INTRODUCTION

Trevor Burnard, in his recent book on Thomas Thistlewood, the eighteenth-century Jamaican overseer, pen-keeper, and slaveowning diarist, notes the spirit of egalitarianism that existed among Whites in Jamaica and the absence of class conflict among them, despite clear socioeconomic differences.¹ He cites Edward Long who “argued that there were no distinctions among whites besides those between good and bad citizens,” and himself argues that Thistlewood’s attitudes were shaped by “an ideological milieu in which slavery created conditions of relative equality between whites” (Burnard 2004:71, 72-73). He refers to this condition as “ideological egalitarianism within structural inequality” (Burnard 2004:73). But he goes further to assert that the “conscious equality” that distinguished West Indian whites was rooted in a degree of real equality that was not replicated in British North American colonies” (Burnard 2004:76).

Burnard’s (2004:74) argument is that there were so few Whites and so many slaves that Whites inevitably bonded together for security purposes and “out of fear.” Moreover, a high percentage of Whites shared a common expe-

¹. I wish to gratefully acknowledge the three following fellowships or grants that have allowed me to work on this and other papers related to a larger project on the interface among moral, disciplinary, and labor regimes in Anglophone Caribbean history: 2000-2001 NEH-Schomburg Scholars-in-Residence Fellowship, Schomburg Center for Research in Black Culture, New York; 2001-2002 Henry Charles Chapman Research Fellowship, Institute of Commonwealth Studies, School of Advanced Study, University of London, and a 2002-2003 Faculty Research Grant from the Center for Latin American Studies (CLAS), University of Pittsburgh. I would also like to thank the reviewers of this article for their critical and very generous insights.
rience of racialized mastery through slave ownership, however unevenly so. In addition even poor Whites could leverage their scarcity by demanding and receiving high wages. Perhaps most controversially (in light of ample evidence to the contrary), Burnard argues insistently that there are commensurate limits on Thistlewood’s authority over these poor Whites, his occupational and social inferiors. Finally, the low numbers meant that there were simply not enough wealthy Whites to fill the entire range of political offices in the colony. So “at the lower levels – positions such as justices of the peace, militia officers, and vestrymen – political participation had to be extended below the ranks of the wellborn and wealthy” (Burnard 2004:77). All of this fostered a spirit of egalitarianism and fraternity among Whites, particularly White men.

The argument is clearly correct on a number of points, and not without significant merit and insight. However, it is somewhat exaggerated and it risks justifying the suppression or deferment of a necessary analysis of quite profound structural inequalities within the White community. The fact that race trumped class in the White creole imagination and that recruitment to political office was of necessity inclusive of “lesser Whites” should not in any way provide an excuse for leaving those inequalities unexamined – especially when they formed a key constitutive element in the production of empire. My concern here is less a rejection of Burnard’s thesis than a cautionary corrective to his rich but interpretively selective account. Within the scope of his argument about White egalitarianism (especially Chapter 3), Burnard (2004:81) glosses over important differences among nonelite Whites, exaggerates the lack of conviviality between “free Blacks or Coloreds” and lesser Whites, and, most importantly for this paper, ignores critical evidence of the social-structural factors separating the socioeconomic or class niche of respected, socially mobile lesser-White settlers like Thistlewood and that of the upper plantocracy. This article is primarily taken up with an examination of the latter subject.

However, an additional and longer-term concern here is to demonstrate the need to systematize a framework that captures the complexity of West Indian social structure and looks beyond the most visceral racial divide on the one hand or the merely local on the other. In other words, to capture the complexity of West Indian social structure is to understand that “race” is not enough to explain the nuances of the local, but also that the “local” is not enough to explain the nuances of race. The historian of colonial systems is always faced with the difficult but inescapable task of understanding the colony at once on its own – very complex – terms and on a scale well beyond its embodied limits. This is often counterintuitive to both the tendency to understate the complexity of the local qua local and the tendency to “forget” the ongoing operation and effectivity of the local-translocal-metropolitan transmission belt of connected processes.

While this article’s primary rationale or raison d’être is therefore not a critique of Burnard, his particular emphasis furnishes a convenient concep-
tual foil to a project whose preoccupation has been to insert Thistlewood’s story into a very different kind of narrative and analytical problematic. Both Burnard’s significant, award-winning book and the research agenda I am proposing (which has its own genealogy) would be trivialized by a representation of the contribution here as some kind of “rejoinder” to him. ² I am hoping that the article functions instead as both the introduction of a new research agenda and as a preliminary contribution to such an agenda. In trying to balance both functions, it runs the risk of leaving both the historian and the sociologist dissatisfied. The hope is that it manages to transcend the bounds of narrowly defined disciplinary regimes just enough to capture the imagination and pique the interest of all kinds of Caribbeanists. Based primarily on limited secondary sources, there is no attempt to pass these results off as satisfying all the requirements to merit a claim for “writing history.”

Neither can I claim uniqueness for the vision and concerns adumbrated here. Important parallels exist in the work of Ann Stoler as well as others cited by her as defining what she calls “critical colonial studies” or the “new imperial history.” As such, it gets even more complicated because while I see parallels, in a very preliminary reading of some of their work, I am unqualified, and in any event unprepared at this early stage, to claim any strict affiliation. Nonetheless, the following comments by Stoler, in the introductory chapter of one of her books, seem to me to be particularly compelling and relevant to the central preoccupations of this article:

No longer fixed on the colonized alone, colonial studies has increasingly been concerned with historical variability in the making of racialized categories. No longer convinced that colonialism was a successful hegemonic project, students of colonial histories now direct their archival energies to the instabilities and vulnerabilities of colonial regimes, to the internal conflicts among those who ruled, and to the divergent and diverse practices among them. As this book suggests, few students of the colonial would claim that colonialism was more an economic venture than a cultural one or that studies of the colonial can be bracketed from the making of the modern, of Europe and its nation-making projects. No one would claim that colonial effects were confined to areas of physical conquest alone. (Stoler 2002:9-10)

In a way Stoler and others are pursuing the cultural counterpart of a project that has long informed the core premises of the scholarship of Caribbeanists, Third-World and postcolonial scholars, nonessentialist Afrocentric revisionists of colonial history, dependency theorists: how did colonialism make and re-make the political economies of both colony and metropole, as part of a contentiously unitary and structurally differentiated imperial trajectory? As

². Moreover, Burnard has a varied and multifaceted body of work, whose component parts, though in some instances relevant here, are too numerous to mention.
much ink has been used to deny the centrality of colonialism in the unfolding of metropolitan political economy by “internalist” Eurocentric revisionists of various ideological persuasions as has been used to trace the hidden and not-so-hidden threads of the mutually reconstructive connection by those who have taken it for granted. Therefore, this new cultural history is surely, in some ways, a vindication of the latter tradition. However, “critical colonial studies” goes well beyond a necessary or simple understanding of mutual determination to a long overdue destabilization of the easy dichotomies and binaries of such categories as metropole/colony and colonizer/colonized or of the idea of colonialism as a finished, efficient, successful, or transparently executed project. Its perspective claims that the ingredients in the reproduction of colony and empire, colonizer and colonized took unexpected and multiple twists and turns on the ground. The sentries and subversives of empire could be a motley crew, often hidden in the seams of the “main” narrative.

Thus, against the grain of Burnard’s assertion of racialization (and racial solidarity) as a completed, successful, and difference-obliterating project, I am interested in exploring the very contradictions and differences that had to be suppressed (or managed) for the purpose of race-making, and in understanding that process as a set of practices which took some doing and did not just happen. Moreover, it should be emphasized that the discursive and political practices of racial production and the practices of embodied social and economic reproduction – the operation and making of class, class subjects, and class effects – should not be conflated. They are closely related but not coterminous, and they belong to different levels of the social system, linked through a labored process of mediation. Through this process the contradictions between the imperatives of race and the quotidian realities of class are constantly being managed, contained, and smoothed out. In a larger sense, this article is precisely concerned with tracing (“underneath” the racializing categories) the crisscrossing strands of embodied and material practices by which the highly textured and patterned tapestry of empire and colony was woven and a delicate (and shifting) balance of distance and intimacy maintained. By way of locating it within a defined analytical field, I would propose that it most closely engages what Stoler (2002:7) refers to as “the microphysics of colonial rule.” Without committing Stoler or her collaborators in any way to this more risky position, I would also suggest that if ever there was a moment to re-invoke, in new ways, the oft-repudiated Marxist categories of “infrastructure” and “superstructure,” as differentiated dimensions of social practices and social relations (or as relatively autonomous social practices and relations), it is here.

