

*THE BORDERS OF
DOMINICANIDAD*



Race, Nation, and Archives of Contradiction

LORGIA GARCÍA-PEÑA

*THE BORDERS OF
DOMINICANIDAD*

Race, Nation, and Archives of Contradiction

LORGIA GARCÍA-PEÑA

Duke University Press

Durham and London

2016

© 2016 Duke University Press
All rights reserved
Printed in the United States of
America on acid-free paper ∞
Typeset in Garamond Premier Pro
by Graphic Composition, Inc.,
Bogart, Georgia

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: García-Peña, Lorgia, [date] author.

Title: The borders of Dominicanidad : race, nation, and archives
of contradiction / Lorgia García-Peña.

Description: Durham : Duke University Press, 2016. | Includes
bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2016021424 (print)

LCCN 2016023796 (ebook)

ISBN 9780822362470 (hardcover : alk. paper)

ISBN 9780822362623 (pbk. : alk. paper)

ISBN 9780822373667 (e-book)

Subjects: LCSH: Dominican Americans—Race identity. | Blacks—
Race identity—Dominican Republic. | Immigrants—United States—
Social conditions. | Race in mass media. | Dominican Republic—
Relations—Haiti. | Haiti—Relations—Dominican Republic. |
United States—Foreign relations—Dominican Republic—History. |
Dominican Republic—Foreign relations—United States—History.

Classification: LCC E184.D6 G36 2016 (print) | LCC E184.D6
(ebook) | DDC 327.7307293—dc23

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2016021424>

Cover art: Pepe Coronado, *US/DR en relación*, 2016

A MIS PADRES,

DOÑA MARITZA PEÑA Y DON TULIO GARCÍA,

Y A MIS HOMBRES,

JOHN GALLAGHER Y SEBASTIÁN GALLAGHER-GARCÍA.

GRACIAS POR DÁRMELO TODO. AQUÍ LES DEVUELVO UN CHIN.

CONTENTS

NOTE ON TERMINOLOGY ix

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS xi

INTRODUCTION Dominicanidad in *Contradiction* i

PART I. Founding the Archive

- 1 The Galindo Virgins: Violence and Repetition in the Archive of Dominicanidad 23
- 2 Of Bandits and Wenches: The US Occupation (1916–1924) and the Criminalization of Dominican Blackness 58
- 3 Speaking in Silences: Literary Interruptions and the Massacre of 1937 93

PART II. Diaspora Contradicts

- 4 *Rayano* Consciousness: Remapping the Haiti-DR Border after the Earthquake of 2010 129
- 5 Writing from El Nié: Exile and the Poetics of Dominicanidad *Ausente* 170

POSTSCRIPT Anti-Haitianism and the Global War on Blackness 203

NOTES 213

BIBLIOGRAPHY 247

INDEX 261



o.1 Map of the unified island of Hispaniola, 1822. Archivo General de la República, Santo Domingo.

NOTE ON TERMINOLOGY

The terms I use to label race and ethnicity of groups and individuals are incredibly complex given their specific meanings across historical moments and geographical spaces. The following is a list of some of the main identity terms I use throughout the book and a short explanation of how I use them:

- black:** I use “black” as a global category for naming peoples and cultures of African ancestry, recognizing that different nations and cultural groups utilize a diversity of terms to name their race.
- criollo:** Descendants of the Spanish colonial caste whose ancestry is white European.
- dominicanidad:** I employ the term as a theoretical category that refers to both the people who embrace the label “Dominican” whether or not they are considered Dominican citizens by the state (such as diasporic Dominicans and ethnic Haitians) and the history, cultures, and institutions associated with them. I opt to keep the Spanish-language spelling to avoid confusion with capitalized *Dominicanidad*, which refers to hegemonic and official institutions of state control.
- Dominicanyork:** Working-class Dominican migrants and their descendants who live in United States urban Dominican enclaves.
- ethnic Haitian:** A person of Haitian ancestry born in the Dominican Republic.
- Latina/o:** A term that describes people of Latin American descent living in the United States.
- mulato:** Refers to a mixed-race Dominican of light, medium, or dark brown skin. In the nineteenth century *mulato* was a category of privilege. I opted to keep the Spanish terminology because of its sociohistorical specificity.
- rayano:** A person from the geographical area of the Haitian-Dominican borderland also known as the *Línea Fronteriza*.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This book is the result of a long, deeply personal and incredibly rewarding journey. Like many first books, it began long ago as part of my doctoral training, and it has grown with me. I am thankful to see it mature and go out into the world, after many years of dedication and work. But of course, getting to this point required the support of many, including some of the people whose lives and work inform the chapters. My eternal gratitude and appreciation go first to Josefina Báez, whose performance work and writing kindled my curiosity way back when I was a college student at Rutgers University. My interest in her work was the seed that eventually grew into this book. Her friendship has been the most amazing reward. Gracias, mi hermana por tanta luz. The inventiveness of Rita Indiana Hernández; the *acciones* of David “Karmadavis” Pérez; and the literary gifts of Junot Díaz, Rey Andújar, Nelly Rosario, Loida Maritza Pérez, and Aurora Arias provided a road map for translating *dominicanidad* beyond the island and across a vast temporal span. The intellectual legacy of Juan Bosch served as a bridge between the often slippery here and there my book connects. It is my most sincere hope that the archive I created in this book honors their lives and the lives of Olivorio Mateo, Dominga Alcántara, the Andújar family, Sonia Marmolejos, and the many other actors who inform the stories and histories my book memorializes.

This project began while I was a doctoral student in the American Culture Program at the University of Michigan. Lawrence La Fountain-Stokes was incredibly supportive. Yolanda Martínez-San Miguel was an instrumental mentor and advisor. Jesse Hoffnung-Garskof and Richard Turits provided guidance as I began to explore the tensions between history and literature. The mentorship of Jossianna Arroyo, Mary Kelley, Carol Smith Rosenberg, and Julie Ellison and the tireless diligence of Marlene Moore made Michigan a nurturing place for me to grow intellectually and humanly. My friends Afia Ofori-Mensa, Brian Chung, Chris Finley, Danny Méndez, Dean Saranillo,

Heijin Lee, Lee Ann Wang, Kelly Sisson, Rachel Afi Queen, Sam Erman, and Tyler Cornelius gave me feedback and encouragement, pushing me to think about my project across disciplinary fields. Their love and support carried me during difficult times.

I am forever grateful for the guidance of historians Quisqueya Lora, Elizabeth Manley, and Raymundo González, who shared their knowledge and passion for Dominican history with me and taught me the nuts and bolts of conducting research in the Dominican National Archives. *Mil gracias por su apoyo, amistad y generosidad.*

I had incredible support for the various technical aspects of the manuscript preparation. Juleyka Lantigua and Megan Bayles cut many long sentences in two, supplied multiple commas, erased extra ones, and gave me fair doses of “what is this?” that ultimately made the manuscript more accessible to readers. I am grateful for their editorial support. Kilia Llano made the maps and illustrations. Pepe Coronado took my argument to heart and turned it into a beautiful cover image, and Achy Obejas checked many of the translations. I would simply not have been able to complete this enormous task without the tireless assistance of Chantell Smith Limerick, whose incredible availability, careful edits, diligence, and overall kindness made me feel accompanied through the often lonesome process of writing. I am sure she is in tears reading these words as I am while I write them.

