialism on the island as a context for increased political participation is deeply related to the particularities of colonialism practiced in Puerto Rico, particularly after the 1940s. In Ramón Grosfoguel's essay "The Divorce of Nationalist Political Discourses from the Puerto Rican People: A Sociohistorical Perspective,"

he proposes a historical periodization of the diverse structuring logics (capitalist accumulation, geopolitical military/security considerations, symbolic/ideological strategies) that have governed U.S. interests in Puerto Rico during the past century. The interplay of alliances and concessions from the metropolis have produced the context for a non-nationalist political constituency in Puerto Rico. Contrary to traditional political-economy approaches, Grosfoguel argues that capitalist accumulation has not always dominated the structural relationship between the metropolis and the colony because U.S. interests have shifted throughout the century. At certain historical junctures, these shifting interests have in fact contradicted capitalist accumulation processes, thus directly affecting U.S. corporations established on the island. The extension of rights and federal transfers to Puerto Rico, particularly during the second half of the twentieth century, is a clear example of the hegemony of the symbolic in U.S. policy regarding Puerto Rico. Puerto Rico's postwar incorporation was determined by the United States' symbolic strategy of "showcasing" the island as the American model of development for the Third World as opposed to the Soviet model. According to Grosfoguel, the outcome of this strategy was a colonial reform that eliminated the old type of colonialism and transformed the island into a "modern colony."⁸ He concludes the essay with a call to de-essentialize the island's status debate and with a proposal to reconstruct a new left alternative beyond colonialist and nationalist discourses.

The analysis proposed by the essays discussed here is of great importance to a nondichotomous frame of reference since it significantly and productively complicates the various power struggles along more than one axis (colonial subjects/metropolis). At the same time, it examines how different racial, class, and gender groups have been (often simultaneously) oppressed or have benefited from U.S. intervention. Without an understanding of these dynamics, it is virtually impossible to understand how American hegemony functions in Puerto Rico and how Puerto Ricans resist colonial power(s). Thus, the weakening of a political nationalist agenda in Puerto Rico was partially produced by the metropolitan oscillation between making "good" on their promise of bringing "progress" to Puerto Rico—civil liberties, a minimum wage, welfare programs—and their colonial needs such as economic exploitation and military maneuvering. This conceptualization has enormous consequences for political participation because it seriously questions the premises upon which contemporary oppositional (nationalist) island politics are built.

The Nation-Building Processes in the Caribbean Region

Although Puerto Rico has never had a massive pro-independence movement, Puerto Ricans hold a vicarious knowledge of other postcolonial realities, particularly in Latin America and the Caribbean. What Puerto Ricans have witnessed very close to home has not been seductive: regimes of state-orchestrated terror, International Monetary Fund intervention, pauperization of the population, illegal emigration, foreign debt, and a lack of strength to forcefully negotiate with the economic centers. As Patrick Baker suggests:

As the world system developed, metropolitan centres found that they could obtain Third World resources through the economic structures that had emerged, and that the need for costly administration of their colonies was no longer necessary, efficient, or desirable. Thus, the metropolitan powers were ready to divest themselves of their colonies, and they took advantage of local efforts to centre peripheries to rid themselves of the administrative responsibility for them.⁹

Puerto Ricans—in a more dramatic way—have taken note that the most economically and socially vulnerable social groups are among the most affected by postcolonial economic realities as Haitians, Dominicans, and Cubans risk their lives to reach Puerto Rican or American shores.¹⁰ This comment does not imply that Puerto Ricans do not have legitimate economic claims in relation to the metropolitan center—Puerto Rico's per capita income, for example, is half of the poorest U.S. state—which should form part of any anticolonial political program. Within the context of transtatal capitalism in the Caribbean, however, Puerto Ricans can count on more resources to maneuver capitalist restructuring in the region by its relationship to the center as a “modern colony” than as a Caribbean nation-state.¹¹ Moreover, capitalist transtatalization has made nation-states' structures obsolete in attempting to control economic processes within their borders. In short, Puerto Ricans have experienced a process of nation building without creating a nation-state, in part because the United States, unlike in other intervened countries of the region (which are nation-states), continues to reluctantly finance its own economic and political failure in Puerto Rico.¹²

A more recent contextual element in relation to the decline of nationalist, particularly socialist, discourses in Puerto Rico relates to the fall of the authoritarian Soviet bloc and its illusion of constructing a society “outside” of capitalism. The revolutionary experiences of diverse

Caribbean and Central American nations, where attempts to construct alternate economic arrangements have been crushed militarily (Grenada), defeated through United States-financed warfare (Nicaragua, El Salvador), or strangulated economically (Nicaragua, Cuba), have also contributed to widespread skepticism regarding Puerto Rico's ability to combat U.S. economic hegemony in its own sphere of influence. Even revolutionary movements such as the FMLN (Frente Farabundo Martí para la Liberación Nacional) in El Salvador have been forced to recognize the impossibility of an “outside” to capitalism and have modified their intervention tactics:

To this end, all the five organizations within the FMLN have established profit-making enterprises, ranging from agricultural co-ops and import-export companies, to the conversion of the legendary guerrilla radio station, Radio Venceremos, into a commercial radio station in which ideology and politics have been replaced by non-stop Latin pop and inane DJ patter.¹³

The FMLN experience shows not only that there is no outside to capitalism but also the impossibility within the present historical conditions of frontally challenging U.S. capitalist hegemony in the region (even in its weakened shape). The Sandinistas in Nicaragua have arrived at similar conclusions, even within a developmentalist discourse. Victor Tirado López, one of the nine Sandinista commanders, comments:

I believe that the cycle of anti-imperialist revolutions is coming to a close; understanding these to mean total, military, and economic confrontations with imperialism. We have to look for other options. The underdeveloped world cannot resist to live in perpetual war. . . . Underdeveloped countries like ours cannot endure conflicts which undermine our economic base. . . . I think the best thing we can aspire to is a peaceful co-existence with imperialism, even if it hurts us to say it. Just have good relations with them so we can develop ourselves.¹⁴

Following this state of affairs, both Sandinistas and the FMLN have negotiated a transition to “democratic” politics without fully abandoning a more radical democratic or revolutionary project.

In the case of Puerto Rico, preliminary plebiscite hearings conducted in San Juan during the late 1980s involving all major political parties made it clear that the United States would keep its military bases on the island and would not tolerate potential alliances between Puerto Rico and American enemies, regardless of the status chosen by the majority. It

was also evident that the American independence or autonomous “solution” for Puerto Rico constitutes a form of colonialism without any of its benefits (in the form of metropolitan transfers and basic democratic rights). Puerto Rico would still be a subordinated part within an American sphere of influence in the region. As Orlando Patterson has noted in regard to the independent island nations of the West Indies:

The flow of American capital, technology and mass culture to the islands, far from promoting self-sustained national development—as was once innocently hoped—has thoroughly disrupted their traditional economies and cultures and is, in fact, the main reason for the current migration to America. The sad truth is that these island economies are, in the long run, simply not viable—they are too small, too poor in natural resources and too close to America’s overwhelming post-industrial culture. They are, de facto, already part of NAFTA, and it’s only a matter of time before they are de jure.¹⁵

Unfortunately, Puerto Rican nationalist pro-independent discourses continue to ignore the fact that Puerto Rico, given its historical relationship to the United States, its lack of a national economy, and its disadvantaged insertion in the world economy, cannot become “independent.”¹⁶ The experience of the Palau Islands, which proclaimed independence from the United States in October 1994, supports the assumptions outlined here for Puerto Rico. (The Palauans status is that of a “Compact of Free Association” between the United States and Palau.) Under the agreement, the U.S. military has access to the island for fifty years and may exercise “strategic denial” in perpetuity to forbid access to Palau by any U.S. “enemy” country, and Palau will receive only \$517 million from the federal government.¹⁷ The right to migrate to and from the United States and work in the United States granted to Palauans would most likely not be offered to Puerto Ricans born under the “Associated Republic.”