In thinking about race as a unifier of Whites of different classes or strata, I find Stuart Hall’s (1977:158, 162) observation about the way hegemony secures the unity of the whole social formation useful for the group as well. He notes that hegemony “secures the unity, cohesion and stability of [the]
social order in and through (not despite) its ‘differences,’” and that “what matters is not simply the plurality of their internal structures, but the articulated relation between their differences.” In this article I want to talk about class-related differences (“the plurality of their internal structures”) among Whites (particularly male-centered groups), and do so with the background understanding both of “complexity-and-unity” (Hall 1977:158) and of racial unity as a labored process of mediation and as unstable and unpredictable. In addition, I want to consider the implications of those differences for the making of West Indian societies as place-based (and deeply stratified) “communities” or social entities rather than just as functions of empire or as racialized spaces.

Finally, in precisely locating the problematic of this sociohistorical piece, I wish to state that this is not some kind of “return” to class, since it does not assume that class was ever abandoned. In the first place, class-based differences among Whites were secondary or even tertiary ones, the primary and focal class relation being that between the slave-owning planter class and the enslaved plantation workers. Secondly, I would like to place considerable distance between myself and those analysts who make all the right conciliatory or deferential gestures toward the particular strengths of postcolonial theory (of which I certainly endorse the need to be rigorously critical) and then subtly manoeuvre a return to the reductive position that “it’s not race, it’s class; it’s not colonialism, it is the capitalist mode of production.” As if race, colonialism, and Eurocentrism did not also constitute devastating material relations of their own (let alone as defining moments of historical capitalism). I try instead to anchor my analysis within those traditions of Black and postcolonial materialist feminism that reject “either/or” conceptual apparatuses in favor of complex “both/and” dialectical ones. Before venturing into the historical narrative, therefore, I briefly consider neglected aspects of the various dimensions whose “intersectionality” positions Whites differently among themselves and the importance of such differences in the making of empire and colony. In the interest of space, most of which will be devoted to the details of the historical narrative or “proof,” I limit my elaboration of the sociological concepts prof-fered and applied in this article to this section.

First, race. Since race, or more especially racial solidarity, is already “given” in this analysis I want to begin with the reminder that it is an achieved, constructed, and somewhat unstable category, not a spontaneous and fixed one. While Barbados provides the clearest example of visceral and enduring class divisions among Whites, Jamaica was not exempt from this condition, despite the relative absence of a self-sustaining poor White class.

3. In a volume that makes an otherwise laudable attempt to bring about a rapprochement between (versions of) Marxist and postcolonial theory, Lazarus’s contribution (2002:43-64) seems to me to be particularly guilty of this either/or and economistic reductionism.
In the case of Barbados, Hilary McD Beckles (1985, 1986) has written at length about early White servitude or “proto-slavery” and about the contempt in which poor Whites were held by White elites, before emancipation and the subsequent strategic closing of ranks on the basis of race.\(^4\) Richard Dunn (1972:9) points to the routine expectation that English servants in the early settlements of Barbados and the Leewards “would desert to the Spaniards at the first opportunity rather than defend their masters.” But even at the height of Jamaica’s golden age of sugar, scattered among the daily compendia of Thomas Thistlewood’s thirty-six-year record of plantation life during that period are occasional references to White servants running away and even to White servants staging uprisings alongside enslaved Blacks.\(^5\)

Closer to the point of this article, we see below that Thistlewood’s entry into the lower ranks of the White elite is a proactively and purposively sponsored one.

\textit{Class and patriarchy.} Admittedly, it is easier to make a case for the salience of divisions among Whites based on the juridical status/class distinctions of freedom/mastery vs. unfreedom/indentured servitude. Indeed, it is puzzling why Burnard should seek to downplay even those. It is perhaps less easy to make a case for the salience of divisions between local sub-elites and dominant translocal elites. However, I want to argue that those distinctions are critical (a) in mapping the differentiated structures of “local-translocal-metropolitan” imperial economic networks, (b) in understanding the specificities of place-making in the colonial restructuring of localities,\(^6\) and (c) in dispelling any illusions about the true specifications (“specs”) and scope of the dominant sugar-planter bourgeoisie (and its delineation of a self-defining \textit{cordon sanitaire}). In other words, these differences matter.

If one brings together a robust concept of class and a historically specific understanding of colonial-capitalist modes of production, one can precisely map the differentiated structure of spatial-circuits\(^7\) circumscribing the reproduction of groups, economic sectors, and places.\(^8\) Within this general

\(^4\) See also Beckles’s other defining contributions to an emerging repertoire of what might be tentatively labeled “critical” British West Indian colonial studies, especially his path-breaking \textit{Centering Woman} (1999).

\(^5\) For example, on Sunday, September 29, 1752, Thistlewood recorded news of an apparently unsuccessful local uprising: “Heard of a white man and the Negroes rising upon Capt. Leister. He afterwards told me the story himself” (Hall 1999:31).

\(^6\) And, one might add, the dynamics of creolization in the colonial restructuring of cultures. See Brathwaite 1974.

\(^7\) See Green (1995:86-89) for a slightly differently focused, but related, discussion of “spatial-circuits” or “enclaves.”

\(^8\) In sociospatial terms one might refer to the space of bodies-in-motion (defined of course by class, race, ethnicity, gender, sexuality, etc.), space of flows (circuits of economic transactions), and space of places (place-defined societies, communities, or niches).
approach, I see classes as comprehending mutually constitutive dominant and subordinate spatial-circuits of re/production (see Green 1992-93). Re/production is an elliptical reference to the joint processes of economic production and the physiosocial reproduction of human beings as constituents of social groups, hence my reference above to “embodied social and economic reproduction.” This precision represents a concern to understand classes both as mutually antagonistic agents of “public” production relations and as social groups separately constituted and marked through institutionally mediated processes and relations of familial, domestic, sexual, generational, and private-human reproduction. By tracing the variously converging and diverging “spatial-circuits of re/production” we can more fully grasp the operation and making of class, class subjects, and class effects, and the implications of diverging modes of extended, intergenerational, group reproduction. The different groups are bounded by diverging/converging modes of reproduction as well as by differential protagonistic roles in dominant and subordinate goods-producing and exchanging economies.

Relations of reproduction in the vast majority of known human societies have been organized on the basis of varieties of patriarchal or male-dominant systems and institutions of heterosexual marriage, sex, and kinship. “Patriarchy” as a ruling system encompasses both in-class organization of ruling-class male power, providing a variably adapted and enforced hegemonic model for the rest of society (other classes), and class/patriarchal domination over subordinate groups. To see class only from the public “productive” angle and not from the private “reproductive” angle (mediated by marriage and/or concubinage) limits our vision. Indeed, the latter angle reveals not just the social, cultural, and genealogical circuits of class but also key aspects of the financial circuits, since profits and property flow through families, through marriages, wills, bequests, trusts, and so on. Class, and therefore racial endogamy if necessary, is maintained through mating and marriage within the perceived bloodlines, no matter what the role played by relations of concubinage. The special case of the “dual marriage system,” which reproduces two class and racial lines from the single male progenitor, will be discussed below (see Green, forthcoming 2007,9 for implications for the enslaved).

Space and place. According to Charles W. Mills (1997:41), the “Racial Contract [of which the “slavery contract” is one permutation] norms (and races) space, demarcating civil and wild spaces.” Catherine Hall (2002:72) gives this concept a particular twist when she notes that, from the point of view of the colonists, “England was for families, Jamaica was for sex.” To paraphrase a famous quotation, the West Indies was for them a convenient facility where enslaved Africans labored to produce tropical commodities for their

profit and for the palates and developing biophysical mass needs of metropolitan consumers. It was, indeed, also a facility where the enslaved were forced to render domestic and sexual service for their resident White masters. One might think of Jamaica and the other West Indian islands in terms of both space – functionally and discursively assigned social spaces as constituent elements of whole systems – and place, geographically fixed and relatively autonomous, locally determined whole societies-in-the-making. Relatedly, one might consider classes/social groups as having different relationships and forms of agency with regard to both dimensions. These differences were important for the constitutive reproduction of both transatlantic empire and local colony, the case of the neoteric societies of the Caribbean islands lending new meaning to the term, “place-making.” In this article, I want to argue that Thistlewood, as representative of one class, or, at the very least, class fraction, and the Barretts, as representative of another, were situated differently in the local-translocal-metropolitan matrices and processes of empire, and I want to understand how these differences mattered.