A Ford Foundation dissertation fellowship allowed me to spend a year conducting research at the Dominican National Archive in Santo Domingo. A Future of Minority Studies postdoctoral fellowship was instrumental in beginning the revisions for the book. The Willson Center Research Fellowship at the University of Georgia allowed me to have time to complete a first draft of the manuscript, and the Milton Grant at Harvard University provided me with financial support to conduct the final research trips to Santo Domingo, Washington, DC, and New York.

Along the way I have found incredibly generous mentors who have read the book carefully and provided valuable feedback and guidance. Nicole Guidotti-Hernández and Silvio Torres-Saillant went above and beyond reading several versions of the manuscript, meeting with me on multiple occasions in multiple locations, and providing both intellectual and moral support every step of the way. To the two of them I am forever indebted. *Hay un poco de ustedes dos en este libro.* My friend Dana Bultman was the first to read a very early draft of the manuscript. She patiently asked important questions and suggested edits and revisions that really pushed me in the right

direction. Her enthusiasm for my work carried me at a moment when I most needed it. Laura Gutiérrez was instrumental in pushing me to think about the body as site of intellectual inquiry. Chandra Talpade-Mohanty made a home for me at Syracuse University during the early stages of writing. Along with Linda Carty, Myrna García Calderón, and Silvio Torres-Saillant, she provided an intellectually stimulating forum for exchanges and discussions. It was during those weeks that I was able to draft a blueprint for the book.

My colleagues in the Department of Romance Languages and Literatures at the University of Georgia hosted a presentation that generated important questions informing chapters 3 and 4. Pam Voekel, Betina Kaplan, Jan Pendergrass, Kelly Happy, Lesley Feracho, Judith Ortiz-Cofer, and Nicolás Lucero encouraged my writing amidst the life juggles of my first academic position. I am indebted also to my friends and colleagues at Harvard University—Genevieve Clutario, Lauren Kaminsky, Kirsten Weld, Robin Bernstein, Mariano Siskind, Mayra Rivera Rivera, Alejandro de la Fuente, Mary Gaylord, Kay Shelemay, Joe Blackmore, Jill Lepore, and Ju Yon Kim. Thanks to the scholars and staff at the Dominican Studies Institute, particularly Sarah Aponte, Anthony Stevens, Jacqueline Jiménez Polanco, and Ramona Hernández, and to transnational Hispaniola scholars April Mayes, Raj Chetty, Maya Horn, Arturo Victoriano, Carlos Decena, Néstor Rodríguez, and Ginetta Candelario, who all provided key advice and expertise. Special thanks to the Duke University Press anonymous reviewers for the insightful comments and to Courtney Berger for believing in this project and seeing it to fruition.

The support of my Latino/a studies and ethnic studies community across the United States was crucial throughout the years. Their feedback, questions, letters, and hugs gave this book and me a home in the field of inquiry that had nurtured my scholarship. Gracias Irene Mata, Ondine Chavoya, Arlene Dávila, Lourdes Torres, Josie Saldaña, Adriana Zavala, Deborah Pacini Hernández, Camila Stevens, Vanessa Pérez-Rosario, Marisel Moreno, Ben Sifuentes-Jáuregui, Lisa Lowe, Patricia Herrera, George Lipsitz, Christen Smith, Barbara Ransby, Frances Aparicio and Israel Reyes for being on my side.

I could have never completed this book without the love and support of my *mujeres*: Nuna Marcano, Josefina Báez, Eric Gómez, Daryelin Torres, Adnaloy Espinosa, Nimsi Guzmán, Indhira García, María Scharbay, Laura Catelli, and Afia Ofori-Mensa. And my dear friends and biggest supporters Junot Díaz, David Tábora, Julie Tábora, Alex Guerrero, and the rest of you

who will be angry I forgot to mention your name but will celebrate with me just the same. Ustedes saben que el resto es la selva.

My family may have not always completely understood what I was doing or why, but they were supportive just the same in more ways than words can ever describe. Thank you to my brothers, Albin García Peña and Kerwin García Peña, for taking care of me, for working so I could read, for often carrying a heavier burden so I did not have to. Thank you to my sister, Vashti Nicolas, por añorarme toda la vida. To my nieces and nephews for their love and laughter. To my cousins in the Dominican Republic—Eliezer, Abel, and Iván Doñé—for chasing after books for me and coming to see my talks, in often hostile environments. Gracias por nunca juzgarme. To my aunts Dorcas and Sarah Peña for the right doses of *moros* and bachatas, particularly on those frustrating days of long blackouts that made my research impossible, and to my dearest uncle, Claudio Doñé, por quererme tanto.

Thank you to my parents for giving me all they had, for having faith in me, and for encouraging me, even when our worlds seem opposite and strange, to keep going forward in a direction that often took me away from them and closer to myself. Your unconditional, absolute love and support is all anyone could ever need. My father, Don Tulio García, introduced me to books and taught me to love words and language. My mother, Doña Maritza Peña, taught me the true meaning of the phrase “sí se puede.” She modeled how to stand up for what was right and how to talk back, particularly when everyone is trying to silence us. Gracias por tu valor, mami.

But my deepest and eternal gratitude is for my partner in all adventures, John Paul Gallagher, and our beautiful son, Sebastián. John made me coffee every morning, ran out to buy ink, chased away imaginary and real demons, and clapped in cheer every time I read him a new chapter, a new page, a new paragraph. Sebastián grounded me and opened a new world of that which is possible. With him in my arms, I began to write this book. I finished it to the beat of his bouncing ball in the backyard. I am grateful I sacrificed nothing of you to write this book. I am grateful I always put you first. John and Sebastián, it is because of you two that I am. And this book, as you both know, I wrote with and for you.

My last words of gratitude are for my students across the multiple institutions I have been part of over the last ten years, but most important, my Freedom University students, who challenged me and gave me a home when I most needed one. Gomabseubnida. Gracias. Thank you.

INTRODUCTION

Dominicanidad in *Contradiction*

During my first semester of graduate school at the University of Michigan, I attended a gathering aimed at connecting graduate students of color with university resources. Upon hearing me speak Spanish to a friend, a professor asked where I was from. Understanding he was not interested in my New Jersey upbringing, but rather in figuring out the origins of my ethnicity and Spanish-speaking abilities, I told him I was born in the Dominican Republic. The professor smiled and said to me: “Ah, *dominicana*! I love your country! Good rum and cheap whores!” I excused myself and abandoned the gathering.

As I walked home that night my body shook with a combination of anger, indignation, and confusion. Why did the professor think it appropriate to refer to my birth country in such aggressive terms? What logic made it possible for him to associate me, a doctoral student, with his hedonistic escapades to the tropics? The dynamics at play in the professor’s diction are foundational to some of the basic questions this book raises.

Given my scholarly training and my preoccupation with the production of dominicanidad at home and abroad, the encounter with the professor prompted a more urgent questioning of the multiple ways in which silences and repetitions operate in the erasure of racialized Dominican subjects from the nation and its archive. Those silences, as my encounter with the professor shows, are then filled with fantasies that reflect colonial desires and fears.¹ Through a colonizing gaze, the professor replaced my (Dominican) subjectivity with the symbolic tropes of colonial desire: “good rum and cheap whores.” Yet as I reflect on what is still a very troubling encounter, I recognize that my body, by its mere positioning within the academic space, also interrupted the professor’s “knowledge” of dominicanidad.