Ambiguous Identities

In general, most intellectuals frame Puerto Rican struggles within a nineteenth-century model of colonialism in which the colonized lived in daily confrontation with the invader on their own soil and thus are unable to properly contextualize Puerto Rican cultural practices. It is often the case that these intellectuals suspect that Puerto Ricans are not independent—assuming independence to be a sign of national maturity and real territorial power, a condition to claim nationhood—because they

have been brainwashed by American colonialism to desire “dependency.” This position fails to understand our specificity as a colonial experience different from that of Latin America and some parts of the Caribbean, producing a narrative that constitutes our experience as aberrant and our hybrid culture as corrupt.

During the early twentieth century, the United States attempted with limited success to “assimilate” Puerto Ricans to “American culture” by coercion. Colonial authorities in Puerto Rico proceeded to impose English as the primary language in several public institutions, particularly in primary and secondary education, and banned the display of emerging nationalist symbols such as the Puerto Rican flag. Within this assimilationist project, any sign of collective (even if minority) national affirmation was considered to be subversive and was actively persecuted. The political cost of this form of domination, the ineffectiveness of these policies (due to resistance and inadequate implementation), and the metropolitan need to maintain domestic peace during the Cold War forced the United States to devise a formula to reinvent Puerto Rico’s colonial subordinated status, thus conveniently recognizing an autonomous and different cultural “heritage.”

The formation of the Estado Libre Asociado (ELA) marked a definitive rupture with traditional assimilationist colonial practices, inaugurating the opposite strategy as a way to contain potentially anti-imperialist sentiments against the United States. The ELA constituted the institutional apparatus that managed to reproduce Puerto Rican national subjectivity at the same time that it created both an illusion of political autonomy and concealment of the subordinated economic absorption of the island by the United States.

Carlos Pabón¹⁸ suggests that the ELA discourse marked the beginning of a metamorphosis in the political meaning of the “national” itself. Luis Muñoz Marín, the leading architect of the ELA, successfully neutralized the nationalist forces led by Albizu Campos during the critical decade of the 1930s by making a particular version of nationalism an integral part of its political ideology. Because of this mutation—which re-signified the meaning of the national in Puerto Rico—the U.S. state apparatus managed by Puerto Ricans on the island was/is able to reproduce a discourse that has effectively constituted “national” subjects (at least culturally). In this sense, neonationalist forces that continue to insist that the basic cultural contradiction in Puerto Rico is between those who are pro-statehood and those who defend *la puertorriqueñidad* fail to recognize

that cultural nationalism has already been institutionalized by the U.S. state apparatus as reproduced in Puerto Rico. Given this process of taming the national by U.S.-Puerto Rico-administered colonial state, the potential of calling on Puerto Ricans' nationalism for a separatist political program is canceled out. Thus, "nationality" is not a question in Puerto Rico but rather a *cientpiés* (centipede) of proposals and possibilities.

Just as the creation of the ELA produced national subjects without a state, it also produced a context of illusory autonomy from the metropolitan center. We call Puerto Rico's autonomy "illusory" not because there is no Puerto Rican agency in this process but because the cultural and political discourses of autonomy have obscured how (subordinately) integrated Puerto Ricans are to the United States' economic and political structures (e.g., Puerto Ricans on the island cannot elect congressional representation or vote for the president, and are under the territorial clause). The U.S. Congress has absolute authority over Puerto Rico's local political structures.

As Jaime Benson-Arias argues in his essay "Puerto Rico: The Myth of the National Economy," Puerto Rico is a colony only in the political sense because the island has been completely absorbed into the U.S. economy. Puerto Rico's economic structures are a regional extension, although subordinated and unequal, of the mainland. The ELA's successful representation of Puerto Rico as an autonomous nation and economy has resulted in a political terrain where both colonialist and nationalist discourses participate in the same illusory assumptions that define both an internal "national economy" and an external U.S. economy.

Due to its overt hybrid character, the ELA in Puerto Rico is a striking example of how national ideological apparatuses can produce the sense that a "nation" (even when it has not consolidated a "state") is controlling an internal space "outside" international capitalist hegemonic control. An ideological tenet of the capitalist world-system is that each nation-state develops independently from the others. This developmentalist ideology represents hierarchical relations of inequality and subordination as if all participants were "equal," that is, nations. According to Immanuel Wallerstein,

A central ideological theme of the capitalist world-economy was that every state could, and indeed eventually probably would, reach a high level of national income and that conscious, rational action would make it so. This fit very well with the underlying Enlightenment theme

of inevitable progress and the teleological view of human history that it incarnated.¹⁹

Similarly, the ELA reproduced a developmentalist ideology by arguing that Puerto Ricans struggled and achieved an autonomous status from the United States, and that its (current) economic development was a product of its own efforts (the industrialization program was adequately named "Operation Bootstrap"). Puerto Rico's early success in transforming and improving the quality of life on the island was sold to "developing countries" as "living proof" that they too could achieve development, if only they worked "hard" and opened their markets to U.S. transtatal capitalist investments. The failure of the developmentalist discourse in Puerto Rico ultimately suggests that an awareness of unequal power relations between the United States and Puerto Rico and of the economic absorption of the island into the metropolis is a more productive premise from which to map future political interventions than the illusion of autonomy (nation-state or any other variant), an illusion that continues to hinder the creation of a public political sphere where a discussion (beyond nationalism) is able to articulate a politically effective critique of world political and economic dynamics as they affect the lives of Puerto Ricans.

The ELA has fostered a "misrecognition"²⁰ of Puerto Rico's colonial positioning in relation to the United States that is shared neither by other "nations" nor the U.S. Congress. This misrecognition is often exemplified in "cultural" debates where a given claim of autonomy contradicts political structures and cultural practices. Thus, it is misrecognition that allows former Senator Ronaldo "Rony" Jarabo, for example, to claim that the "Spanish Only" legislation in Puerto Rico will "protect" all Puerto Ricans from the "English Only" threat, while the legal fact is that any measure taken by the Puerto Rican legislature can be unilaterally invalidated by the U.S. Congress. It is also a misrecognition that permits island intellectuals to represent the island's territory/population as the only Puerto Rican "nation," thus rendering invisible the fragmentation of the Puerto Rican body politic spilled over onto the U.S. mainland. These contradictory claims do not always limit cultural debate or practice. Instead, they often make "culture" a hotly contested and slippery terrain.

Puerto Rico's disadvantaged and ambiguous political and economic integration into the United States has not resulted in a loss of cultural identity, as supporters of "cultural imperialism" theories claim, but in an

overt hybridization and multiplication of Puerto Rican identities played out by different subjects. As Celeste Olalquiaga writes in relation to Latin America in general, "Accustomed to dealing with the arbitrary imposition of foreign products and practices, this culture has learned the tactics of selection and transformation to suit the foreign to its own idiosyncrasy, thus developing popular integration mechanisms that are deliberately eclectic and flexible."²¹

Raquel Rivera, in her essay titled "Rapping Two Versions of the Same Requiem," challenges supporters of cultural imperialism theories by examining how rap culture and music in Puerto Rico give voice to urban, black, and poor youth against state and nationalist discourses that tend to negate or criminalize them. Rap culture also realigns solidarities beyond the colonial/national discursive dichotomy by recognizing class and race as important elements in the building of solidarities. This essay proposes that despite the colonial reforms experienced on the island during this century, the racial/colonial power relationships between the local Puerto Rican (white) elites and black Puerto Ricans have not substantially changed. Based on color and not on origin, racism is still an important mechanism of exclusion on the island, with its particular set of political challenges.

In contrast to U.S.-style racism, Puerto Rican blacks and mulattoes are promised the possibility of "racial mobility" for their offspring through racial intermixing and economic advancement.²² Hence, a light-skinned subject with African ancestry may be accepted as "white" in Puerto Rico if he/she exhibits "white" looks. Simultaneously, despite the widespread understanding that blackness constitutes the most undesirable racial identity among Puerto Ricans, both colonialist and nationalist discourses subscribe to the myth of racial democracy. According to this ideology, all Puerto Ricans regardless of "race" are the mixture of the same ethnic ingredients—Spanish, African, Indian—and therefore equal. This superficially more benign form of racist ideology is often as, if not more, effective than more overt racist discourses in preventing racism from being socially and politically challenged in public discourse.