As such, I am interested in distinguishing the precise historical roles of these “greater” and “lesser” Whites in the mutual constitution of metropole and colony, notwithstanding the fact that they shared an imagined “home” as “freeborn Britons.” The Barretts enjoyed uneven membership in a transatlantic ruling class whose genealogical and economic modes of reproduction routinely traversed a geographically dislocated spatial-circuit and called for a certain distance from the rooted, osmotic process of place-making. My main point is that there should be no illusions that Thistlewood is a representative of this class (his own re/productive niche diverging substantially from theirs), but I also want to suggest some specificities about his own class-related role. Thistlewood, without such border-crossing options, an intimate and routine brutalizer of the enslaved, on-the-spot policeman of the frontier moral economy, but also dependent upon and a participant in the Black reproductive niche and a patron of the subaltern protopeasant economy, is a key vector in the “embedding” and “domiciling” of colonialism and in the making of a potentially independent, unique place-based society. He is more appropriately understood as part of a colonial petty bourgeoisie. In some ways, the practices of his class or stratum were more insinuating with regard

10. I specifically intend and deploy the term “translocal” rather than “transnational.” “Transnational,” though sometimes commonsensically used below, does not quite capture the intended meaning, since the relationship of imperial metropole to colonial hinterland or province is not a relation of inter-nation but one of intra-empire, a relationship of different functional and social spaces in one elaborate hierarchical transatlantic complex. At the same time, “translocal” captures the integrity of each space, as being its own “local” and variously experienced as such by those who cross borders and reside at different times in each, as necessary conditions of their social existence.
to the colonized lifeworlds of the enslaved than was the more removed hegemony of the upper elite, notwithstanding the acknowledged heterogeneity within dynastic practices. I have suggested elsewhere (Green, forthcoming 2006) that Thistlewood might be more central to the question of how intimacy localizes empire and helps reproduce historically unique West Indian creole societies.

Within the context of my specific and primary concern with differences within the White community, I focus on two social groups or class “types” in particular, using two individual/family biographical profiles culled from unevenly documented histories: locally bound intermediate strata clustered overwhelmingly around individual White male immigrants, and translocal upper-class family dynasties with significant generational depth and breadth. In the following sections, I present an overview of Jamaican socio-demographic structure pertinent to the questions raised by the discussion, before considering the “variously converging and diverging spatial-circuits of reproduction” of, first, Thomas Thistlewood and his “lesser White” race/class/gender stratum and, second, the upper-class family dynasty of the Barretts of Jamaica and of Elizabeth Barrett Browning literary fame. It might be objected that Thistlewood’s single biographical trajectory is clearly no match for a dynasty that completed the multi-era, multigenerational cycle from adventurer to creole planter class, to absentee owners, to merger with the industrial bourgeoisie “at home.” However, while Thistlewood shared only about three generations with the centuries-spanning Barrett clan, the deep differences between their respective class experiences and class effects had already become a structural feature of the society during that time.

I conclude the article by briefly reviewing the implications of the difference.

**West Indian Social Structure and Local/Translocal Circuits of Reproduction**

New World plantation slave societies can be generally divided into those that had a “residential” ruling class and high levels of European settlement (usually constituting majorities) and those with a high propensity toward owner absenteeism and low levels of European settlement. The latter group of colo-

11. In other words, while it is important to acknowledge some convergences in sexual and reproductive practices between individual family members of the upper elite and the sub-elite “overseer” class, the dominant principles defining the class as a whole clearly diverge. See the discussion on the dual marriage system below.
nies tended to be treated like overseas investments and the biggest owner-planters tended to merge with the metropolitan ruling class (“at home”), developing no fundamental or sustainable interest in nurturing independent capitalist states in the tropics or subtropics. The demographic structure of Britain’s West Indian colonies, and more particularly Jamaica, can primarily be explained by their historical status as nonresidentiary colonies of exploitation (colonies of export production driven by imported slave labor) and their economic administration through surrogacy.

The White population was skewed toward immigrant single male sub-patterns as a result of absenteeism among the upper ranks of the plantocracy, the tendency to recruit, prefer, or require unmarried men as overseers and other lesser plantation surrogates, and the persistent, semi-mythical lure of overnight privileged status and quick fortunes that Jamaica held for displaced and déclassé casualties of Britain’s rapidly changing economy. In an earlier piece, Burnard (1991:97) noted that in 1730, 76.2 percent of the White population, which itself constituted only 6.6 percent of the entire population of the island, were servants, “usually working as bookkeepers or overseers on plantations.” During Thistlewood’s time (1750-86), Whites accounted for between 6 and 8 percent of the total population, and adult men outnumbered adult women by more than 2 to 1 (Burnard 2004:17-18). Burnard has gone so far as to conclude, with some exaggeration and a disinclination to see beyond the immediate physical confines of the provincial space, that “the evolution of plantation society in Jamaica ... allowed little space for white women” (Burnard 1998:164). Broadly speaking, Whites in eighteenth-century Jamaica indeed tended to be male, young, migrant, and subaltern. Their general character was marked by their location between a preponderant population of enslaved Blacks on the one hand and a “nonresidentiary,” translocal or metropolitan-based White upper class on the other. As Sydney Haldane Olivier (1971:68) observed, even early nineteenth-century attempts to encourage the development of a White yeoman or small-settler class failed because “such a class could not hold its own in the local economy of that period.”

During the second half of the eighteenth century the problem of absenteeism intensified. According to one source, absentee owners owned 30 percent of Jamaica’s sugar estates in 1775 and 84 percent in 1832, as both absenteeism and the concentration of land increased (Sheridan 1974:287). While the great majority of Jamaican planters and pen-keepers were not absentee, the very largest sugar planters – between one-fifth and one-sixth of the total – were, and they owned the majority of slaves and acres in the colony. In 1754, the nine largest landholders, a little over one-half a percent of the total, each owned between 10,000 and 23,000 acres of land (Sheridan 1974:219, Table 10.1). The sugar export economy of Jamaica thus showed a structural propensity toward absenteeism and its demographic consequences. The complications of this phenomenon multiplied as more fortunes were made and
younger generations, schooled and coming of age in England, were less and less inclined to go back to the colonies to manage their inherited plantations in person. Exclusively female heirs – daughters, widows, sisters – made the prospect of return, even as visiting absentee owners in the robust tradition of Matthew “Monk” Lewis (1999), that much more unlikely. This did not mean, however, that female absentee ownership eroded the integrity of White patriarchal planter-class hegemony any more than did male absentee ownership, since there was usually in place a formidable support system of male players, including attorneys and overseers locally and British commission houses and agents in the metropole, to ensure the smooth reproduction of the enterprise.

The subjective social space of the upper West Indian plantocracy was therefore transnationally split. The divided social character of this class was represented precisely by the physical and social separation of certain fundamental conditions of their reproduction – slave-worked sugar plantations and metropolitan financial, cultural and what I call genealogical capital – into different worlds. In one recurring version, the transnational split was accommodated entirely by proxy, with the proprietors remaining in the metropole and their second-class surrogates presiding over their plantations and replicating the dualism of the system on their behalf. In the sagas of the great West Indian Creole family dynasties, biographies that were ultimately or wholly played out in Jamaica, those that zigzagged back and forth across the Atlantic, and those entirely nurtured and sustained in the motherland on the financial sweetness of Jamaican sugar profits, often marked different generational points in the genealogy of a transatlantic colonial family dynastic cycle that started and ended in Britain. The reproductive spatial-circuit of the upper plantocracy could not be comprehended by a look at its “provincial” manifestations only. Their transatlantic mode of reproduction, as indicated earlier, depended upon spatially dislocated means of reproduction coordinated through the converging and centralizing circuits of empire: the slave trade and slave-worked sugar plantations at the provincial sites of production (of the labor force and the export staple), and metropolitan finance capital, White wives properly incorporated through the endogamous institution of elite marriage, and impeccable genealogical and cultural credentials and networks at the central site of capital distribution and subjective class reproduction. These enabled unquestioned and smooth integration into the home-based bourgeoisie and the identity repertoires of upper-class Englishness or Britishness.

In British West Indian society, marriage was considered to be an exclusive upper-class privilege, completely bound up with considerations of race, lineage, and property, from which the “lesser White” bachelor estate personnel and the slaves were effectively barred. The elite institution came to have a special association with absenteeism, as the richest planters looked to England as a source
of marriageable partners and sent their sons and daughters there to be educated, and inevitably to marry and to settle. England became the home site (and place of residence) for the social reproduction of the wealthiest group among the West Indian planters, their transnational niche being materially sustained on the basis of profits from their sugar plantations and the financial backing of British merchant houses. The small West Indian and related mercantile circles in England (and in the colonies) married into each other’s families and effected political alliances that advanced their colonial interests, further securing the transnational niche. Richard Pares (1950:249) points out that the plantations were “loaded ... with legacies and annuities, with widows and old maids quartered upon them from every county in England,” in an extravagant and inefficient system which ultimately redounded to the benefit of the planters’ British creditors. Certain established sugar traders (“factors”) and creditors of the big planters refused to deal with small planters because “they often had coloured families, who might inherit their land and desire a loan from a merchant.” They also “declined to lend money to white planters who were likely to leave their properties to coloured heirs” (Pares 1950:240). Obviously, the ultimate concern was economic rather than “moral,” since the big planters were no less likely to have “colored families,” just either more able to sustain them outside and without encroaching upon their main capital enterprises or less willing to acknowledge them (except perhaps as their property).