In many ways, this book is a project of recovering and historicizing knowledge interruptions through what I call *contradictions*, “dictions”—sto-

ries, narratives, and speech acts—that go against the hegemonic version of national identity and against the mode of analysis we tend to value as historically accurate or what most people call truth. *The Borders of Dominicanidad* is concerned with the ways in which dictions are projected and performed on racialized bodies to sustain the exclusionary borders of the nation. Such acts of violent nation bordering are historically determined; yet they also require the complicity of citizens in the violent policing and erasure of racialized bodies. The professor's diction—"good rum and cheap whores"—summoned the historical nexus that has marked the relationship between my birth country, the Dominican Republic, and my adopted one, the United States. His diction encapsulates the unequal dynamics through which racialized immigrant and ethnic minority subjects are marked as perpetual others, becoming the carriers of two nations' exclusion—the one associated with their ethnicity and the one in which they reside.

Literary scholar Silvio Torres-Saillant argues that emigration for Dominicans is always a form of exile because the emigrants are forced to leave their homeland due to poverty and disenfranchisement: "Emigra quien no puede quedarse. . . . Nuestra emigración es una expatriación" (Those who emigrate do so because they cannot stay. . . . Our emigration is the same as expatriation).² I take Torres-Saillant's argument further by insisting that black Dominican migrants are exiles at home and abroad. They are symbolically and physically expunged from their home nation because they are black and poor, yet they remain unadmitted into their host nation for the same reasons. While "black" does not exist as an ethnically distinguished category in the Dominican Republic the way it does in the United States, being black (*prieto*, Haitian, or *rayano*) there inhibits social mobility through civic, political, and economic exclusion. A poor *prieto*, someone with dark brown skin, can easily be assigned the category of foreigner (*haitiano*). A poor *prieto* who migrates to the United States then becomes a Dominicanyork, her body doubly marked as black and foreign. The multiple geopolitical borders of *dominicanidad*—Haiti, the Dominican Republic, and the United States—become visible through the body of the racialized Dominican Latino/a. This dynamic made it possible for the professor to see in me his fantasy of *dominicanidad* despite my subject position as a US national.

The long and unequal relationship between the United States and the Dominican Republic has been relegated to the often unread margins of the US archive. Historians of American Empire, for instance, rarely include

the Dominican Republic in their study of the nineteenth-century expansion that led to the Louisiana Purchase (1803); the Annexation of Texas (1845); and the colonization of Puerto Rico, Cuba, and Guam after the Spanish-American War (1898). This omission exists despite the fact that the United States attempted to purchase Dominican territories between 1824 and 1884 and established unofficial military bases in the Dominican southwest region during the US military occupations of 1916–24.³

This Dominican “footnote condition,” which writer Junot Díaz allegorizes in his acclaimed novel *The Brief Wondrous Life of Oscar Wao* (2007), extends well beyond the historical archive of nineteenth-century US expansionism. In 2000, for instance, Dominicans became the fastest-growing ethnic group in New York City.⁴ Yet the media and advertisement industry rarely portrays Dominicans as exemplary of US Latinidad. Dominican blackness does not fit the colonial fantasy that makes the light-skinned version of Latino/a *mestizaje* marketable in the United States (as exemplified in actors Salma Hayek, Benicio del Toro, Antonio Banderas, and “The Most Interesting Man in the World”). The diversity of Latino/a ethnicities, languages, and cultures are thus replaced with the “repackaged” Latino/a—a concoction of stereotypes, fantasies, and historical figures associated with Spain and Mexico (bullfights and Cinco de Mayo)—that fulfills colonial desire for the foreign and exotic.⁵ Amidst such abysmal inequalities, my encounter with the professor, though incredibly enraging, is not surprising.

The Borders of Dominicanidad brings dominicanidad from the footnote to the center of the page, insisting on the impact of dictions on the national and racial identity of a people. The stories and histories upheld by nations and their dominant archive create marginality through acts of exclusion, violence, and silencing. Though these official stories of exclusion are influential in bordering the nation and shaping national identity, this book also shows they are always contested, negotiated, and even redefined through contradictions.

I see dominicanidad as a category that emerges out of the historical events that placed the Dominican Republic in a geographic and symbolic border between the United States and Haiti since its birth in 1844.⁶ Dominicanidad is thus inclusive of subjects as well as the dictions that produce them. It also encompasses multiple territories and ethnoracial identifications: Dominicanyork, *rayano*, *dominicano*, Afro-Dominican. Those, in turn, make up Dominican subjectivities across national spaces.⁷

Living in El Nié

In the United States, the Dominicanyork can be read as African American until the person's accent or ability to speak Spanish sets the individual apart as an *other* black. The Dominicanyork thus inhabits a space of dual marginality belonging to neither nation, a space artist Josefina Báez allegorizes as the “flagless nation” of “El Nié”: neither here nor there.⁸ But the ambivalence of El Nié is not unique to the Dominican diasporic experience. Gloria Anzaldúa writing in 1987, for instance, described her Tejana condition as one of such discomfort it could be equated to living on barbwire.⁹ Speaking about Puerto Rican transnationalism, novelist and critic Luis Rafael Sánchez in his seminal essay “La guagua aérea” (1994) called Puerto Rico a “flying bus.”¹⁰ Similarly, scholar Gustavo Pérez Firmat, also writing in 1994, theorized the Cuban American condition as “living on the hyphen.”¹¹ While highlighting the inherent discomfort of their particular liminalities, Anzaldúa, Sánchez, and Pérez Firmat hinted at an advantage awarded to the border-immigrant-transnational subject: They can serve as a bridge between two geographical, historical, and linguistic borders, contesting, as Anzaldúa would argue, “the unnatural historical boundaries” that prohibit human bodies from freely crossing between here and there.¹²

But the specificity of Dominican alterity allegorized through Báez's Nié—which also means, in its most vulgar sense, the “taint”—queers both the hegemonic narrative of the nation-state(s) and the very location of in-betweenness inhabited by Anzaldúa, Sánchez, and Pérez Firmat: “We all live in the same building. El Nié. My mother, my grandmother, la comadre—mi madrina, el ejemplo, la quiero a morir [my comadre—my godmother, the role model, I love her to death].”¹³ Through a diction that embodies and projects the very liminal experiences of the black Dominican and Dominicanyork subject the nation seeks to contain, Báez's Nié becomes a trans-historical location where the stories of exclusion can be recovered and preserved. El Nié signifies not the border space that the subject inhabits—Anzaldúa's the barbwire—but rather the body that carries the violent borders that deter them from entering the nation, from access to full citizenship and from public, cultural, historical, and political representation. Such act of border embodiment is a manifestation of Afro Dominican spirituality.