As the example of rap music suggests, the so-called products of global culture can have a radicalizing impact on class and racial struggles on a local level, creating new communities beyond traditionally determined national boundaries. In "Contending Nationalisms: Culture, Politics and Corporate Sponsorship in Puerto Rico," Arlene Dávila radically questions the premise that the globalization of culture will inevitably re-

sult in the dissolution of cultural differences. Dávila contends that in Puerto Rico, contrary to nationalist claims on "cultural imperialism," American corporate sponsorship has become a major player in shaping and reproducing nationalist discourses through its financing of popular and elite cultural events and the commodification of national representations, for example, the flag, landscapes, and architecture. Different from most U.S. marketing strategies in the world, capitalist interests operating in Puerto Rico have realized that Puerto Rican cultural representations sell products and hence must be deployed rather than ignored. Interestingly, cultural representations promoted by corporations are often based on popular—rather than elitist or nostalgic—conceptions of "culture," such as salsa concerts, that can be at odds with other forms of Puerto Rican culture considered to be more "authentic" by the island's middle and upper classes.

The reframing of the question of Puerto Rican "culture" is, then, not whether Puerto Ricans even "have" a culture or if that culture is corrupt or "penetrated," but rather in what ways do Puerto Ricans imagine themselves in culture as part of communities. As Benedict Anderson says, "Communities are to be distinguished not by their falsity/genuineness, but by the style in which one is imagined."²³

"Puerto Rico" has been (and continues to be) imagined in many ways: as a sovereign nation, as a nation within a nation, as an ethnic group with a regional identity in alliance with a nation, or as several combinations of these formulations. In addition, "Puerto Rico" is not always conceived as a geographically specific space but as a symbolic claim of belonging to a community of fellow members. As Agustín Lao poetically argues in his essay "Islands at the Crossroads: Puerto Ricanness Traveling between the Translocal Nation and the Global City," Puerto Ricans form part of a "transnation" or translocal nation, a web of possibilities, flows, and broken-English dreams between the island and the United States. Given the contradictory political relationships with the United States that Puerto Ricans must engage in daily, the sign of "Puerto Rican" sometimes serves as a way of maintaining critical distance within oppressive contexts of unequal exchange. Thus, in Puerto Rico, after a failed attempt to produce "American" cultural subjects on the island during the early twentieth century, "Puerto Ricans" are reproduced by widely circulated and repeated narratives of belonging that sometimes function oppositionally through specific institutions (e.g., schools, family, media) and sometimes as complementary to American "identity."

Concurrently, in the United States Puerto Ricans are reproduced by a combination of racist American structures and ethnic community formations mostly in large northeastern cities. Third-generation Puerto Ricans in the United States continue to identify themselves as Puerto Ricans without the hyphenated "Puerto Rican-American." Puerto Ricans are the only group in the United States that after several generations keep using a nonhyphenated identity. On the island as well as in the United States, however, the ambiguity of Puerto Ricans' relationship to the United States creates a slippery semantic context where sometimes "Puerto Rican" is claimed as a sign of difference, for example, cultural identity and language, while at other times, the same sign is equated with being part of the "United States" (citizenship, welfare entitlements). This double strategy was spectacularly performed during the intense debates around language policy in Puerto Rico during the early 1990s. The legislative imposition of Spanish as the single official language of Puerto Rico in 1991 was met with intense resistance by various sectors who saw the measure as an obstacle to the discussion of permanent and/or full political integration in the United States. The reversal of the decision by the pro-statehood administration in 1993 and the reinstitution of English and Spanish as official languages were a triumph of the majority political strategy of maintaining a doubleness to Puerto Rican "identity." As Frances Negrón-Muntaner argues in her essay "English Only Jamás but Spanish Only Cuidado: Language and Nationalism in Contemporary Puerto Rico," the language debates intermittently brought to public attention during the twentieth century in Puerto Rico are modes of imagining the collectivity's limits and hierarchies while rehearsing alliances and testing the viability of political projects. A close look at the metaphors and performances enacted throughout the past five years in relation to "Spanish First" and "English Also" suggests that the political ambiguity and flexibility signaled by an official bilingual language policy represented a more inclusive political project than the linguistic nationalist proposition, even when advocates on both sides made essentialist assumptions about the relationship between power and language (English = progress, Spanish = tradition). Yet, the fact that nationalist ideologies of different stripes are part of public discourses at all levels and by all sectors of the population underlines the fact that the "national question" is no question at all in Puerto Rico. The more relevant question is, On behalf of whose interests are "national" discourses mobilized for?

A Puerto Rican Ethno-Nation?

The multiple and contesting notions of the concept of "nation" alluded to in the previous discussion are, however, not indeterminate. A clear majority of the population (as gauged by popular elections, media, and popular culture) articulates Puerto Rico as both an ethnic group with partial or no desire to control its own state apparatus and as a distinct cultural identity autonomous from the United States and/or "complementary" to the United States. In Puerto Rico, it has been possible for a significant number of the population to imagine the "nation" without a "Puerto Rican" state and to view the United States' state apparatus as a more beneficial structure to advance the "nation's" interests. By the same token, although many Puerto Ricans on the island are willing to give up (at least formally) claims to territorial power, all Puerto Rican political formulas are articulated on behalf of a group of people imagined to belong to a well-defined territory. Ambivalence among pro-statehooders in calling this collectivity a nation is probably as linked to ideological differences in their imagining of Puerto Rico as to political pragmatism. All sectors of the pro-commonwealth and pro-statehood political elites are keenly aware that a nationalist discourse will seriously impede pro-statehood negotiations with Congress. Thus, it can be argued that to the extent that Puerto Ricans make political (territorial) claims on behalf of Puerto Ricans, Puerto Ricans constitute a national formation. At the same time, to the extent that a political claim is made on behalf of Puerto Ricans formally relinquishing state power, Puerto Ricans constitute a partially territorialized ethnic group (islanders). Since both tendencies not only coexist between groups but also simultaneously in social and subjective contexts, Puerto Ricans imagine themselves as an "ethno-nation," with different emphasis on both sides of the hyphen. This ambiguity and double consciousness are not born out of political opportunism. Instead they are the result of strategies developed under conditions of colonial domination. As Rajagopalan Radhakrishnan, an Indian postcolonial critic, said,

I would argue that there is a distinction between ambivalence as a given conditioning and the agential politization of ambivalence. We cannot forget that double consciousness and ambivalence are mutually constitutive, and peoples and cultures that have been coerced into more than one history through domination, slavery, and colonialism have the ethico-political need and authority to make their presence felt

in all of these histories. Ambivalence gives these cultures a double directionality: a here or the present home, and a there or the elsewhere in terms of which metropolitan contemporaneity can be interrogated and transformed. Call this the anthropologization of the West (Spivak) or the ethnicization of America. The diasporic reterritorialization of postcoloniality into ethnicity has the potential to represent the third world within the first world not through easy assimilationalism or strategic opportunism, but through a fundamental questioning of the manner in which dominant regimes play and dictate the identity game to subaltern groups on the basis of a rigged and stacked text.²⁴

The ambiguity of this articulation is evidenced by the fact that even when many Puerto Ricans in the United States imagine themselves pragmatically as an "ethnic group" with no territorial (state) claim in the United States, Puerto Rico is at least claimed symbolically as the territorial site where ethnics become nationals through the magical operation of the air bridge. The instability of the concept of ethnic group to refer to Puerto Ricans is also rooted, for example, in assumptions about how ethnicity is reproduced in the working classes. Some suggest that the persistence of ethnicity in the capitalist world economy's metropolises is mostly related to the reproduction of a cheap labor force or industrial reserve army. This is partially true in the Puerto Rican case. Yet, as María Milagros López suggests,²⁵ many Puerto Ricans are not effectively reproduced as capitalist labor force, but instead, under conditions of colonial postindustrial expulsion from the labor force, Puerto Ricans developed postwork strategies within the system (informal jobs, hustling of diverse state-generated incomes, or a combination of both) in order to survive without renouncing access to capitalist mass consumption. In this sense, Puerto Rican "ethnicity" cannot be reduced to the sphere of labor reproduction.