Access to upper-class White wives, metropolitan finance capital, and extended reproduction of genealogy across the Atlantic were available to only a small number of elite White West Indian men. For those planters who were resident in the colony, their reproductive and sexual niches might be consummated and sustained not just in relations of marriage with White women, co-resident or headquartered abroad, but also in relations of concubinage with Black women, enslaved or free. White planters often became the mediating biological and social link between two (or more) sets of families, helping to reproduce two different classes either simultaneously (usually, but not always, involving multiple residences) or sequentially (perhaps beginning – or resuming – their legal marital careers after going “home” to England). Raymond T. Smith (1987:167) refers to this as the “dual marriage system,” noting that “from the beginning of the development of the slave regime, a marriage system was in place that included both legal marriage and concubinage, a system in which the elements were mutually and reciprocally defining and which articulated with the racial hierarchy.”

I want to insert here a note about White Wives, not just as genealogical capital or reproducers of patrilineage, but also as widowed owners ensuring the continued reproduction of productive property and economic capital. Women, though in a distinct demographic and structural minority, were also independent planters locally and not just as widows. However I am paying particular attention here to absentee widowed upper-class female legatees of
large plantation property. One remarkable example (and there are others) should caution us against assuming too readily the historical passivity of the overseas White wife/widow. On January 17, 1776, Anna Eliza Elletson, “left Devissee and sole Executrix” of Hope Estate in Liguanea, Jamaica (and “all his Estates Real & Personal in England”), by the death of her husband, Roger Hope Elletson, writes to her Jamaican attorneys, pleading the peculiar disadvantages of her sex:

Mr. Elletson was a very good understanding Planter, but I am a mere novice, Indeed few people can have a just idea of cultivating any Country with which they are unacquainted, and I believe, it seldom happens to be the subject of Contemplation with Women – our mode of Education does not qualify us for such employments, if I wish in any Degree to render myself Mistress of this subject, tis only, that I may comprehend, what you may have occasion to write me, but not to presume to direct you, the least in your management.

Mrs. Elletson, having thus charmingly disarmed her local representatives, proceeds with systematic and steely resolve, in this and her other letters, to establish an astonishing command over the direction of her properties from across the Atlantic. She is scrupulous in setting up the contractual instruments and terms of her new management regime. She familiarizes herself with and strictly monitors the market for sugar in relation to grade, color, price, fluctuations of supply and demand, shipping, timing, and location of sale. She suggests and orders elaborate schemes for scientific and technical improvements of the property and methods of cultivation, including irrigation systems and procurement of the latest technology and technical expertise. She is as rigorous in her attention to the care and upkeep of the slave labor force as she is to the details of the estate accounts, especially in regard to various testamentary claims upon and debts owed the estate. She keeps close tabs on the staff conditions and regularly submits recommendations for changes. With the help of her Jamaican and British lawyers, she vigorously pursues a number of new and pending prosecutorial and defensive legal actions on behalf of the estate. Most boldly, she successfully sues the Town of Kingston over a prior concession to supply water to the town from the estate that had

12. See, for example, letters from Anne Fyffe of Dundee, Scotland, after the death of her husband, David, regarding the family’s Jamaican properties, in the Fyffe Family Collection, MS 1655, National Library of Jamaica. The Fyffe family fortunes were, admittedly, considerably less auspicious.
13. He had served as lieutenant-governor of Jamaica.
been granted by her late husband. Her successful suit cites the estate’s need of the water for its own sugar manufacturing operations.

Mrs. Anna Eliza Elletson’s role as remote trustee of a large West Indian property, preserved through endogamous marriage for British upper-class posterity, is exemplary but by no means unique. Her legal victories were facilitated by her substantial support and surrogate system, complete with political and financial reinforcements subsequently brought in by her titled new husband, the Duke of Chandos. Later, after their only child married the Duke of Buckingham, the estate would become the property of the Duke of Buckingham and Chandos (Brown 2004:22).

The critical roles of absentee wives, returned widows, and mothers relocating in the motherland with their school-age sons and daughters are also in evidence in the account of the Barrett family presented below.

The so-called “dual marriage system” potentially or actually generated two race/class lines – one legitimate, the other illegitimate – with the White master as common genitor, reproducing White paterfamilial propriety and racial superiority on the one hand, Afro-creole matrifocality and hybridized subalternity on the other. Just as marriage came to be an exclusive property of the very wealthy and a mechanism for the transnational reproduction of the Euro-creole upper class, concubinage came to be the means by which a “bastard” intermediate class was bequeathed to the societies of the West Indies by the planters and their surrogates as the social superiors of the slaves and, later, of the Black peasantry and working class. Legitimacy and illegitimacy defined the relation of center to periphery and the genteel drawing-room world of White wives to the profane underworld of Black concubines. But “dual marriage,” involving simultaneous access to White wives and Black concubines, was not typically an option for subaltern White men, and, indeed, not all the liaisons that produced these “bastard scions” had the same social standing. The range crossed the hierarchies of male-gender White and female-gender non-White society, moving from the regular form of predatory rape experienced by any number of female plantation slaves in the casual, irregular, or random sexual encounters forced upon them by masters and their associates in the course of their everyday lives, through the semi-regular, sometimes long-lasting or permanent – and more or less consensual – “housekeeping” arrangements which brought a “favorite” slave into the household of an overseer or proprietor or continued to involve dual residences on the plantation (slave women sometimes being specially purchased or hired for such “housekeeping” purposes), to the semi-respectable or at least openly “alternative” liaisons between planter-class men and relatively high-status “free Colored” women, who might be either independently situated or “kept” in their own establishments, residential and/or commercial. Late eighteenth-century observer, Bryan Edwards (1793:22), allowed of the latter that the “terms and manner of their compliance ... are commonly as
decent, though perhaps not as solemn, as those of marriage; ... giving themselves up to the husband (for so he is called) with faith plighted, with sentiment, and with affection.” Others were more contemptuously cynical and given over to racial and sexual stereotyping in their observations: “Though the daughters of rich men, and though possessed of slaves and estates, they never think of marriage; their delicacy is such, for they are extremely proud, vain and ignorant, that they despise men of their own colour; and though they have their amorous desires abundantly gratified by them and black men secretly, they will not avow these connections” (Moreton 1790:124-5).

Indeed, one other consequence of the skewed racial-gender demographics of colonial West Indian populations was the emergence into numerical and intermediate caste/class conspicuousness of a free Colored population and a politically anomalous free Colored elite. This is another group whose importance and complicating presence are understated in Burnard’s discussion of White egalitarianism. In keeping with this observation, Thistlewood’s diaries show us that even the account of racially endogamous and racially exogamous mating by Whites defining the boundary between legitimacy and illegitimacy, while broadly true, should not be exaggerated. Thistlewood’s longest engagement as an overseer in the first half of his residency in Jamaica places him in a subordinate class position vis-à-vis the respectably married “not quite” White heir of the late White plantation owner, William Dorrill, under whom Thistlewood also served. While this type of situation may have been rare, Thistlewood’s Jamaican biography – played out in an unsettled space “in-between” sharply defined racial and class worlds – should, on a whole, caution us against composing too simplistic an account of relations and status hierarchies among Whites as well as between Whites and free Blacks and Coloreds. Details of this biography presented below allow us to more vividly and sensitively mark the complexities of those relations and status hierarchies.15

15. My main source for the details of Thistlewood’s diaries, in addition to Burnard’s book itself, is the much earlier one by Douglas Hall (1999). Hall’s book is an edited presentation of the excerpted diaries that has a somewhat different focus from Burnard’s and has both great independent and great complementary value. I also got a chance to do a cursory preview of the diaries themselves, while I was in Jamaica doing archival research. The University of the West Indies Mona library has a complete copy of the original Monson manuscripts in its West Indies Collection section. Having broached the formidable task of sampling the 32 folios, which contain 10,000 sometimes illegible pages of handwritten text, it was not difficult to come away in some considerable awe of both Burnard and Hall and their remarkable accomplishments in reading, editing, synthesizing, and interpreting. I also read enough to get a sense that there is probably no substitute for an original reading. Even in my preliminary sampling I was able to glean a number of details that show patterns not highlighted by either Hall or Burnard. Depending on particular scholarly interests, there is no doubt that everyone will have his or her own Thistlewood.
Among the complexities and nuances that might confound a too-strict correlation between race and class or race and political interests, there are two on which I wish to focus in the following section: first, the reproductive niches of those White men who did not have access (or at least easy access) to White wives and the “dual marriage system” or to actively and transnationally deployable metropolitan finance, cultural, and genealogical capital; second, the enforceable and regularly enforced authority that overseers like Thistlewood, as resident masters, had over the White plantation underlings, whose reproductive niches tended to be even more constrained than their own. There is a third subject which cannot be fully addressed here but should be borne in mind: that of proximal relations between Whites and free Blacks or Coloreds (usually the latter) mediated through ties of friendship, commonly experienced ownership of slaves and land, “illegitimate” but more or less acknowledged kinship, and even – as in the case of John Cope, Thistlewood’s boss during most of his overseership, and his wife, Mary Cope (née Dorrill) – marriage. I would argue that Burnard understates the evidence of these complexities and nuances as furnished by Thistlewood’s diaries and therefore the ways in which they rendered British West Indian social structure far more opaque than the easy representations offered by various commonsensical accounts would have us believe.