M. Jacqui Alexander's groundbreaking work *Pedagogies of Crossing* meditates on the role of the sacred Afro-religious traditions in the process of uncovering historical silences that produce oppression. She argues that the

body of the Afro-religious devotee can become a vessel from which the past, in the form of the dead, can come back offering truths.¹⁴ El Nié functions as an embodiment of past through present knowledge. It bridges Hispaniola colonial and diasporic experiences through the very body of the Dominican-york exile subject. Studies about transnationalism and migration typically look across national borders in order to propose subjects as ethnic minorities or unwanted foreigners, immigrants or emigrants, defining people through nations and in so doing, through a nation-bordering chronology. The symbolic space of El Nié expands our understanding of borders; it displaces the location and polarity of the nation-border, instead proposing the body as the location that contains and reflects national exclusion (borders) across history and generations.

The Borders of Dominicanidad investigates how individuals who inhabit El Nié grapple with the multiplicity of dictions, racial paradigms, and economic disparities sustained by the dominant narratives of the nation. This book asks: How does the Dominican racialized exile subject—the rayano; the exoticized, sexualized brown-skinned *dominicana*; the Dominican-york; and the Dominican migrant—contradict the hyphenated histories and stories that violently continue to silence them from the archives of the two nations it is charged with bridging? The intellectual impulse guiding my investigation derives from a preoccupation with the footnote condition that mutes Dominican plurality, silencing stories and histories from both US and Dominican archives. In that sense, this book is concerned with how dictions—that which is written, said, or described—impact the way people, particularly those considered ethnic minority, colonial, or racialized subjects, are imagined and produced across national paradigms.

Chicana feminists Gloria Anzaldúa and Cherríe Moraga called for a theorization “from the flesh” in order to contrast the epistemic violence that perpetually excluded minoritized people’s knowledge and histories from the archive.¹⁵ Following this call, critics Walter Mignolo and Nelson Maldonado-Torres have urged us to think from the position of suppressed and marginalized in order to “decolonize knowledge.”¹⁶ Though skepticism surrounds intellectual projects that are not solely evidence based, I argue that finding a more complete version of “the truth” requires us to read in contradiction, paying attention to the footnotes and silences left in the dominant archives. To do so, I follow Elizabeth Grosz’s groundbreaking proposition of the body as a central framework for the construction of subjectivity.¹⁷

If the body, as Grosz argues, can be a “thing” through which the domi-

nant rhetoric of sex and gender can be contested, I argue it can also be a site where the violence and silencing of the borders contained in the nation's archive can be *contradicted*. If the body of the racialized subject can carry the burden of coloniality (“good rum and cheap whores”), becoming a screen onto which colonial desires and fears can be projected, this book argues it can also become a site from where the histories and stories that perpetuate and sustain the oppressive borders of the nation can be interpellated.¹⁸ I propose the body—the racialized body of dominicanidad living in El Nié—as a site for negotiating the narratives of race, gender, and cultural belonging that operate in bordering the nation.

Race and Borders

The study of the US-Mexican border has been central in establishing the growing fields of border studies and Latino/a studies in the United States. Though the importance of the US-Mexican border is undeniable, my book invites the reader to think about how other geographical and symbolic borders have been significant in imagining the national identity of the United States, particularly as related to race (blackness) and ethnicity (Latinidad). The United States' centrality in the formation of Dominican racial discourse is key to my analysis of the different ways in which dictions have shaped how Dominicans negotiate racial identities and national belonging across geographical and symbolic borders.

The noun “border” alludes to tangible objects (a sign, a site, or even wall) that can arbitrate people's access and belonging to a particular territory. A border, though often invisible, can be named, crossed, and sometimes even erased. “Bordering,” on the other hand, evokes a continuum of actions that affect human beings. Bordering implies an actor (one who enacts the bordering) and a recipient (they who are bordered). As my experience with the professor shows, bordering can take place even when geographical markers are absent; bordering cannot be geographically contained.

This book suggests the border between Haiti and the Dominican Republic as a locus for understanding how race and nation intersect in the bordering of a people. As people and ideas travel back and forth, borders are reaffirmed, contested, and redefined through official and unofficial actions. Increased Haitian immigration to the Dominican Republic since the US intervention in Hispaniola (1914–34) and the massive Dominican emigration to the United States that began after the assassination of dictator Rafael

Leónidas Trujillo in 1961 largely shaped Dominican understanding of race and citizenship. *The Borders of Dominicanidad* insists on the centrality of the Haiti-DR border as a site that is both historically linked to and symbolically present in the United States through the body of the Dominican racialized immigrant/minority subject.

My repositioning of the Haiti-DR border within US history requires two disruptions of the current temporal and geographical notions guiding our understanding of race and ethnicity in the United States. The first disruption requires the reader to sustain the idea that “fear of Haiti”—the overwhelming concern that overtook slave economies like the United States and Spain following the slave revolt that began in 1791 and led to Haitian independence in 1804—is foundational to the production of US notions of race and citizenship. Fear of Haiti dominated the young and robust, slavery-driven US economy and determined the Empire’s relationship to the two Hispaniola republics.¹⁹

During the early years of the foundation of the Dominican Republic (1844–65), the United States supported the idea of Dominican racial superiority over Haiti and disavowed Haiti as racially inferior and thus unfit for self-government. This dichotomist view of the two Hispaniola nations shaped the relationship between the Dominican Republic and Haiti. It also shaped how the two nations and the relationship between them were imagined, and continue to be imagined and produced, across the globe.²⁰ Fear of Haiti combined with Dominican *criollo* colonial desire and the threat of US expansionism impelled nineteenth-century Dominican writers and patriots such as Félix María del Monte and Manuel de Jesús Galván to produce dominicanidad as a hybrid race that was decidedly other than black, and therefore different from Haiti’s blackness. They did so through literary and historical narratives of *mestizaje* that substituted notions of race (*mulato*, *prieto*) with nation (*dominicano*). The foundational myth of the Dominican hybrid nation has led to the continuous physical and epistemic violence against Dominican blacks, *rayanos* (border subjects), and Haitian-Dominicans. It has also contributed to military violence against rayano and Afro-Dominican religious groups at the hands of totalitarian and repressive regimes that dominated the twentieth-century Dominican Republic (US military: 1916–24; Trujillo dictatorship: 1930–61; US military: 1965; and Balaguer regime: 1966–78).

The history of US blackness is also largely intertwined with the history of Hispaniola’s independence projects. With the emergence of two black and

mulato-led republics (Haiti in 1804 and the Dominican Republic in 1821), Hispaniola became an international locus for black resistance and liberation as well as the object of fear in the antebellum United States.²¹ At the beginning of the Haitian Revolution, thousands of French planters fled the island, taking refuge in the United States; many took slaves with them.²² By 1792, more than two hundred white Saint Domingue families had moved to Philadelphia.²³ Following the fall of Cap-Français in 1793, the number of refugees increased daily, at one point reaching a rate of ten thousand per day for over a week. Most refugees went to the United States in the hopes of continuing to participate in a slave-driven economy.²⁴ The Saint Domingue events arguably influenced early abolitionist efforts and black insurgency in the nineteenth-century United States. Examples of this influence can be found in the Gabriel Conspiracy (1800), a plan by African American slaves to attack Richmond and destroy slavery in Virginia that “Frenchmen” allegedly orchestrated, as well as the famous Vesey Plot of Charleston (1822), in which the accused mentioned the Haitian Revolution as their inspiration for insurgency.²⁵