The hegemony of ethnicity over nation or nation over ethnicity depends on the geopolitical and historical context of the Puerto Rican communities in question, and what objectives are sought at any particular juncture. For example, most Puerto Ricans consider Puerto Rico a "nation" when Olympic competition or the Miss Universe Pageant is involved but an ethnic community when claims to civil rights or access to federal programs is concerned. Military service is another example. Puerto Ricans have fought and died in all the wars the Americans have fought during this century. When it comes to wars, the United States has been ready to recognize Puerto Ricans as full U.S. citizens and to recruit them for military service. Puerto Ricans have participated in these wars

as a U.S. ethnic group. However, in the Vietnam War, many Puerto Ricans resisted "ethnic identity" and claimed "national identity" in order to question their participation in a war of aggression against a Third World country.

Hence, the discursive demarcation of a Puerto Rican specificity points to a strategy of resistance that defies easy categorization within contemporary theoretical debates. Because of a multiplicity of factors, Puerto Rican politics and cultural practices are neither entirely "inside" the American mainstream nor "outside" it. We conceptualize Puerto Ricans' self-representation as both an increasingly deterritorialized "ethno-nation" in the United States and a territorialized "ethno-nation" in Puerto Rico.²⁶ Although there are differences of location and participation between Puerto Ricans living in the United States and Puerto Rico, some of these differences become remarkably more overt or negligible when the main category of analysis is not "national identity" but a more complex understanding of how social identities are constructed, resisted, and represented.

The proposed conceptualization of Puerto Ricans as an ethno-nation is a self-conscious effort to recognize that the majority of Puerto Ricans tend to oscillate between understanding themselves (self-representing) as an ethnic group, a nation within a nation, and a sovereign nation. We suggest that given the limits imposed on Puerto Rican locations, effective political strategies should include both incorporation (with critical distance) and differentiation. The breaking of the binary is already a step in another direction that facilitates looking beyond nationalist and colonialist discourses to recognize other political agendas (women, gays, Afro-Puerto Ricans) not organized along the colonized/metropolis axis, which may facilitate the production of a more inclusive body politic for Puerto Ricans residing anywhere. By this last comment we do not mean to suggest that Puerto Rico's colonial insertion is irrelevant to these other political subjectivities. Instead, we suggest that the dichotomy fails to explain these locations' complexities and thus fails to provide them with transforming possibilities.

Puerto Ricans as Racial/Colonial Subjects

In the United States, the hierarchization of ethnic groups has been hegemonized by male elites of European descent ("Whites") throughout a long historical process of colonial/racial domination of Native Ameri-

cans, enslaved Africans, and migrant populations.²⁷ Even after independence, when the formal juridical/military control of the state passed from the imperial power to a newly independent state, white elites continued to control economic and political structures. This continuity of power from colonial to postcolonial times allowed these hegemonic groups to exclude people of color from the categories of full citizenship in the imaginary community of the "nation," thus affirming a "coloniality of power"²⁸ within the existing and expanding borders of the new state. The civil, political, and social rights that citizenship provided to the members of the nation were selectively expanded over time to the white working classes and to white middle-class women. However, groups with colonial histories in the United States remained as "second-class citizens," never having full access to citizen rights, despite a formal recognition of these rights as naturalized in legal discourse.

During the first half of the twentieth century, the word *ethnic* referred to cultural differences among white European groups (e.g., Italian, Irish, German) while *race* was used to refer to distinct cultural (as well as ethnic and/or national) groups from non-European origins (e.g., Blacks, Asians). Since the 1960s, *ethnic* in the United States has become a code word for race as a result of the civil rights movement.²⁹ Rather than characterizing groups along racial lines (which had been linked to racist and antidemocratic practices of segregation), the more conciliatory terms of *ethnic* and *migrant* were used instead. This emerging dominant discourse was elaborated by Nathan Glazer and Daniel P. Moynihan in their now classic *Beyond the Melting Pot: The Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Jews, Italians, and Irish of New York City*.³⁰

In Glazer and Moynihan's formulation, the experiences of people of color in the United States are equated to the white European migrations dating from the beginning of the twentieth century. The main assumption is that by transmuting the terms of discrimination from racial to ethnic, groups such as Puerto Ricans and African Americans will suffer the ordinary pressures of any incoming European ethnic group and eventually become economically incorporated as were earlier waves of white migrants. This approach obliterates the history of racial/colonial oppression experienced by, for example, African Americans and Puerto Ricans and ignores each group's specific colonial incorporation into the U.S. body politic.³¹ In the African American case, barriers to full social, economic, and political participation stem from a long colonial history of slavery and subsequent marginalization under a segregationist regime.

Puerto Ricans were submitted to a colonial regime that expropriated the most desirable land and incorporated the people as cheap labor in sugar plantations during the first half of the century and as low-wage manufacturing workers in Puerto Rico and the United States during the past four decades. In this sense, Puerto Ricans and African Americans are not simply migrants or ethnic groups but rather colonial/racialized subjects in the United States.³²

At the same time, Puerto Ricans present a puzzle to the rigid racial definitions structuring American social and political relationships. A mixed racial community ranging in "color" from white to black—and everything in between—Puerto Ricans cannot be fixed as a single racial category (White or Black). Despite this racial ambiguity, increased contact with Puerto Ricans in large cities like New York provided the context to redefine Puerto Ricans as a racialized Other of a different kind.³³ Thus, Puerto Ricans became a *new* racialized subject (Spanish-speaking, racially hybrid), different from Whites and Blacks, but sharing with the latter a subordinate position to the former.³⁴ This shift of perception was represented and projected onto mainstream culture by Hollywood films during the late 1950s and through the 1970s, and famously articulated by *West Side Story*.³⁵ Through this tale of the perils of miscegenation, Puerto Ricans were transformed into a nationally recognized racialized minority, no longer to be confused with Asians, Blacks, or Chicanos.³⁶

The racialization of Puerto Ricans was the result of a long historical process of colonial/racial subordination on the island and the mainland.³⁷ Although the racism experienced by Afro-Puerto Ricans in many instances can be more overt than that experienced by light-skinned Puerto Ricans, "white" Puerto Ricans are also racialized as an inferior group³⁸ by at least two mechanisms: open identification with the group, and/or by assumption of origin as registered through the use of Spanish, surname, and/or accent. This highlights the social rather than biological character of racial classifications. Regardless of phenotype, all Puerto Ricans are considered a racial group in the social imaginary of most Americans, accompanied by racist stereotypes such as laziness, violence, stupidity, and dirtiness.³⁹ The derogatory naming of Puerto Ricans as "spiks" in the symbolic field of New York designates the negative symbolic capital attached to identifying, or being identified, as a Puerto Rican.⁴⁰

The racialization of Puerto Ricans in the United States is also intimately connected with the labor migrations during the second half of the century to New York City and other northeastern and midwestern cities.

In New York's racial/ethnic division of labor, Puerto Ricans occupied the economic niche of low-wage manufacturing jobs. By 1960, more than 50 percent of Puerto Ricans in New York were incorporated as low-wage labor in this sector. During the 1960s, Puerto Ricans' successful struggles for labor rights made them "too expensive" for the increasingly informalized manufacturing sector; simultaneously, the deindustrialization of New York led to the loss of thousands of manufacturing jobs. Most of these manufacturing industries moved to peripheral regions around the world, while those that stayed in New York operated in a more informal way. The manufacturing industry, in constant need of cheap labor, relied heavily on new Latino immigrants, legal or illegal, that counted on even fewer citizenship rights than internal colonial subjects such as Puerto Ricans. The expulsion of Puerto Ricans from manufacturing jobs and the racist educational system that excluded Puerto Ricans from the best public schools produced a redundant labor force that could not reenter the formal labor market. This led to the formation of what some have called the Puerto Rican "underclass," which we prefer to call a displaced racialized/colonial population.⁴¹ Unable to find jobs, many Puerto Ricans developed survival strategies, legal or illegal, to overcome the crisis.