**THOMAS THISTLEWOOD: IN BETWEEN RACIAL AND CLASS WORLDS**

Thistlewood is the younger of two sons of a middling yeoman farmer in Lincolnshire County in England. He is apparently displaced from a livelihood in farming as a casualty of the law of primogeniture, although he does receive a small legacy of £200 from his father. Lacking in both the moral and resource prerequisites for a proper/tied match with a respectable woman of his class, he casts his lot with colonial adventures overseas and decides to seek his fortune in Jamaica. Despite a deep-seated ambition, a decent basic education that included a smattering of the classics and the sciences, and miscellaneous entrepreneurial proclivities and experiences, Thistlewood cannot aspire to a position above that of overseer. Modest as it might seem, it was not the worst he could do. According to Edward Kamau Brathwaite (1971:142), overseers on absentee-owned plantations were “master[s] of the place,” whereas bookkeepers, in spite of the authority of immediate, everyday tyranny they sometimes held over Blacks, were typically among the poorest and most powerless White men. For one, Thistlewood goes to Jamaica on his own account; he is a free man, not shackled by a pre-contracted formal indenture. On the contrary, he is fortunate enough to be armed with letters of introduction from local notables with West Indian connections. He finds work immediately and remains a well-regarded and much sought-after over-
seer for the first seventeen years of his life in Jamaica. At the end of this period, he moves, together with a small, gradually acquired slave workforce, to property he has purchased jointly with Samuel Say, a fellow member of the overseer class. He converts his portion to a pen, a type of operation that is ancillary to the great sugar estates, and he eventually develops it into a much-admired horticultural showpiece. He is a small proprietor by most standards (thirty or more slaves and 160 acres, of which more than half is swampland), but his agronomic skills and relative commercial success, combined with his appointments to a number of lower-level political offices and military commissions confirm him as a respected member of the White community.

Thistlewood’s diaries speak to us of two worlds: the predominantly homosocial world of dominant (both “greater” and “lesser”) White men and the overwhelmingly African world over which he presides with routine and unremitting brutality, but which he also shares, however unevenly, in an intimate and sometimes startlingly mundane domestic arrangement with Phibbah, an Afro-creole house slave. He acts as a kind of mediator and link between, and traverser of, these two worlds, the homosocial world of White men without, or unaccompanied by, White wives and the world of brutalized, infantilized, and sexualized Black men and women. His role in each world is contradictory and complex. He is a near (“not quite”) equal participant in the exclusive White male political commons, in which he is appointed to lower-level but not insignificant offices. He engages actively in both intra-class and inter-class social networks of White homosocial conviviality in which women make an occasional appearance, and he is a member of the fraternity of White plantation masters whose domination of the bodies of the enslaved includes compulsive and unrelenting sexual predation upon those of enslaved women. Like the overwhelming majority of the other White men in his world, he routinely and regularly exercises his at-large droit du seigneur on the female labor force of the estates under his management.

Yet there are limits. He can never aspire to being an elected member of the Assembly, that jealously guarded instrument of planter-class self-government and of the sovereignty of claims to “freeborn English” identity and subjecthood. He is never invited to dinner at the Governor’s House or to the great balls of elite planter-class society – complete with bona fide hostess wives and the small circle of society ladies – though he often supplies the livestock, game, vegetables, and flowers that ensure their grand success. He does not become a sugar planter and exporter, instead remaining primarily a less-valued broker of domestic economy and a patron of the protopeasant economy of the slaves, particularly the coterie of “elite” domestic and skilled slaves networked around his “wife,” Phibbah. Perhaps most importantly, he does not have a White wife, but lives “according to the custom of the country,” and more especially according to the custom of his class.
Even here there are important qualifications. Thistlewood is not a candidate for the dual marriage system who decides to forego the benefits of a White wife in part because of the assurance of other conditions of reproduction that guarantee full maintenance of class status. This is true, for example, of George Goodin Barrett, Elizabeth Barrett Browning’s great-uncle, discussed below, who mates exclusively (at least, in self-acknowledged terms) with a mulatto slave, Elissa Peters. Their children suffer a fate not untypical of the offspring of such couplings: they are not given the Barrett name, but they are sent to England to be schooled and domiciled according to the terms of their father’s will, and they receive secondary (and inevitably contestable) bequests. Thistlewood, in contrast, gives his son John his name. He does not have the economic wherewithal or the genealogical amplitude and latitude to school him in England, and evinces no aspirations or plans to that effect. John is schooled locally and is later apprenticed to a master carpenter, William Hornby.

It should be pointed out here that not all large planter names were so closely guarded (outside of the widespread process of giving estate slaves the surnames of their owners). Another strategy, pursued by Martin or Martyn Williams, the dually married husband of George’s properly pedigreed first cousin (who later becomes the widowed mistress of George’s brother), was to both pass on the name and petition the courts to declare his illegitimate mixed-race children, whose mother was a free Black woman, legally White.16 To complicate matters, there is a third option that both Williams’s “dual marriage” obligations and the changed inheritance laws of his and George’s time17 preclude him from pursuing (whatever his personal inclinations): bequeathing his main properties to Colored heirs. His properties are passed on to his legitimate White heirs. The case of Molly or Mary Cope (née Dorill), the fully endowed illegitimate quadroon daughter of Thistlewood’s late employer (now his employer, under coverture of her White husband) is different, but in part only because of the absence of competing claims from a “legitimate” White family. She appears to us, through the admittedly limited medium of Thistlewood’s cryptic daily log, as the tragic dupe of a strategy

16. This is a reference to a special statute in Jamaica by which free Colored individuals were allowed to petition the Assembly (or to have someone petition the Assembly on their behalf) for “special privileges” that would render them legally White, thereby conferring upon them an approximation of the whole bundle of rights and obligations that came with free White status. This “special privileges” statute was peculiar to Jamaica among the British islands. See Heuman 1981:6.

17. William Dorrill’s last will and testament was dated March 5, 1754, seven years before legislation was passed in 1761 prohibiting Whites from leaving real or personal property worth more than £1,200 sterling (or around 2,000 Jamaican pounds) “to any Colored or Black.” See Heuman 1981:6.
to re-inscribe and recover a proper plantocratic and racial destiny for the at-risk property and lineage of her paternal ancestry. Once she has fulfilled all the right conditions she becomes practically dispensable. She confides to Thistlewood that her husband “wants her to cut the entail off and settle upon him for life” (Hall 1999:70). She is being pressed to transfer title to the estate to her abusive and incompetent White husband.18

Not only is Thistlewood not a candidate for the dual marriage system but his sexual rights over his slave mistress are limited by the preeminent rights of her owner (through his heiress wife), John Cope. Thistlewood is forced to defer to Cope, the younger man, in a variety of ways, not the least of which is his own powerlessness to stop him from exercising paramount rights of ownership, and (therefore) patriarchal precedence over Thistlewood, by summoning Phibbah into sexual service on more than one occasion. Thistlewood’s exclusive rights to Phibbah are only secured when he is settled on his own property and he is finally allowed to hire her on a permanent basis from the Copes. At that point, Thistlewood is able to keep his intense dislike for Cope in sufficient check to astutely accommodate the latter man’s increasingly significant role as sponsor and patron of his own vertical mobility and growing respectability in the White community.