During the second half of the nineteenth century, blackness was an important category in the definition of US destiny. A nation that was built at the expense of black people’s freedom now had to figure out a way to redefine itself as multiracial, facing its great crime and finding ways to deal with the trauma of slavery. In this atmosphere—which coincides with the progression of Manifest Destiny, and the growth of the “White Man’s Burden” ideology in Washington—US discourse of blackness that, as I argue, emerged in dialogue with Hispaniola, traveled back to Hispaniola through political and cultural imperialism. Nineteenth-century African American abolitionists such as Frederick Douglass and Martin Delany, as well as early twentieth-century thinkers such as W. E. B. Du Bois and Arturo Schomburg, located in Haitian slave rebellions the spirit of liberty and freedom needed to fight for the equality of races.²⁶ Some of these figures would eventually argue for emigration efforts of free American blacks to Hispaniola. Between 1823 and 1898, as many as twenty thousand black Americans emigrated to the southern part of Cap-Haïtien and to the Bay of Samaná, eventually forming communities and influencing the culture and history of both nations of Hispaniola.²⁷

Frederick Douglass, who joined the Republican Party and participated amply in the imperial project, was appointed to the Commission of Inquiry for the Annexation of Santo Domingo, in 1871.²⁸ Douglass, an ex-slave and great defender of racial equality, actively participated in a project that would

end the sovereignty of a nation ruled by African descendants. Reconciling his desire for equality and justice with his idea of a cohesive nation, Douglass got behind the Manifest Destiny of the United States. He believed that in order for the black race to move forward, it needed the support and strength of a strong nation and its leaders. Douglass believed “Santo Domingo could not survive on its own,” but could be great as part of the US Empire.²⁹ Douglass, an expert on race, believed Santo Domingo would be a refuge for African American professionals and scholars seeking to escape the oppression of the post-Civil War United States to develop their full potential as humans: “This is a place where the man can simply be man regardless of his skin color. Where he can be free to think, and to lead.”³⁰ But Douglass was not the first American to describe the Dominican Republic as a form of nonblack racial other. The US commission from 1845 in charge of assessing Dominicans’ ability to self-govern found Dominicans to be “neither black nor white.”³¹ Assuaging public anxiety surrounding the potential emergence of another black nation, both commissions (the 1845 commission led by white American diplomat John Hogan and the 1871 commission in which Frederick Douglass served as secretary) insisted on the difference of Dominican *mulataje* as an advantage in the future progress of the young nation, in contrast with the disadvantageous blackness of neighboring Haiti.

Though Douglass found Dominican racial mixtures promising, particularly as compared to Haiti, he also found Dominicans to be generally uncivil and in need of much guidance and teaching. Consciously or not, Douglass, the voice of black thought in US politics of the late nineteenth century, established US blackness—which he embodied in the eyes of his nation—as an authority for determining the racial, political, and cultural implications of blackness in Hispaniola. His legacy of US black intellectual dominance continues to shape scholarly discussions about Dominican blackness to date.³² If white Americans, like Hogan, were endowed with the power to govern and instruct young nations, black Americans—Douglass’s actions seem to suggest—had the burden of teaching other blacks how to be black, civil, and free. In this framework, which would be expanded to the rest of the Hispanic Caribbean after the Spanish-American War, we can find that the roots of the “complicated” Dominican blackness are deeply intertwined with the economic and political ambitions of expansionist post-Civil War United States.

My proposed genealogy and geographical triangulation of the US-Haiti-Dominican borders can shed light on the contemporary prevalence of anti-

Haitianism in the Archive of Dominicanidad.³³ At the same time, it offers a way out of the discursive checkmate that persistently produces Dominicans and Haitians as racial opposites. Contemporary studies about Hispaniola tend to cast Dominicans and Haitians as enemies, the former being (more) successful, yet negrophobic and anti-Haitian, while the latter often being romanticized as poor, yet symbolic of black pride and black resistance. The common juxtaposition of Haiti and the Dominican Republic—which appears in the works of Henry Louis Gates Jr., Michelle Wucker, and Dawn F. Stinchcomb, among others—although important in beginning a conversation about the complexity of transnational race studies, can reproduce a decontextualized understanding of anti-Haitian discourse as a postmodern and local phenomenon resulting from twentieth-century Trujillo nationalism. Such an anachronistic approach obscures the fact that anti-Haitianism is a colonial ideology that traverses Hispaniola's historical struggle with European colonialism and US imperial expansionism. It also erases the fact that present-day Dominican anti-Haitianism is founded on nineteenth-century global anti-Haitianism. A more productive examination of the Dominican-Haitian relationship thus requires our awareness of the intricacies of Hispaniola's border history in dialogue with US history. Such analysis would also lead us to recognize the present Haiti-DR border as a product of the US Empire.

Disrupting Latinidad

The second disruption I propose as a way of expanding our understanding of race, nations, and borders as central in producing the US ethnoracial category of Latino/a. This epistemic interruption decenters the experiences of migration and border crossing—the movement of the body from one location to the other and/or the shifting of geographical frontiers that end up moving a community or locale from one nation to another. Rather, I argue that US political, economic, and military expansion over Latin America—which began circa 1790 with the slave revolts that led to the Haitian Revolution—are foundational to the production of Latino/a as a US racial category and consequently to the process of US cultural bordering that continues to render Latina/os as foreign. To explain this process, I examine *dominicanidad* neither through the dominant yet mutually exclusive temporal and geographical lenses dividing island and US Dominicans, nor through the polarization of migration-minority experiences. Instead I approach Dominican racialized subjectivity through a study of the palimpsestic coexistence of

colonial impositions that are projected on the racialized body of subjects living on the island or the United States.

Borders are often imagined as a locus of migration or as a national landmark dividing citizen from immigrant subjects.³⁴ My analysis goes beyond this dichotomist view by insisting on the border as both a tangible location where subjects live as well as an embodied location—El Nié—where the multiple impositions of the nation-state and the imperial-colonial discourses coexist. The dictions that produce border subjectivity are thus always historical and translocal.

Foregrounding El Nié does not intend in any way to diminish the importance of the experience of migration in the construction of Latino/a ethnicity in the United States. Rather, I am bringing attention to an *other* way to expand our knowledge of Latinidad by looking at the significance of nineteenth-century US imperialism over Latin America for present processes of bordering, racialization, and exclusion of Latino/as from the United States and its archive. In this way, my proposed disruptions contribute to and expand the intellectual labor of US-Mexican border scholars Nicole Guidotti-Hernández, Laura Gutiérrez, and Raúl Coronado in their historical and geographical repositioning of relationships between US Latino/as and Latin Americans as shaped by the continuous presence of European and US American colonial impositions on the bodies of racialized subjects.

Coronado's "history of textuality," for instance, invites us to imagine Texas not as we do today, "as some behemoth of nationalist independent feeling," but rather as an "interstitial colony shaped by a long history of imperial jockeying among New Spain (now Mexico), French Louisiana, and the expanding United States."³⁵ Similarly, Guidotti-Hernández urges us to think beyond the dominant narratives of resistance associated with Chicana history to uncover the "interstices of multiple colonial regimes" that operate in the production of racialized subjects, "showing how language is what makes the subject and the body."³⁶ Coronado and Guidotti-Hernández's interpellations of US Mexicanidad pose urgent critiques of dominant epistemological approaches to Latino/a studies by insisting on the need to historicize the colonial *contradictions* that operate to produce the racialized subject. My proposed genealogy of dominicanidad and the disruptions produced by the triangulation of US-DR-Haiti further demonstrate *how* racialized Latino/a voices, bodies, and dictions are silenced from multiple archives across time and geographies, but it also simultaneously creates an alternative archive that allows readers, if they so choose, to read in *contradiction*.