Concurrently, it is important to highlight that for many Americans living outside cities with large Puerto Rican populations, who do not have an awareness of the diversity of Latino migrations, Puerto Ricans can sometimes be confused or homogenized into other ethnic groups or simply referred to by the generic "Latino" (a racialized term as well but with no cultural or historical specificity). In contrast to the awareness of African Americans, for example, a group invested with great symbolic value as part of nation-building "historical" metanarratives (e.g., the Civil War, the civil rights movement), general unawareness concerning American colonial history, particularly the enormous impact of the Spanish-American War and the civil rights struggles of Puerto Ricans in the United States, has historically contributed to a context of Puerto Rican invisibility. In this sense, it may sometimes be more accurate to suggest that in most American cultural and political spaces, Puerto Ricans are rendered invisible as an internal colonial population despite one hundred years of shared colonial history. Conversely, when Puerto Ricans are recognized as distinct, they are represented as racialized subjects, with little—if any—understanding of the group's distinct relationship to the United States as a colonial possession under congressional jurisdiction. This lack of symbolic relevance is one of the greatest political prob-

lems facing Puerto Rican self-determination today, since very few Americans will contest an imposed unilateral "solution" by Congress to legally resolve the question of Puerto Rico's status.

Puerto Rico's Double Coloniality of Power

While all Puerto Ricans suffer from different degrees of racialization and exclusion as second-class citizens in the United States, subordinated social groups in Puerto Rico suffer from a double coloniality of power. The first coloniality of power—supported by racist structures and exercised from the metropolis—severely constrains the possibility of self-government and allows Congress to unilaterally determine all aspects related to Puerto Rico. The second, and much less discussed form, is a coloniality of power enforced by the local elites (the "blanquitos" or "little whities") over local hegemonic political, cultural, and economic spaces, sometimes under the banner of a nationalist ideology. The fact that an end to colonial relationships between countries does not entail the dismantling of class, racial, and gender hierarchies within the frontiers of the new state (internal colonialism) constitutes one of the greatest challenges to decolonizing projects at the close of the twentieth century.

The Latin American experience of the past two centuries shows that an independent state does not guarantee a radical transformation of the old colonial racial and class hierarchies. As Richard Harvey Brown has written:

The political and cognitive processes go on between elites and others *within* states much as they did between colonizers and colonized. Indeed, colonists from old nations and state builders within new ones both operate at a critical ideological juncture, for nowhere are the notions of normal, familiar action and given systems in greater jeopardy than at the external frontier of the empire or the internal frontier of the state. . . . Thus, the process of state formation may be seen as a kind of internal colonization, a maintenance of identity and authenticity through cultural labeling and suppression.⁴²

After the wars of independence that took place throughout Latin America during the nineteenth century, there was a transfer of power from the metropolis to the white creole elites but little transformation of the relations between classes, races, and genders. In the few contexts where a call for social revolution was part of the independence struggle, such as in Cuba during the late 1890s, a U.S. intervention made sure that

independence was nominal and social revolution impossible. A similar process occurred in Puerto Rico after World War II. The colonial reforms allowed Puerto Ricans to elect their own governor rather than be ruled by a white American governor appointed by the president. However, this reform not only did not transform the colonial control of the U.S. Congress over the island but left Puerto Rico's racial and class hierarchies largely intact. The initial possibility of social revolution opened up by the 1898 invasion was eventually narrowed down as the Puerto Rican white elites monopolized the new local political and economic spaces. Although racial exclusion has not been exercised in Puerto Rico through apartheid mechanisms, such as in the South in the United States, Afro-Puerto Ricans and mulattoes are excluded from, or subordinated to, racist, classist, and gendered power structures. Ironically, some of the few (even if extremely limited) mechanisms of class and social mobility available for all Puerto Ricans, including Blacks, are those mandated by the colonial state such as the public school system.

The historical continuity between the first (colonialist/colonized) coloniality of power and the second (internal colonialism) demands a need to redefine what is meant by decolonization. Contemporary nation-states such as Guatemala represent pointed examples of persistent colonial relationships. The demands of militant and internally colonized "ethnic" Mayas are often aimed at the racist structures that legitimize social inequities within the state's borders. In this sense, the decolonization of the Mayas and their access to full citizen rights require the inclusion of indigenous people at all levels of political participation and the resistance to co-optation under the guise of identity politics. Rigoberta Menchú has commented:

Recently, the FDNG [Guatemala Democratic Front] proposed creating an indigenous ministry in Guatemala. We all came out against it. Why? Because it would be returning to apartheid Guatemala. The Ministry of Defense and all other ministries would be in the hands of non-indigenous people, and there would be a tiny bureaucratic office for Maya peoples. This would be a mistake.⁴³

A decolonization project in the Caribbean cannot be understood only as a process of self-determination at a formal political level, but must be seen as a process of radical transformation of the old colonial hierarchies, that is, the eradication of the racial, gender, sexual, and class hierarchies built throughout a long colonial history.

Postmodernist Strategies: Rican Style New Political Subjects

The emergence of a postmodern state of affairs has inaugurated new political subjects whose agenda is often not contemplated by traditional nationalist (or colonial) political discourses. Intellectuals invested in a political project critical of the unfulfilled promises and hierarchies of modernity (the "posmodernos" in island terminology) are also becoming more visible. Thus, new cultural and political practices, social movements, and countercolonial and national discourses are questioning the patriarchal, racist, and homophobic premises of much nationalist political thinking and practice, including those of the metropolitan state itself.

The fissures between subjects assumed to hold identical subject positions (that is, "women") are investigated in Yolanda Martínez's "Deconstructing Puerto Ricanness through Sexuality: Female Counternarratives on Puerto Rican Identity." This essay explores some of the tensions among Puerto Rican women on the basis of class, race, and political ideology, referred to in Jiménez-Muñoz's text, through the literary texts of two women novelists of diverse class and ideological positions. Martínez follows a double strategy in the reading of these texts in order to foreground the difficulties of incorporating "women" into hegemonic national narratives during the early twentieth century. The first strategy focuses on comparing the texts of working-class internationalist Luisa Capetillo and bourgeois nationalist Ana Roque. Capetillo as an internationalist worker organizer is a dissenting voice in the articulation of the "nation," but the explicitly nationalist narrative by Roque is also incapable of assigning one (unitary) subject position to all women. The second strategy reads women's previously ignored voices against the canonical male literary proto-nationalist production (exemplified by Antonio S. Pedreira and novelist Manuel Zeno Gandía), thus calling into question the alleged continuity of a national project in Puerto Rico from the late nineteenth century to the mid-1930s.

The texts by Martínez and Jiménez propose that Puerto Rican women have made use of a wide range of representational (textual and political) practices without restricting themselves to nationalist discourses. In this process, women's locations, desires, and subjectivities are revealed as multiple, contradictory, and not reducible to the colonial and nationalist discourses that have historically sought to contain them (that is, the reproductive, the body to be seduced). In this sense, even when it

can be argued that Puerto Ricans constitute a national formation of a specific kind, national narratives often collide with each other. Thus, while each narrative may have the attributes and continuity of the subject,⁴⁴ they often articulate different subjects altogether or contradictions within the subject, only superficially equated by the categories of language.

In part fostered by a relatively large "sexilio"⁴⁵ to the metropolis and a growing public discourse around sexuality generated by the AIDS epidemic, Puerto Rican gay and lesbian cultural production and scholarship are currently producing some of the most challenging readings of cultural identity, nationalism, colonialism, gender, and migration. Thus, in Manuel Guzmán's "Pa' La Escuelita con Mucho Cuida'o y por la Orillita," the strategies for Latino cultural resistance are articulated through the experiences of Latino gays and lesbians who patronize New York's most long-lasting bar, "The Little School." At the same time, Guzmán's analysis of La Escuelita as a site of resistance is intertwined with a personal narrative of identity, producing a new form of narrative in Puerto Rican historiography that refers to multiple levels of experience usually articulated as dichotomous (high culture/popular culture, the personal/political, Puerto Rican/gringo). Through writing the subject as unstable, Guzmán ultimately abandons the category of "Puerto Rican realness" (discarded as a social "malaise") in order to affirm an ethnic/sexual hyphenated identity not contemplated by either hegemonic accounts of migration or national identity. Within this formulation, Latino gay codes of resistance can articulate other forms of cultural syncretism, including the formation of a multi-Latino cultural imaginary (that is, through the use of drag as an encoder of sexual and cultural memory), further stretching the borders of Latin American (queer) "nations" beyond nationalism.