Overseers and others of their class often hired and sometimes purchased favored slave lovers and brought them into their homes in “housekeeping” arrangements, which involved providing sexual and domestic services, sometimes for life. Sometimes the housekeeper was a free Black woman. Mrs. Carmichael, a five-year sojourner in the West Indies as a planter’s wife, and a tenacious apologist for the plantocracy, describes the “Colored housekeeper” as a necessary evil for the poorly paid and poorly equipped resident manager or overseer who cannot afford a White wife or offer her an acceptable way of life:

Managers so situated, too often keep a coloured housekeeper, who generally manages well for herself, though she almost always does something for her own subsistence, either by huckstering or making preserves. She

18. Ultimately the transgressive racial composition of the family appears to take its toll. The main properties, totaling thousands of acres, are mismanaged by Cope and eventually have to be sold off. Moreover, tragedy seems to haunt the Dorrill-Cope women, i.e. Mary and her two daughters. All three women, non-White but near-White, have been able to secure a relatively elusive level of respectability through appropriate marriages to White men, but have obviously done so at great psychic cost. One of the daughters later hangs herself in an apparently laudanum-induced episode (Hall 1999:291). As for her brothers, they are sent to school in England and return to ambiguous statuses and constant conflict with their abusive father.

19. Olivier (1971:67), too, noted that overseers and bookkeepers were “stingily paid in cash.”
can live, and be very comfortable, in circumstances that no European woman could possibly be happy in; for she is never at a loss for society, as she can always find some coloured people not far distant, of her own habits and manners; but an European female in such circumstances, would be desolate and miserable, even if her husband could afford to give her the common comforts of life; for no woman of decent moral habits, can make a friend of any of the coloured population who move in that sphere of life. (Carmichael 1969:61-62)

According to Mrs. Carmichael, the combined circumstances of conditions that are both materially and morally unfit for a European woman “operate powerfully upon the middling and lower classes of white people, in preventing marriage, and opening a door to much immorality” (Carmichael 1969:61-62).

The slave mistress was typically the object of lease or purchase but not of manumission. While offspring were often manumitted at a young age, it was not unusual for their slave mothers to be freed by their owner/keepers only in death, as a fulfillment of the last will and testament. This safe system of postmortem release protected and preserved the sanctity of the slaveowning order and, presumably, assuaged the consciences of dying White men. For the belatedly enfranchised, “freedom” was usually too short-lived and too deeply compromised to be properly enjoyed.

Despite the difficulties Thistlewood encountered in hiring Phibbah, ostensibly because of ties of devotion between the latter and her owner, Mary Dorrill/Cope, the practice of procuring “housekeeper” services through either the hire or purchase of female slaves did not as a rule meet with major objection from owners. On January 17, 1776, Anna Eliza Elletson wrote her attorneys in Jamaica to carry out the intention of her late husband to transact the sale of his slave mistress and mulatto daughter to one Mr. Coe, the estate distiller. She hopes, however, that this will not prove a distraction from his duties:

among Mr. Elletson’s papers I found one which by the subject, I believe was intended, to convey all right & title to a negro slave, named Maria, and her mulatto Daughter, to the said Mr. Coe, for the consideration of one hundred & thirty pounds current money of Jamaica – I presume Mr. Elletson meant to execute that Title, therefore, as soon as you are pleased to give me instructions concerning it, I will certainly execute it, at the same time, I hope that Black Lady will not engross too much of his attention from his business.20

A little over four years later she has occasion to arrange for the title to his mulatto child to be transferred to the current overseer. As usual, she wants

to make sure the estate is duly compensated: “I am very ready to comply with Mr. Concannon’s request by making him a title to his mulatto child, on condition of his replacing it with an able Negro, & wish to have yr. opinion adopted relative to the other mulatto children on the estate.”

During his early years in Jamaica, Thistlewood shares, or aspires to share, similar domestic arrangements with fellow-overseer Mordiner (or “Mordenner”) and the two socialize with each other. Thistlewood notes that his friend “has been purchasing Quasheba ... He gives for her, two new Negroes cost him 48 pounds each, beside duty. He paid 14 pounds per annum for her: he paid in ready cash for her and his two children about 166 pounds – besides what they have cost him in victuals, clothes, etc.” (Hall 1999:52). Thistlewood is clearly impressed with Mordiner’s commanding ability to secure, with unmitigated proprietary rights, one of the basic requirements of secondary White manhood in the West Indian colonies – the in-house provision of exclusive sexual and domestic services by a selected Black woman, legally enslaved or nominally free. He has cause to be envious. In 1757, when he temporarily leaves the employ of the Copes, he “begged hard of Mrs Cope [Mary Dorrill] to sell or hire Phibbah to me, but she would not; he [Mr. Cope] was willing” (Hall 1999:79). After a visit from Phibbah, he yearns achingly, “I wish they would sell her to me” (Hall 1999:80). It is not until he is settled in his own property ten years later that the Copes finally agree to hire Phibbah out to him at an annual rate of £18; but selling is still out of the question.

Sometimes expressions of affection for a slave mistress breached the boundaries of inviolate and robust White manhood, and exposed the vulnerability of those whose circuit of reproduction depended exclusively on the emotional, sexual, and other household and bodily care services provided by Black women within domestic (back)space. William Crookshanks, Thistlewood’s immediate subordinate on Egypt Plantation, proves to be an embarrassment to his race, gender, and class in that regard, as he violates both the spatial and the expressive limits of this kind of relationship. Mirtilla, his slave mistress, whom he has leased at a yearly rate of £20 and re-hires out to earn her expenses, completely manipulates him (according to Thistlewood), refusing to work, feigning illness, “only resolved to put William through a needless charge through spite” (Hall 1999:70). “William cries sadly, the more fool he, as it is probably for Salt River Long Quaw [another slave],” (Hall 1999:68) Thistlewood comments, regarding a miscarriage Mirtilla suffers early on in the ill-fated relationship. The love-crazed William curses her owners when they punish her for some misdeed. Later, he attends her in

the labor of giving birth to their child. “W.C. came home and cried,” over-
whelmed by the experience. Thistlewood clearly regards W.C.’s softness for
Mirtilla as excessive and foolish, and a dangerous embarrassment to the stan-
dards of potent and inscrutable White manhood.

Crookshanks’s behavior is obviously related to his marginality within
the White plantation-based community. He cannot really afford a full-time
“housekeeper” in the manner of Thistlewood and other supervisory staff, and
he is “forced” to subcontract out Mirtilla’s services so that she can earn her
keep. His precarious financial and psycho-emotional status quickly causes
him to lose control of the situation. The procurement of stable, full-time, and
exclusive domestic and sexual services, or “housekeeper” arrangements, was
typically beyond the reach of the lowest and most transient of the White male
plantation staff. Moreover, they were subject to the patriarchal precedence of
the resident master, overseer, or owner in the matter of access to the sexual
services of the enslaved female labor force.

Not only does Burnard exaggerate Thistlewood’s enjoyment of a shared
political egalitarian space with the White elite, but he also suppresses the
compelling evidence of his supervisory authority over the White subordi-
nates beneath him. As resident master, Thistlewood has the power to hire
and fire lower-level White staff and to police both their employment-related
and their personal and sexual conduct, especially in relation to that most
precious of plantation property, the slave labor force. He wields the ultimate
power of patriarchal arbitration over both the White subordinates and the
slaves. He controls access to enslaved women, approves, makes, and breaks
matches (both White/Black and Black/Black couplings), referees sexual
rivalries and domestic conflicts, punishes both male and female transgres-
sions against the patriarchy, and of course reserves to himself the absolute
right of access to any female slave, unmitigated by prior claims, including
those most recently adjudicated by him in favor of a successful claimant
against interlopers.

Over the course of his tenure at Egypt, he has cause to either approve
or thwart the designs of members of his White staff regarding both tran-
sient sexual opportunities and more lasting “housekeeper” relationships
with enslaved women. Sometimes his authority derives more clearly from
direct ownership of the slave in question. In late 1762, he gives his assent
to the partnering of the new driver, Robert Gibbs, a Barbadian, with his
slave Nanny (Hall 1999:127). Nanny’s next “keeper,” another White man,
Patrick May, stayed only six days. He came home drunk on the evening
of May 23, 1763, “quarreled with Nanny whom he kept, and shot her with
small shot, one of which struck her head near the top, and the other her
ankle, both these shots seem to be lodged” (Hall 1999:128). Thistlewood
dismisses him. A previous employee, James Rogers, leaves after being rep-
rimanded for assaulting the slaves in the field while drunk (Hall 1999:124).
Thistlewood is particularly averse to the risk posed by White drunkenness, an endemic feature of plantation life, to slave property and to his own authority. He denies the right of certain White underlings to prey upon the female slaves at will. For example, he “reprimanded Henry MacCormick for frequenting the Negro houses in the night” (Hall 1999:140). On other occasions he steps in to prevent what he sees as inappropriate or injurious couplings, even to the point of preferring the claims of elite male slaves over those of certain White contenders. He takes care to protect longer-term supervisory alliances over more transient ones, regardless of race. The peripatetic and elusive character of White labor made such a course wise. Moreover, poorer White servants, many of whom were Irish and Scottish, were the object of open ethnic prejudice, suspicion, and contempt from self-aware Englishmen like Thistlewood. During the entire period he is executing this kind of dominion, Thistlewood is still an overseer.