Contradicting the Archive

In order to understand my proposed geopolitical triangulation, *The Borders of Dominicanidad* examines the structural foundations of what I call the Archive of Dominicanidad—historical documents, literary texts, monuments, and cultural representations sustaining national ideology—through which I argue the criollo elite sought to define the racial borders of the nation following independence from Haiti (1844) and throughout the second half of the nineteenth century. I trace how these foundational ideologies have been interpolated, institutionalized, deployed, and embodied through repetition at five critical moments in the history of the nation: (1) the murders in 1822 of the Andújar sisters, better known as the Galindo Virgins, during the Haitian unification of the island of Hispaniola; (2) the killing of Afro-Dominican religious leader Olivorio Mateo in 1922 during the first US military occupation of the Dominican Republic; (3) the Massacre of 1937 of more than twenty thousand ethnic Haitians and Afro-Dominicans in the northern borderlands during the Trujillo dictatorship; (4) the 1965 military intervention of the United States in the Dominican Republic and the subsequent emigration of one million Dominicans to the United States; and (5) the earthquake that devastated Haiti and parts of the southwest region of the Dominican Republic in January 2010.

The time period encompassed in this study (1822–2010) is sizeable. However, I am not interested in producing a historical survey of dominicanidad. Rather, my work traces the genealogy of Dominican discourses of nation and race, and their appearances, reconstructions and interpellations across time and space through the literary representations of the five historical episodes at key moments in the nation's political history. Michel Foucault proposed the concept of “genealogy” as one that does not produce history as causal to the present or that pretends to “go back in time to restore an unbroken continuity.” Instead, he argued: “Genealogy allows us to see how the complexity of the present is somehow linked to the errors, the false appraisals, and the faulty calculations that gave birth to those things that continue to exist.”³⁷ My book creates a genealogy of dominicanidad through a careful reading of the conflicts and incongruities that appear in the dictions performed through the multiple repetitions of the five episodes *The Borders of Dominicanidad* proposes as key to the foundation of the nation and its archive.

The term “*contradiction*” frames my analysis of the ways in which narratives produce nations through the violence, exclusion, and the continuous control of racialized bodies. *Contradiction* explains, for instance, how dominicanidad became simultaneously a project of the criollo elite and the US Empire in their common goal of preserving white colonial privilege in the mid-nineteenth century. “Diction” refers to the distinctiveness of speech through which meaning is conveyed and understood. Thus, in its basic implication, “diction” signifies the performance of language and meaning. The larger way that “diction” works throughout the book is through the contrapuntal analysis of the historical (documents presumed to be evidence of fact such as military memos, newspaper articles, decrees, court transcripts) and the literary (which I broadly define so as to include different forms of cultural productions such as films, performances, and songs). My interrogations of the texts bring attention to the *contradictions* that surge within and between history and literature, showing how literature works, at times, to sustain hegemony, while at others, it serves to contest it.

The epistemological break between history and literature is always expressed concretely through the historically situated evaluation of specific narratives. Yet the very disruption between history and literature offers a way to challenge what we have come to regard as truth, or as Michel Trouillot put it, “the ways in which what happened and that which is said to have happened are and are not the same may itself be historical.”³⁸ My book thus examines how “truths” contribute to the violence, silencing, and erasure of racialized people and their truths.

The five historical episodes that frame my analysis of *contradictions* demonstrate the lasting effects of dictions on the lives of human beings as narratives become “truth” and as “truth” becomes the basis for exclusionary laws that sustain the ideological and political borders of the nation. Insisting on the consequences that silences produced by history have on the sustenance of power and inequality, Trouillot argues that each historical narrative renews its own claim to truth through acts of epistemic repetition.³⁹ Repetition of historical events, whether through historical or fictional narration, can replace the actual trauma of violence with the symbolic effect of the particular act of violence on the hegemonic project of nation-bordering.

One of the ways silencing through repetition becomes visible in the dictions I analyze is through passive voice interference in literary and historical narration of violent events, which often materializes through allegorical and

metaphorical language. The passive voice often interrupts and exculpates the pain and trauma caused on the bodies of the victims of violence (the Galindo Virgins, Olivorio Mateo, the twenty thousand rayanos and ethnic Haitians killed in 1937), delaying both the traumatic historical confrontation of the event and the possibility of healing. Allegorized rather than confronted, violence becomes a vehicle for the nation's bordering, which is reinforced through the constant, but indirect, repetition of the traumatic event in literature and history.

One well-documented example of the effects of silencing and repetition is the Massacre in 1937 of twenty thousand rayanos and ethnic Haitians that I study in chapter 3. The multiple, mostly foreign, studies about the Massacre of 1937 further exacerbate its erasure by casting it as an anti-immigrant state-sponsored crime against Haitians living on the Dominican side of border rather than as the genocide of the intraethnic border population of rayanos who lived and worked in the northwestern border towns of the Artibonito Valley. Thus, repetition contributes to erasing the fact that in 1937 Dominicans killed their own. Though the massacre is the most recurrent event in the historical and literary archives of twentieth-century Hispaniola, the actual violence on the bodies of victims has yet to be acknowledged. There are no memorial sites, official commemorations, or state-sponsored efforts for peace and reconciliation of the victims and survivors.⁴⁰

In *Silencing the Past*, Trouillot insists on the relationship between power and the production of history, reminding us that silences enter every stage of constructing the historical archive: "at the moment of fact creation (the making of the sources); the moment of fact assembly (the making of the archives); the moment of fact retrieval (the making of narratives); and the moment of retrospective significance (the making of history in the final instance)."⁴¹ A better way to find out "what happened" or what Trouillot calls "the final product of history" requires the reading of the creation of silences: a reading from the silences *left* by history. To do so, Trouillot urged us to be less concerned with what history is, but rather how it works.⁴²

The methodology I follow throughout the book guides the reader to see *how* literature and history have silenced black lives, actors, and histories from the Archive of Dominicanidad, and *how* these silences have, in turn, produced violence and exclusion of actual human beings throughout the history of the nation. Diana Taylor, Pedro San Miguel, and Doris Sommer have insisted on the complicity between history and literature in the construction of the Latin American archive since the emergence of the modern nation

in the nineteenth century. Taylor argues that this complicity also allows for “public acts of forgetting” that blur the obvious discontinuities, misalliances, and ruptures that founded and sustained the myths symbolically bordering the nation.⁴³ Following Taylor, Nicole Guidotti-Hernández warns us that these “public acts of forgetting” happen because of, rather than in spite of, the constant repetition of historical events. Repetition is another way of silencing.⁴⁴

The Borders of Dominicanidad assumes the enormous challenge of reading in *contradiction* by analyzing the silences created by the repetitions and passive voice interferences that inhabit the Archive of Dominicanidad. To do so, I analyze a wide variety of texts including never-before-studied evidence-based documents found in historical archives in Santo Domingo, Port-au-Prince, and Washington, DC, as well as lesser-known literary texts, *salves*, photographs, performances, oral interviews, and films. The chronologically, formally, and linguistically diverse readings of materials both *contradicts* the hegemonic Archive of Dominicanidad and produces a new archive of *contradiction* that I hope will invite further studies.