Puerto Ricans' *Jaiba* Politics

The crisis of both nationalist and pro-colonial discourses, the potential American disavowal of its responsibility in (re)producing deteriorating Puerto Rican possibilities, the emergence of new social movements, and the hegemony of transtatal capitalism beg the burning question of participation and transformation. What are some strategies for effective and transformative political participation? How can we begin to deconstruct the colonialism/nationalism dichotomy in our political praxis in order to open other possibilities? Are broad-based coalitions beyond nationalism and colonialism possible? We think so. Majority responses to both na-

tionalist and colonialist discourses during the past fifty years have insisted on an ambiguous and guarded position that articulates a politics of caution that can serve as the basis for a different kind of anticolonial politics. This practice, often referred to locally as *jaibería*, anticipates current postmodern debates and concepts such as "mimicry without identification"⁴⁶ and "postmodernist parody."⁴⁷

Decades before the emergence of postmodernism, Puerto Rican popular sectors developed political strategies very close to what today some theorists refer to as "postmodernist" politics and culture. It can be argued that Puerto Ricans during the twentieth century have often deployed a strategy of "mimicry" (adoption of "American" discourses and styles) to struggle against the most oppressive elements of colonial rule. In using this term, we do not mean to erase historical junctures of confrontations with the U.S. regime, particularly during the 1930s and 1970s, when pro-independence nationalist organizing was a crucial part of setting the tone for later negotiations between the United States and the Popular Democratic Party. What we aim to point out, however, is that the strategy of mimicry has been historically and consistently successful in obtaining political concessions that have resulted in the improvement of everyday life for Puerto Ricans.

According to Diana Fuss in her essay on Frantz Fanon,⁴⁸ there is a tendency within postcolonial and psychoanalytic discourse to distinguish between the practices of mimicry and masquerade. While in psychoanalysis, masquerade is understood as the unconscious assumption of a role, mimicry, according to Homi K. Bhabha, is understood as a colonial strategy of subjugation. Fuss, however, stresses that there can be a mimicry of subversion where the deliberate performance of a role does not entail identification. The performance's contexts thus become crucial in determining its subversive potential:

But the point to be registered is that imitation may either institute or gratify an unconscious identification, it can and does frequently exceed the logic of that identification. Put another way, identification with the other is neither a necessary precondition nor an inevitable outcome of imitation. For Fanon, it is politically imperative to insist upon an instrumental difference between imitation and identification, because it is precisely politics that emerges in the dislocated space between them.⁴⁹

It is significant for our proposals that in both Fanon's and Fuss's texts, the most powerful example of subversive mimicry is that of the Al-

gerian nationalist woman militant who “passes” as a Europeanized subject in order to advance the cause of national liberation. We can associate this mimicry of subversion with women not because women necessarily do it more often (or better) than men but because femininity itself is coded as artifice while masculinity is the “natural” (non-imitative) term of the polarity. Thus, to suggest a “feminization” of Puerto Rican politics at this juncture is to suggest that neither confrontation nor a rational discourse of the benefits of Puerto Rico to the United States will result in any positive changes to the current situation. We are affirming that those strategies associated with women by the patriarchal imagination are part of the anticolonialist discursive arsenal for rethinking a reflexive and seductive Puerto Rican politics. As Grosfoguel has written elsewhere,

Rather than seeking to violently impose its will in sterile confrontations that lead to self-destruction, a feminization of political practices would deploy a pragmatic and realistic style of politics which stems from the recognition that peripheral countries are in an unequal relationship of power, constraining the possibility of achieving every objective.⁵⁰

“Feminization” here is not inscribed in the traditional colonial discourses’ binary opposition of colonial subjects/feminine versus imperial power/masculine. Instead, feminization refers to a nonessentialist political strategy that has been practiced by many oppressed subjects (organized through different categories such as men, women, gays, lesbians, Afro-Americans, Afro-Caribbeans) in diverse contexts of extreme subordination and repression in the metropolis as well as in the periphery. In the Caribbean context, a patriarchal imaginary of virility and confrontational politics has mediated left-wing political strategies whose outcomes have normally been political defeat and economic disaster. Thus, a “feminization” of political practices refers to a positive resignification, generalization, and extension of political strategies such as seduction, ambiguity, and negotiation, associated historically with women in patriarchal discourses, to a wide range of political struggles.⁵¹ It is the strategy of those forced to struggle in the terrain of the adversary. This strategy is especially relevant in the present context of globalization where there is no absolute “outside” to transtatal capitalism.⁵²

A strategy of Puerto Rican “mimicry” without identification is perhaps one of the most viable means of demanding U.S. responsibility and

decolonization without losing a sense of autonomy from the United States. The recent devastation of the AIDS epidemic, commented on by Alberto Sandoval Sánchez, is also an important context in which to examine how Puerto Ricans have used colonialist resources and discourses for their benefit at the same time that radical transformation faces the limits of colonialism.⁵³ It is, however, precisely within these ambiguities and tensions that political theories for new political projects must be sought, not in the master narratives of independence and nationalism—except if they prove to be useful, which at this point they have not.

The notion of postmodern parody holds a similar allure as a trope for Puerto Rican politics since, according to Linda Hutcheon, this concept allows for a complicitous critique (or in Grosfoguel’s term, “subversive complicity”)⁵⁴ where cultural practice articulates a critique of capitalist societies within the terms of that society:

What I mean by “parody” here—as elsewhere in this study—is *not* the ridiculing imitation of the standard theories and definitions that are rooted in eighteenth-century theories of wit. The collective weight of parodic *practice* suggests a redefinition of parody as repetition with critical distance that allows ironic signalling of difference at the very heart of similarity.⁵⁵

Puerto Rican political practice does not posit an “outside” to capitalist and consumer relations but rather parodies them through the articulation of diverse postwork subjectivities, illegal forms of work, and hustling of diverse state-generated incomes.⁵⁶ Puerto Rican postwork subjectivity is created by the confluence of lacking access to salaried work, high consumption habits generated by an increased standard of living, and the United States’ need to maintain Puerto Rico as a showcase for the rest of the world, even when they must subsidize the show. The fact that Puerto Ricans feel “entitled” to federal transfers entails both a recognition that “work” is increasingly unavailable in postindustrial societies and that under capitalist organization work is in fact a somewhat “undesirable” activity offering low wages and little satisfaction. Within this context, diverse claims to “enjoyment” rather than work may (there is no guarantee) become a proposal for a postwork, postcapitalist society. Another proposal is to reduce labor time from eight to six hours per day, without a reduction in salary. This could reduce unemployment by increasing the availability of jobs.⁵⁷

Entitlement and a postwork attitude among Puerto Ricans do not

remit us to racist perceptions of Puerto Ricans as lazy and therefore reluctant to exercise citizenship rights. It is instead a stance against a capitalist division of work in which it seems preferable to fake an illness to obtain Social Security benefits than to become sick or to age prematurely working at a polluting factory or maddening Fordist assembly line, and to claim citizenship rights to obtain some state income than to continue unemployed searching for a fictitious or nonexistent job in a deindustrialized city. This pragmatic assertion is not a celebration—it does not necessarily entail a practice of collective transformation—but it refers to some of the specific strategies used by Puerto Ricans in negotiating the system in its own terms. Social rights are an important component of citizen's rights that in a postindustrial/postwork society should be expanded in order to include a social salary for those marginalized from the labor force. Unable to produce new sources of jobs, deindustrialized countries such as France, where the RMI (Revenue Minimum d'Insertion) program provides a social salary for the unemployed, recognize social rights. However, in a Protestant-work-ethic society like the United States, not only do these programs not exist, but those few programs that exist to ameliorate the social conditions of the marginalized population are under a constant threat of eradication. In this sense, Puerto Rican entitlement attitudes and postwork subjectivity imply a pragmatic resistance to capitalism and colonialism and an assumption that there is no outside/inside dichotomy nor an outside to consumer culture. Yet, this pragmatic recognition has made survival *and* subversion possible, despite its contradictions. As Hutcheon suggests,

It must be admitted from the start that this is a strange kind of critique, one bound up, too, with its own complicity *with* power and domination, one that acknowledges that it cannot escape implication in that which it nevertheless still wants to analyze and maybe even undermine.⁵⁸