One other important distinction palpably present in Thistlewood’s account is that between free status and indentured status among Whites. I have noted elsewhere that indentured servants to some degree shared with enslaved Africans the condition of “deracinated isolates” (Green, forthcoming 2007). Both slave and indentured servant were seen as detached embodiments of labor power at the complete disposal of the master. Their legal personalities were thereby suspended or canceled out, the one permanently and by force, the other temporarily and by contractual self-submission. For both groups, marriage was prohibited as an interference with the master’s proper enjoyment of his property rights in their persons and labor services. Even outside the bonded contract, single status was often stipulated as a condition of employment of the White overseers and bookkeepers, for whom these positions were expected to act as stepping stones to bigger and better things. As noted above, Thistlewood himself records instances of White servants absconding or making common cause with enslaved Blacks against their masters.

Thistlewood came to Jamaica as a free – and English – man, with the pride of the yeoman class and a burning personal ambition coursing through his veins. He becomes a master of White servants and Black slaves, a slave-owner, small planter, and, through a process of sponsored mobility, a respected junior member of the White plantocratic political commons. His social niche, however, lay outside the “dual marriage system” or the border-crossing transatlantic circuits of the upper elite. His accommodation to the “custom of the country,” embedding him within a cross-racial spatial circuit of personal and generational reproduction, was not simply his “choice” or “preference” (i.e. as an option that willfully excluded a White wife). To a very great extent, these were the means of reproduction available to him, for

22. Thistlewood appears to hold a particular aversion for Scotsmen.
his use and abuse. And indeed, he remains a lifelong sexual opportunist and predator, exploiting generations of enslaved women owned and managed by him, including mothers and their daughters or other lineal descendants. By a contrast that may seem startling today but was normative in its time, he also shares a lifelong co-residential, intimate, complex, and dense conjugal partnership with his chosen slave “wife,” Phibbah.

The processes of Thistlewood’s daily and generational reproduction, in bodily and affective terms, take place within a Black/African female-mediated emotional and cultural domestic space. Thistlewood has no insider knowledge of any other kind of private domestic world. In this space, even as ultimate patriarch and master, he is humanized (as far as possible) by and dependent upon the intercessionary care services and emotional solicitude of Phibbah, agent and mediator of multiple worlds in her own right. He is genitor of a hybrid, intermediate, “Colored” race/class line, which in his case abruptly ends with the premature death of his only acknowledged son, Mulatto John. After an initial period of referring to this son anonymously as “Phibbah’s child,” he eventually does step into the role of social father-disciplinarian to him, however contentiously so. This second-generation (and self-obliterating) merger of the White overseer and small settler class into the increasingly significant intermediate class of free Coloreds became a routine structural feature of Jamaican society, in ways that, while not peculiar to Jamaica, did not occur everywhere. Olivier (1971:69) is careful to point this out:

The small white settler class was absorbed as overseers and book-keepers, married or cohabited unmarried with coloured women, and in a generation or two became merged in the class described as the “free coloured people.” They did not, as white immigrants of their position did, for example, in Barbados or in South Africa at a later period, give rise to a permanent “poor white” class; and it was very fortunate for Jamaica that they did not.

Nonetheless, considerable doubt remains as to whether Mulatto John would have been duly vested as Thistlewood’s main heir, had he lived. Thistlewood’s nephew, John Thistlewood, his elder brother’s son, joins him from England in early February 1764, a few years after the birth of Mulatto John (and, it should be said, the passage of the law restricting bequests to Colored heirs). Was this a move on Thistlewood’s part to secure a collateral extension of the White Thistlewood family on Jamaican soil? If so, it was not to be, because the young John Thistlewood meets with an untimely death soon after his arrival in Jamaica. However, we have the evidence of Thistlewood’s last will and testament. After making conditional provision, within strictly mandated price limits, for the purchase and manumission of Phibbah and the settlement
upon her of Bess, a female slave (already informally “owned” by Phibbah),
with the latter’s son and “future issue,” and a small plot of land to be pur-
chased and upon which a house was to be erected “suitable to her station.”
Thistlewood apportions the balance from the expected proceeds of the sale
of his estate to his brother’s surviving children in England – three-fifths to
“William Thistlewood son of my brother John Thistlewood of the County
of Lincoln” and two-fifths to “my niece Mary Annet daughter of my said
brother John Thistlewood” (cited in Hall 1999:313-14). If Phibbah’s manu-
mission cannot be secured upon his terms, the alternative arrangement of
settling upon her a small annuity for life (fifteen pounds per annum) must be
followed. Thistlewood also bequeaths £50 sterling to his agent in London,
and an equivalent amount to a planter friend, “lately of this parish.”

Thus even though Thistlewood’s direct line ends in miscegenated ano-
nymity in Jamaica, where he leaves behind the only conjugal family he
has known and that has physically and emotionally sustained and serviced
him for the past thirty-five or so years, the bulk of his modest fortune, built
partly on their blood and sweat, ends up in England, with his White col-
lateral heirs.

**Contrasting Thistlewood: The Barretts, a West Indian Creole Dynasty**

The genealogy of the famous English poet, Elizabeth Barrett Browning
(EBB) illustrates both the fabulous wealth of the Creole upper class and their
somewhat heterogeneous family/kinship patterns and strategies, despite the
central role played by the White wife as reproducer of the race and the lin-
eage. The entire Jamaican trajectory of the (self-professed White) Barrett
family spanned nearly 340 years, beginning with the expeditionary forces
in 1655 that handily won Jamaica for the burgeoning British Empire, and
ending with the death in 1992 of Edward Richard Moulton Barrett, the “last

23. Phibbah had been made a “gift” of Bess by Mrs. Bennett, the free Colored woman
who owns the pen that Thistlewood and Say later jointly buy. Her friendship extends to
other areas as well: she boards “Little Mulatto John” during the week while he attends Mr.
Hugh’s school in the Savanna (Hall 1999:134). Bess has to be registered as Thistlewood’s
because, as a slave, Phibbah cannot own another slave. The ties of friendship and busi-
ness with free Colored women like Mrs. Bennett and Elizabeth Anderson (later Mrs.
Mould), Molly Cope’s mother and the widowed mistress of her father William Dorrill,
belie Burnard’s pronouncement about the lack of social contact between Whites and free
Blacks or Coloreds. Thistlewood writes many letters to both women, as well as to Molly
Cope, while in her employ as well as after, communicating details of both a business and
a private nature, including asking personal favors and making personal inquiries. In addi-
tion, Thistlewood and the women often exchange gifts.
of the Barrett landowners in Jamaica” (Barrett 2000:iix). In 1838, the year slavery was finally abolished, the vast and multiple Jamaican estates of the extended Barrett clan covered 31,000 acres, according to one source (Markus 1995:99).

The saga of this famous family, still shrouded in the compulsively amnesic mystery of British colonial and literary history, has all the makings of a sensational best-selling novel: multigenerational inbreeding; unmarried cousin mating; interracial liaisons and childbearing with enslaved and free Black women; unresolved questions about the racial “purity,” or escape from racial “contamination,” of the self-proclaimed White bloodlines; uneasy social relations with “Colored” cousins sent to England for schooling and in some cases permanent relocation; bitter, drawn-out legal battles between White and Colored heirs of some of the Jamaican properties, involving the poet’s father as a claimant on the “legitimate” White side; rumors of incest, madness, sociopathy, and drug addiction. For a very long time in Elizabeth Barrett Browning historiography, the historical and political memory loss ran so deep that there seemed to be a general complicity in the project of re-inventing a solidly authentic, if colorful, English past, while strategically deploying fragments of the Jamaican connection as titillating and evocative devices in the romantic and exotic figuration of the poet-legend. In various biographical entries, her father, Edward, is often described as a member of the British landed gentry who sent his sons to Jamaica “on business.” It is hardly ever mentioned, for example, that EBB’s estranged grandfather and two of her beloved brothers all lived out the final portions of their lives in consensual and procreative – and in one case legal – relationships with Black or Colored Jamaican women on Jamaican soil. EBB’s father had both White and non-White illegitimate half-siblings and, although he probably did not live long enough to know this or to fully absorb the knowledge of it, non-White Jamaican grandchildren (the first one being born four months before his death in 1857, according to one source). These details – especially the unexpected trope of return and re-creolization or “going [back] native” – interfere with

24. For my account of the Barretts I have relied upon two main sources and a number of supplementary ones. The main sources are, first and foremost, the remarkable 1938 family history by Marks, and the more recent work by Barrett (2000), a descendant of the family, who himself relies somewhat on Marks. Marks’s work is highly idiosyncratic, but to the shame of subsequent chroniclers of the Barrett family, unmatched in historical detail, based on original research, and historical candor (especially for its time and place). An exception to this rule is the 1995 work of Markus, who draws appropriately on both the details and the candor. Marks is not without her own prejudices, but she gives one room to read her work and her evidence as an exposé of White West Indian society.