Archiving Contradictions

The majority of scholarship focusing on the Dominican Republic concentrates on the study of the Trujillo dictatorship (1930–61), the effects of sex tourism since the 1990s, and the present state of Dominican migration to the United States. Though many scholars are concerned with questions of racial identity and representation, these questions are typically examined through a contemporary lens. I argue, however, that to understand present-day dominicanidad and the borders that have produced it, we must look at the historical and rhetorical narratives of the early nineteenth century that sustain racism in the Dominican Republic. Such historical grounding would lead us, for instance, to understand that the present-day extreme xenophobia better known as anti-Haitianism that led the Dominican government to denationalize more than 200,000 citizens in October 2013 is the result of a colonial bequeath that was in turn upheld and sustained by the United States to preserve its own imperial ventures, rather than the recent legacy of the Trujillo dictatorship.

Part I, titled “Founding the Archive,” examines the considerable role that Haiti played in the process of imagining and narrating dominicanidad along racial, cultural, and political lines during the critical years of the birth of the

Dominican Republic and through the first half of the twentieth century. Chapter 1, “The Galindo Virgins: Violence and Repetition in the Archive of Dominicanidad,” shows how the racialized and sexualized body of the Dominican subject—exemplified in the case of the Andújar Murders of 1822—is objectified, violated, and sacrificed for the benefit of the nation-state. The chapter traces the transformation of the historical crime against the Andújar family into the symbolic rape and murder of the Galindo Virgins at the hands of the state-serving *criollo letrados*. The chapter examines the court transcripts of the proceedings against the murderers of the Andújar family in *contradiction* with the multiple literary repetitions of the crime that begin with Félix María del Monte’s epic poem *Las vírgenes de Galindo* (1860). In their efforts to preserve their own white colonial privilege, del Monte and his successors produced Galindo as a crime of barbaric black Haitians against white civilized Dominicans. The production and repetition of the Galindo Virgins, I argue, is foundational to Dominican anti-Haitian rhetoric.

Chapter 2, “Of Bandits and Wenches: The US Occupation (1916–1924) and the Criminalization of Dominican Blackness,” proposes Afro-religious rituals of possession (*montarse*) and storytelling through *salves* (sacred songs) as important *contradictions* of the dominant exclusionary archives that underlines my analysis of the 1922 murdering of Afro-religious leader Olivorio Mateo at the hands of the US Marines during the military intervention of 1916–24. My historical analysis sheds light on how the US military intervention in the Dominican Republic shaped the Haitian-Dominican border, and contributed to further erasing and disenfranchising of black Dominicans. Through close readings of military records related to the persecution of Olivorio Mateo; traditional *liborista salves*; oral interviews; letters; and the novel *Song of the Water Saints* (2002), by Dominican American author Nelly Rosario, I analyze how the logic of the occupation contributed to imagining the Dominican body as a site that needed to be controlled and civilized. The chapter also recovers and preserves the multiple ways in which racialized subjects *contradicted* the epistemic violence imposed on them by the Dominican and the US states through reading of letters, literary texts, and oral interviews. The variety of evidence this chapter engages creates a sensible account of the US military intervention that shows not only how the marines implemented US policies in the Dominican Republic, but also how these policies affected the everyday life of Dominican citizens at the time.

Chapter 3, “Speaking in Silences: Literary Interruptions and the Massacre

of 1937,” looks at the killings of ethnic Haitians and rayanos as remembered in four fictional accounts: the short story “Luis Pie,” published in Havana in 1942 by exiled Dominican writer Juan Bosch; the Haitian novel *Compère Général Soleil* (General Sun, My Brother), by Jacques Stéphen Alexis (Port-au-Prince, 1955); a *testimonio* *El masacre se pasa a pie* by Freddy Prestol Castillo (Santo Domingo, 1973); and the celebrated novel by Haitian American writer Edwidge Danticat, *The Farming of Bones* (New York, 1998). My analysis links the Massacre of 1937 to the anti-Haitian dictions of the early republic examined in the first chapter, showing how diction became law and epistemic violence transformed into physical violence. Without diminishing the importance of the horrific nature of these events, my analysis of the massacre moves beyond the trauma of 1937, provoking a conversation among Haitian, Dominican, and US American texts to analyze the rhetorical significance of the massacre in shaping racial ideologies during the second half of the twentieth century. In addition, the chapter insists on the persistence of xenophobic nationalism in present-day Dominican Republic.

The second part of the book, “Diaspora Contradicts,” engages the impact of transnational interventions in contesting hegemonic notions of dominicanidad. This section shows how *contradictions* take various forms throughout the twentieth and twenty-first centuries as other narrations of dominicanidad emerge, particularly in the diaspora. Historical novels dominate the bulk of Dominican American literary production, as evidenced in the works of Julia Álvarez, Junot Díaz, and Nelly Rosario. Diasporic *contradictions* thus, on the one hand, place the Dominican experience within US history, insisting on the long and unequal relationship between the two nations that has resulted in the massive migration of 10 percent of the overall population to the United States in the last fifty years. On the other, they historicize the Dominican experience from the perspective of people who have been silenced in the nation’s archive: women, migrants, peasants, blacks, LGBTQ, and the disabled.

Chapter 4, “*Rayano* Consciousness: Remapping the Haiti-DR Border after the Earthquake of 2010,” was inspired by a photograph I saw one week after the Haitian Earthquake in 2010 of a rayana woman, Sonia Marmolejos, nursing a severely injured Haitian baby. The image provides an analytical framework for understanding the borders of dominicanidad in a global context. The English translation of the word *rayano*, “borderer,” invites us to think about the Haiti-DR border within the framework of border studies, inevitably summoning a relational critique of the continued persistence of

US colonial domination on foreign territories, which shapes national identities, cultures, and bodies. My conceptualization of rayano consciousness creates a transnational, transtemporal interchange that I hope produces new ways to theorize Latino/a studies, inciting fruitful dialogues that can help us rethink how power and politics interact with the production of symbolic and geographic borders that shape our understanding of race, nation, and culture. Transcending the political and conceptual limits of the Haitian-Dominican border, rayano consciousness, as I define it, encompasses the multiplicity of borders—transnational, interethnic, and multilinguistic—that characterize the Dominican experience on and beyond the island. Rayano consciousness thus refers to the historical and present awareness of Dominican borders—symbolic, political, and geographical—a process that includes marginalized subjectivities in the imagining and narrations of dominicanidad. Following the structure of previous chapters, chapter 4, while focused on the present, puts into dialogue a variety of temporally, linguistically, and formally diverse texts: *Cantos de la frontera*, the poetry collection (published 1963) by Dominican nationalist writer Manuel Rueda; a series of performances and videos (2005–10) by David “Karmadavis” Pérez; and “Da pa lo do,” a song and music video by writer and performer Rita Indiana Hernández (2011). The diversity of the texts studied in the chapter moves my analysis toward a decolonial turn, to borrow from Caribbean critic Nelson Maldonado-Torres, that helps us better understand dominicanidad within its context while proposing the possibility of a hopeful dialogue of solidarity that can contribute to dismantling anti-Haitian and xenophobic discourse on the island and beyond.