Lastly, the popular tradition of *jaibertia* provides us with an indigent metaphor for an attitude toward negotiation and transformation. The word *jaibertia* has its origins in the term *jaiba*, or mountain crab, who in going forward moves sideways. Within the Puerto Rican usage, *jaibertia* refers to collective practices of nonconfrontation and evasion (the “*unjú*,” roughly translated as “sure . . . no problem”), of taking dominant discourse literally in order to subvert it for one's purpose, of doing whatever one sees fit not as a head-on collision (“winning” is impossible)

but a bit under the table, that is, through other means. This form of addressing power has been the subject of much enraged nationalist writing. Antonio S. Pedreira referred to it as a “verbal contraband” and “ill-intentioned malice.”⁵⁹ Puerto Rican patriot José de Diego, for example, deplored the lack of virility implicit in the Puerto Rican's inability to say “no” as a reprehensible Puerto Rican political and cultural habit:

Generally, a Puerto Rican never . . . knows how to say NO: “We'll see,” “I'll study the issue,” “I'll deal with it later.” When a Puerto Rican uses these expressions one must understand that he is saying NO, although at most, he is linking the YES to the NO, and making from an affirmative and a negative adverb a conditional conjunction, ambiguous, nebulous, in which the will fluctuates . . . like an aimless bird without a nest over the plains of a desert.⁶⁰

Mid-twentieth-century writer René Marqués popularized this ambiguity as a negative “trait” in his infamous essay “El puertorriqueño dócil” (“The Docile Puerto Rican”).⁶¹ In this sense, ambiguity, lack of virility, and ambivalence have often all been noted by nationalist writers to explain Puerto Ricans' inability to form a nation-state. In our formulation, these three traits are revalorized as useful resources in negotiating colonialism and subordination, although often with less than ideal results. As Doris Sommer has argued, “Why is it political only to resist? Are deals never struck, concessions never made? . . . Is there no—perhaps postmodern—politics that acknowledges insoluble tensions as dynamic sites of construction?”⁶² It is also important to note that there can be purely complicit uses of *jaibertia* that fail to advance any collective agenda. Yet, *jaibertia* as a form of complicitous critique or subversive complicity points to an acknowledgment of being in a disadvantaged position within a particular field of power. A nonheroic position, *jaibertia* favors endurance over physical strength, and privileges ambiguity over clarity. Although it has been mistaken for docility, it is instead an active, low-intensity strategy to obtain the maximum benefits of a situation with the minimum blood spilled.

The proposed reframing of these questions is advanced not only by “postmodernist” theorists but also by other scholars such as Immanuel Wallerstein⁶³ when he criticizes the old left liberal ideology of acquiring state power and rationally managing the difficulties of the system for the benefit of all. This liberal strategy has tended to destroy antisystemic social movements, transforming them into conservative nation-state

institutions trapped in a developmentalist illusion. Given the failure of socialist liberalism, Wallerstein suggests other ways to contest capitalist hegemony:

A multi-front strategy by a multiplicity of groups, each complex and internally democratic, will have one tactical weapon at its disposal which may be overwhelming for the defenders of the status quo. It is the weapon of taking the old liberal ideology literally and demanding its universal fulfillment . . . one can push on every front for the increased democratization of decision-making, as well as the elimination of all pockets of informal and unacknowledged privilege. What I am talking about here is the tactic of overloading the system by taking its pretensions and its claims more seriously than the dominant forces wish them to be taken. This is exactly the opposite of the tactic of managing the difficulties of the system.⁶⁴

The tactic of taking the old liberal ideology "literally" and demanding its universal fulfillment is a form of parodic or mimetic politics. It is the strategy practiced today not only by the Sandinistas in Nicaragua and the FMLN in El Salvador but also in Puerto Rico since the turn of the century.⁶⁵ Many social movements in Puerto Rico during the twentieth century practiced such a "postmodern" or *jaiberta* strategy by literally adopting metropolitan discourse and demanding civil rights already recognized in the metropolitan constitution.⁶⁶

The notions of *jaiberta*, parody, and mimesis, however, all point to strategies that are most effective in contexts where Puerto Ricans are by far the most disempowered part of the equation.⁶⁷ The adoption of these practices is also a way of acknowledging the contemporary (worldwide) political defeat of alternative political and cultural propositions "outside capitalism" that are potentially more egalitarian.⁶⁸ If mass movements contesting the current geopolitical and economic hegemonies throughout the world existed, our reading of the situation would clearly be different. Unfortunately, given the current coordinates of power, Puerto Ricans must develop strategies to address the growing deterioration of everyday life, both on the island and in the United States, by seeking increased representation within the centers of power. Puerto Rico's complex set of problems, unlike the political parties seem to suggest, will not be solved by the victory of any "ideal" (Commonwealth, independence, or statehood). None of the dominant political "solutions" (or "formulas" as they are interestingly called) scratch the surface of the power inequities that will remain after any political change in definition. These

proposals will only rearrange the current players' ability to administer a colony, neocolony, or impoverished U.S. state.

The task of reimagining Puerto Rican politics is, of course, not free of particular ideologies or contextual constraints. A further difficulty is the sense among postmodernist intellectuals that in some ways Puerto Ricans have the dubious honor of being "postcolonial" colonial subjects. Thus, how can a postcolonial politics be imagined as a basis for a political practice without falling into the trap of altogether ignoring the fact that Puerto Rico is a colonial configuration? In this sense, intellectuals invested in a decolonization project for Puerto Ricans must seek models that speak to the specific ambiguities of our location. The essays in this collection contribute to this ongoing and inconclusive debate.

Notes

We would like to thank Doris Sommer, Ada Muntaner, Mariano Negrón-Portillo, and Julio Ramos for their thoughtful comments on and recommendations for this introductory text.

1. For a cinematic treatment and partial pretexts to this book, see Frances Negrón-Muntaner's films/videos *Brincando el charco: Portrait of a Puerto Rican* (1994, distributed by Women Make Movies and the Independent Television Service), *Puerto Rican I.D.* (1995, distributed by Signal to Noise and the Independent Television Service), and *Homeless Diaries* (1996, distributed by Receding Coastline Pictures).

2. Arcadio Díaz Quiñones, *La memoria rota* (Río Piedras: Huracán, 1993).

3. The Estado Libre Asociado, founded in 1952, made Puerto Rico a self-managed colonial possession. It created a parliament (house of representatives and senate) and allowed for popular elections for all local government posts. However, Puerto Rico's insertion into the American body politic is determined by its inclusion in the Constitution's territorial clause, which clearly states that all local decisions can be mandated by Congress. The sole Puerto Rican representative in Congress had (and still has) no vote.

4. An example of this is the recent eradication of the 936 Section of the U.S. Internal Revenue Code exempting U.S. corporations from paying federal taxes on profit remittances from the island to the mainland. The program will phase out by the year 2006.

5. This is an ironic pun on the official slogan affirming that Puerto Rico is the "shining star of the Caribbean." For a critique of this official ideology, see Poli Marichal, *Burundanga Boricua*, video, 1987.

6. Ramón Grosfoguel, "Plebiscitos, 'colonias modernas,' y el Caribe," *Diálogo*, Mar. 1996, 27.

7. Ramón Grosfoguel, "Feminizando la política," *El Nuevo Día*, July 24, 1990, 51.

8. For a further discussion of this conceptualization, see Ramón Grosfoguel, "Caribbean Colonial Immigrants in the Metropoles: A Research Agenda," *Centro 7*, 1 (1995): 82-95.

9. Patrick L. Baker, *Centring the Periphery: Chaos, Order and the Ethnohistory of Dominica* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1994), 59.