Chapter 5, the final chapter, “Writing from El Nié: Exile and the Poetics of Dominicanidad *Ausente*,” proposes that rayano consciousness informs the creation of an alternative poetics of dominicanidad in the diaspora. Historically rooted in the 150 years of unequal relationship between the United States and the Dominican Republic, and particularly in the trauma of the US intervention of 1965, I argue that this poetics of dominicanidad ausente breaks away from the nostalgic trope of migration narratives in order to propose a critique of the relationship between power, the production of history, and the construction of transnational citizenship and identities. The chapter offers a reading of works by Dominican American artist and writer Josefina Báez in dialogue with twentieth-century Dominican narratives of exile, as exemplified in the seminal works of Juan Bosch and Pedro Vergés. In so doing, the chapter awards the opportunity to explore the ways in which a

poetics of dominicanidad ausente has emerged as a dialectic process of transnational interpellation of the official national narration of dominicanidad solidified during the Trujillo regime. This final chapter demonstrates that marginality becomes a transnational experience for Dominican Americans who are the same poor, black, marginal subjects who have been historically oppressed and exiled from the nation-state.⁴⁵

The borders of dominicanidad are many, encompassing the transnational and diasporic experiences of Dominicans in the United States and elsewhere; the existence of a community of Haitian-Dominican peoples on the borderlands; and the growing presence of Haitian immigrants living in Dominican cities. *The Borders of Dominicanidad* bridges the multiplicity of margins of dominicanidad while also bringing attention to the intangibility and elusiveness of the divisions that emerge on the individual as well as collective levels of the population. My book thus suggests a reimagining not only of the physical, militarized borders that separate the two nations that inhabit Hispaniola, but also of the series of loose articulations, discourses, traumas, myths, contradictions, and historical events that have informed the Dominican subject's understanding of him or herself in relation to Haiti and the United States. Borders are about regulating, controlling, and prohibiting the free crossings of bodies and objects from one locale to another. They are also about containing the undesirable outside of the nation's center. Thus the body of the (undesirable) border crosser is inscribed with the historical, social, and legal events that seek to contain/control it. These inscriptions can in turn become another way of understanding "truth." The body of the border subject—the prieto, the rayano, the Haitian immigrant, or the Dominicanoyork—can also become an archive of *contradiction*.

NOTES

Introduction

Unless otherwise noted, translations of foreign-language quotations are my own.

1. I use the Spanish version of the term “dominicanidad” without italics and in lowercase to name both the people and the ideas related to Dominicaness. When “Dominicanidad” appears capitalized it refers to hegemonic and official versions of Dominicaness (as in the Archivo of Dominicanidad or the Archive of Dominicaness). See “Note on Terminology” at the beginning of the book.

2. Torres-Saillant, *El retorno de las yolas*, 18.

3. The military base of Barahona and San Juan became operational once again following the closing of the Vieques US Navy Post in Puerto Rico in 2001.

4. US Bureau of the Census, 2000.

5. Dávila, *Latinos Inc.*

6. I choose not to give an exact date of independence here as the very argument of my book suggests that the birth of the nation is a process of *contradiction*. In chapter 1, I explore the three possible dates for Dominican independence: 1821, 1844, and 1865.

7. The term *rayano* comes from the word *raya* (line) and alludes to people living on the dirt line that for centuries divided the two territories that make up Hispaniola.

8. Báez, *Levente no.*, np.

9. Anzaldúa, *Borderlands/La Frontera*, 25.

10. Luis Rafael Sánchez, *La guagua aérea*.

11. Gustavo Pérez Firmat, *Life on the Hyphen*.

12. Anzaldúa, *Borderlands/La Frontera*, 25.

13. Báez, *Levente no.*, np.

14. M. Jacqui Alexander, *Pedagogies of Crossing*.

15. Anzaldúa and Moraga, *This Bridge Called My Back*.

16. Mignolo, *Local Histories/Global Designs*, and Nelson Maldonado-Torres, *Against War*.

17. Grosz, *Volatile Bodies: Toward a Corporeal Feminism*, xiii.

18. In Marxist theory “interpellation” refers to the process by which an ideology is embodied in major social and political institutions, informing subjectivities and social interactions. My use of the term follows Althusser’s argument that the situation always precedes the subject. Individual subjects are thus presented principally as produced by

social forces, rather than acting as powerful independent agents with self-produced identities. Althusser, "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses," 11.

19. Renda, *Taking Haiti*, 15.
20. Renda, *Taking Haiti*, 15.
21. See Fischer, *Modernity Disavowed*.
22. Treudley, "United States and Santo Domingo," 112.
23. Fordham, "Nineteenth Century Black Thought in the United States," 116.
24. Treudley, "United States and Santo Domingo," 112, 113.
25. Treudley, "United States and Santo Domingo," 113; Fordham, "Nineteenth Century Black Thought in the United States," 175.
26. Fordham, "Nineteenth Century Black Thought in the United States," 120.
27. Fordham, "Nineteenth Century Black Thought in the United States," 120.
28. Douglass, *Life and Times of Frederick Douglass*, 410.
29. Brantley, "Black Diplomacy and Frederick Douglass' Caribbean Experiences," 197–209, 203.
30. Douglass, *Life and Times of Frederick Douglass*, 398.
31. Welles, *Naboth's Vineyard*, 77–78.
32. In his PBS documentary airing in 2012, race scholar Henry Louis Gates Jr. introduced the topic of Dominican racialization, avowing Dominicans' denial of their blackness. I further explore this subject in chapter 4.
33. Here I capitalize Dominicanidad for two reasons: to follow Spanish grammar and to highlight the hegemonic/official nature of term as different from dominicanidad (in lowercase) which is more fluid and inclusive.
34. See Anzaldúa, *Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza*; Lazo, *Writing to Cuba*; Ortíz, *Cultural Erotics in Cuban America*; Saldívar, *Trans-Americanity*; and Sanchez, *Becoming Mexican American*.
35. Coronado, *A World Not to Come*, 34.
36. Guidotti-Hernández, *Unspeakable Violence*, 12.
37. Foucault, "Nietzsche, Genealogy, History," 64–139.
38. Trouillot, *Silencing the Past*, 4.
39. Trouillot, *Silencing the Past*, 23.
40. An unofficial collective annual commemoration began in 2013 organized and led by Eduardo Paulino, a Dominican American historian: the Border of Lights, an event in which artists and community activists stage a memorial of the massacre in Dajabón and Ounaminthe.
41. Trouillot, *Silencing the Past*, 26.
42. Trouillot, *Silencing the Past*, 34.
43. Taylor, *The Archive and the Repertoire*.
44. Guidotti-Hernández, *Unspeakable Violence*, 12.
45. The Dominican migration to the United States has been mostly caused by economic crisis. See Torres-Saillant, *El retorno de las yolas*; Hoffnung-Garskof, *A Tale of Two Cities*; and Duany, *Quisqueya on the Hudson*.