10. Grosfoguel, "Plebiscitos, 'colonias modernas,' y el Caribe."

11. Ramón Grosfoguel, "El Caribe y la 'Independencia realmente existente,'" *Diálogo*, May 1996, 26.
12. Miriam Muñoz, "Más allá de Puerto Rico 936, Puerto Rico USA y Puerto Rico INC: Notas para una crítica al discurso del desarrollo," *Bordes* 1 (1995): 54-66.
13. Matthew Carr, "El Salvador: Two Cheers for Democracy," *Race and Class* 36, 1 (1994): 6.
14. As quoted in Ramón Grosfoguel, "Suicidio o Redefinición," *El Nuevo Día*, June 25, 1990, 55; and Grosfoguel, "Feminizando la política," 51.
15. Orlando Patterson, "The Culture of Caution," *New Republic*, Nov. 27, 1995, 26.
16. Ramón Grosfoguel, "Confesiones de un Alienado," *El Nuevo Día*, July 24, 1990, 51.
17. William Branigin, "Palau Independent of United States," *Philadelphia Inquirer*, Oct. 3, 1994, 8.
18. Carlos Pabón, "De Albizu a Madonna: Para armar y desarmar la modernidad," *Bordes* 1 (1995): 22-40.
19. Immanuel Wallerstein, "The Concept of National Development, 1917-1989: Elegy and Requiem," *American Behavioral Scientist* 35, 4/5 (Mar.-June 1992): 517.
20. Jacques Lacan, *Ecrits* (New York: W. W. Norton and Co., 1977), 1-7.
21. Celeste Olalquiaga, *Megalopolis: Contemporary Cultural Sensibilities* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1992), 84.
22. For further discussion regarding different articulations of racist ideologies, see Darcy Ribeiro and Mercio Gomes, "Ethnicity and Civilization," *Dialectical Anthropology* 21 (1996): 217-38.
23. Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities* (London: Verso, 1983), 15.
24. Rajagopalan Radhakrishnan, *Diasporic Mediations: Between Home and Location* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996), xxiv.
25. María Milagros López, "Post-Work Selves and Entitlement Attitudes in Peripheral Post-Industrial Puerto Rico," *Social Text* 38 (spring 1994): 111-33.
26. A few decades ago, Puerto Ricans in the Northeast could claim a sense of "territory" within the metropolis since most migrants settled in New York. New migration patterns, however, are destabilizing these spatial correlations, thus making the migratory experience increasingly deterritorialized/reterritorialized.
27. For a discussion on colonial/racial domination as it applies to Puerto Ricans in the United States, see Ramón Grosfoguel and Chloé S. Georas, "The Racialization of Latino Caribbean Migrants in the New York Metropolitan Area," *Centro* 8, 1-2 (1996): 190-201.
28. Aníbal Quijano, "América Latina en la economía mundial," unpublished manuscript, 1993. For a discussion on the use of Quijano's concept "coloniality of power" as it applies to Puerto Ricans on the island, see Kelvin Santiago-Valles, "On the Historical Links between Coloniality, the Violent Production of the 'Native' Body, and the Manufacture of Pathology," *Centro* 7, 1 (1995): 108-18; as it applies to Puerto Ricans in the United States, see Grosfoguel and Georas, "The Racialization of Latino Caribbean Migrants."
29. Grosfoguel and Georas, "The Racialization of Latino Caribbean Migrants."
30. Nelson Glazer and Daniel P. Moynihan, *Beyond the Melting Pot: The Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Jews, Italians, and Irish of New York City* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1963).
31. Grosfoguel and Georas, "The Racialization of Latino Caribbean Migrants."
32. *Ibid.*
33. *Ibid.*
34. The literature on migration and ethnic relations has traditionally treated Puerto Ricans as an ethnic group. The conceptualization of Puerto Ricans as a new racial category in the social imaginary of white Americans distinct from Asians, Blacks, or Native Ameri-

cans is developed in Grosfoguel and Georas, "The Racialization of Latino Caribbean Migrants."

35. For a critique of Puerto Rican representations in a variety of mediums, including mainstream and independent films during the past four decades, see Frances Negrón-Muntaner, *Passing Memories: Puerto Ricans and Assimilation to American Culture and Politics*, unpublished manuscript. For a more in-depth look at *West Side Story*, see Alberto Sandoval, "A Puerto Rican Reading of 'America': *West Side Story*," *Jump Cut* 39 (1994): 59-66.
36. Grosfoguel and Georas, "The Racialization of Latino Caribbean Migrants."
37. See Kelvin Santiago, *Subject People and Colonial Discourses* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1994); and Blanca Vázquez, "Puerto Ricans and the Media: A Personal Statement," *Centro* 3, 1 (1991): 5-15.
38. This point is developed in Grosfoguel and Georas, "The Racialization of Latino Caribbean Migrants."
39. *Ibid.*
40. *Ibid.*
41. *Ibid.*
42. Richard Harvey Brown, "Cultural Representation and State Formation: Discourses of Ethnicity, Nationality, and Political Community," *Dialectical Anthropology* 21 (1996): 265-97.
43. "An Interview with Rigoberta Menchú Tum," *NACLA*, 29, 6 (May/June 1996): 6-10, 8.
44. Etienne Balibar, "The Nation Form: History and Ideology," in Etienne Balibar and Immanuel Wallerstein, eds., *Race, Nation, Class: Ambiguous Identities* (New York: Verso, 1988).
45. The term *sexile*, coined by Manuel Guzmán, refers to a specifically gay and lesbian island migration to the United States. These migrants point to homophobia as part of their decision to migrate.
46. Diana Fuss, "Interior Colonies: Frantz Fanon and the Politics of Identification," *Diacritics* 24 (summer-fall 1994): 20-42.
47. Linda Hutcheon, *The Politics of Postmodernism* (London: Routledge, 1989).
48. Fuss, "Interior Colonies."
49. *Ibid.*, 28-29.
50. Grosfoguel, "Feminizando la política," 51; translation by the author.
51. *Ibid.*
52. *Ibid.*
53. The AIDS crisis underlines both Puerto Rico's colonial situation in relation to the United States and the possibility of transferring resources from the United States to Puerto Rico to combat the epidemic. Thus, the "air bridge" functioned in multiple ways: migration of HIV-positive Puerto Ricans to the United States in search of better medical treatment and support networks, formation of activist communities linking U.S. and island-based AIDS activists, sharing of resources and information, and return migration of people with AIDS from the United States to Puerto Rico. For further discussion of the ACT-UP/San Juan air-bridge phenomenon, see Frances Negrón-Muntaner's interviews with Robert Vázquez and Juan David Acosta, "Surviving Cultures: A Dialogue on AIDS and Gay Latino Politics," *Centro* 6, 2/3 (1994): 115-27; Luis "Popo" Santiago, "Twenty Years of Puerto Rican Gay Activism," *Radical America* 25, 1 (1993): 39-51; and Moisés Agosto's intervention in the film *Brincando el charco: Portrait of a Puerto Rican*.
54. Grosfoguel, "Feminizando la política," 51.
55. Linda Hutcheon, *A Poetics of Postmodernism: History, Theory, Fiction* (London: Routledge, 1988), 26.

56. María Milagros López, "Post-Work Selves and Entitlement Attitudes in Peripheral Post-Industrial Puerto Rico."

57. For a discussion on new technologies, joblessness, and new postwork alternatives, see Stanley Aronowitz and William DiFazio, *The Jobless Future* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994).

58. Linda Hutcheon, *The Politics of Postmodernism*, 4.

59. Antonio S. Pedreira, *Insularismo* (Río Piedras: Editorial Edil, 1973).

60. José de Diego, "No," in *Obras Completas Tomo II* (San Juan: Editorial del Instituto de Cultura, 1966), 18. Translated by the authors.

61. René Marqués, *Ensayos* (Río Piedras: Editorial Antillana, 1972).

62. Doris Sommer, "Puerto Rico: A flote desde Hostos hasta hoy," unpublished paper.

63. Immanuel Wallerstein, "The Collapse of Liberalism," in Ralph Miliband and Leo Panitch, eds., *The Socialist Register 1992* (London: Merlin Press, 1992).

64. *Ibid.*, 110.

65. For a discussion of this strategy in the context of Latin America, see Ramón Grosfoguel, "From Cepalismo to Neoliberalism: A World-Systems Approach to Conceptual Shifts in Latin America," *Review* (Journal of the Fernand Braudel Center) 14, 2 (1996): 131-54.

66. Grosfoguel, "Suicidio o Redefinición," 55; and "Feminizando la política," 51.

67. *Ibid.*

68. Grosfoguel, "From Cepalismo to Neoliberalism."

PART ONE

Challenging Nationalism