25. Markus 1995:303. The supreme irony of his life was that two of his sons who were not disinheritend by him because of known – or unknown – marriages against his will produced only Colored “illegitimate” grandchildren. His White grandchildren (those that
the smooth and sanitized induction of the Barrett Browning legacy into the annals of the British literary canon. All Colored offspring (especially those that were self-evidently so) have been kept scrupulously expunged from or marginalized within “official” constructions of the Barrett family tree, while out-of-wedlock White scions, most certainly those with the correct maternal pedigrees, have all been allotted their “rightful” and prominent places upon its branches (see both Marks 1938 and Barrett 2000). Who is included as part of the historical Barrett family is first and foremost a matter of race.

I want to reinforce the point that this kind of semi-mythical genealogical reconstruction was both required and made possible by the socioeconomic status of the transatlantic Creole dynastic upper class – moreover, in ways that dramatically distinguished them from bachelor settlers of modest self-made fortunes like Thistlewood, despite the fact that the two types often found common ground in Jamaica. Thistlewood simply did not have the financial and genealogical capital to reproduce such a dynasty. But neither did his status as a respected junior member of the White planter community and participant in White homosocial convivial networks and political commons require such dynastic connections. At the same time, it would be a mistake to assume that Thistlewood did not keenly feel his place in the White Jamaican and imperial social order.

Thistlewood’s life was contemporaneous with about three or more generations of the Barrett family. They also lived in the same region of western Jamaica, and there are cross-references in Thistlewood’s journals and the Barrett biographies to some of the same personalities, places, and major local events. His business partner, Samuel Say, is overseer at Old Hope Estate, the property of Martin Williams, future husband of Elizabeth Barrett Waite, mother of the famous Richard Barrett (not Williams’s child), speaker of the Assembly during the tumultuous pre-emancipation years. After Say’s death, Williams offers Thistlewood the job, but he turns it down. By then he is the owner of his own property. Another connection is George Robert Goodin who owns land abutting Sarah Bennett’s property, the very one which Thistlewood and Samuel Say later buy. He is the brother of Judith Goodin, wife of Edward Barrett of Cinnamon Hill, EBB’s great-grandfather and Richard Barrett’s grandfather. After Thistlewood’s death, Goodin purchases his precious “Bread Nut Island Penn” for 600 pounds currency. And so on. The upper-class dynastic status of the Barretts, and the depth of their West Indian genealogy offer a working contrast to the modest social position and hard-won individual status of Thistlewood. It helps us to place him and them, and to properly distinguish the constituent strands of the social tapestry.

were ostensibly White) from legalized marriages, in a strange pathological twist, were cut off by him. But that is a detail of individual or individually manifested pathology, only obliquely traceable to structural factors.
EBB’s great-great-grandfather, Samuel Barrett, Jr., a direct descendant of Hersey Barrett, pioneer, who arrived in Jamaica in 1655 with his wife and children among the expeditionary forces of Admiral Penn and General Venables, married Elizabeth Wisdom in 1722. They had fifteen children, of whom six died young, three married and moved to London, five married and remained in Jamaica, and one contented himself with a “housekeeper arrangement” with an enslaved woman. Six years before his death in 1760, Samuel Barrett was in possession of some 2,605 acres of land, 2,285 of which were in St. James and the remainder distributed among the parishes of St. Ann, St. Elizabeth, Clarendon, and Vere. In 1754, only 13 percent of Jamaican landholders had 2,000 acres or more. Among Samuel Barrett’s children who remained in Jamaica was the fabulously wealthy Edward Barrett of Cinnamon Hill, who married Judith Goodin (George Robert Goodin’s sister) in 1760. These were EBB’s great-grandparents. In 1798, the year of Edward’s death, it was reported: “his moderate income this Year is full £50,000 Stg – and is likely to be more the Next. Enough – we moderate People will admit – for fifty Families” (quoted in Barrett 2000:45). He and his wife had five children, including Elizabeth, EBB’s grandmother, who married Charles Moulton, her grandfather, a sometime wine merchant, slave trader, and planter of disputed origins, in 1781. It is this generation that displays for us the full range of the Jamaican elite’s mating, marriage, and family patterns. Elizabeth’s own marriage does not appear to have had much substance or to have endured very long. The record shows Charles Moulton later having children by a number of lovers, White and Black, in England and finally back in Jamaica, and becoming largely irrelevant to the Barrett family, who considered him a sponger (Marks 1938:310-14; Barrett 2000:52). In one of his last testaments he is most concerned with securing the patrimony of his illegitimate children and the goodwill of his legitimate ones towards them. His long-estranged wife is never mentioned (Barrett 2000:52).

Elizabeth’s eldest brother, George Goodin Barrett, goes on to have a distinguished public career as a leading member of the Jamaican plantocracy. Home from Oxford University in 1784, he was appointed justice of the peace for St. James the next year, and was subsequently elected three times to the House of Assembly, in 1787, 1790, and 1795. In 1793, he was appointed attorney for the estates of William Beckford of Fonthill Abbey.

26. Judith Goodin Barrett re-married in 1803 after the death of her husband, Edward. Her new husband was thirty-three-year-old Captain Michael White Lee, who was stationed in Jamaica at the time. She was “in her sixtieth year.” The truly interesting reason this is worth mentioning, however, is the fact that Captain Lee subsequently retains his Barrett connection by marrying Barrett Williams, the daughter of Elizabeth Barrett Waite Williams and Martin Williams, and Judith’s own grand-niece by law (through her first husband). See Marks 1938:271, 370 and Barrett 2000:48-49.
whose London house stood near that of his Jamaican-born aunt, Margaret Barrett Lawrence, in Portman Square. In 1795 he became assistant judge of the Supreme Court and comptroller of public accounts. He was promoted to captain of the Trelawney Militia in 1793, and fought as a colonel of the Horse Militia in the Maroon War of 1795, in which he was wounded. He died two months later of apparently unrelated causes.

George Goodin Barrett was also a factor in the slave trade, “in partnership with Leonard Parkinson of Jamaica, the purchaser in England of Kinnersley Castle near the Ledbury ‘Hope End’ which Edward Moulton Barrett [his nephew and EBB’s father] was to own” (Marks 1938:215). The records show that as a slave trader he bought small batches of slaves from Charles Moulton, EBB’s grandfather and his sister’s husband. George, for all his impeccable upper-class credentials, never had a White wife, but, in the period 1785-1794, fathered six children by Elissa (or Eliza) Peters, a mulatto slave who was settled at Oxford Pen, one of the many Barrett properties. Ownership of Elissa was transmitted to George by his father, and the children were serially manumitted through purchase by him, but Elissa remained a slave. She (as well as “her Issue and Offspring”) was finally manumitted in his last testament, recorded the day before he died. Marks (1938:220) notes that “it is an interesting fact that no Barrett in any known will, until George Goodin Barrett drew his will, left property to such connections. They purchased manumissions and stopped there.”

Another brother, Henry, took the more conventional path of marrying Barbara, the daughter of Richard Samuels, with whom he had one daughter. Marks also reports him having “two mulatto boys with a negro slave.” Closely associated with George in his illustrious public career was Samuel Goodin Barrett, the youngest brother, whose mating career took a different, unconventional twist, though one which, without question, preserved the family genealogy and family wealth. He lived in a common-law union with his older and widowed first cousin, Elizabeth Barrett Waite Williams, which was never converted to legal marriage. She continued to be known as Mrs. Williams, and Jeannette Marks (1938:210) observes that “Sam’s passion for his cousin Elizabeth Barrett Waite Williams had its inception in their unmar- ried love and life together.” Marks is careful, however, to give their doubly pedigreed Barrett children a prominent place in the family tree, while scrupulously omitting all issue of color. Indeed, this branch of the Barrett family produced some of the central figures of Jamaica’s turbulent nineteenth-century political history. The union of the cousins produced four sons, one of whom, Richard Barrett (mentioned above), was to play a leading role on behalf of the planter class in the fiercely fought battles over nonconformist missionary rights, the 1831 slave rebellion, and abolitionism. Richard Barrett was variously editor of the *Jamaica Journal*, several times member of the Assembly, Custos for St. James, and Speaker of the House. His mother,
Elizabeth Williams had been married to Martin Williams, owner of Old Hope Estate in Westmoreland, who was thirty years her senior and by whom she had had five or more children (Barrett 2000:30). Her late husband, for his part, had fathered eight mulatto children by Eleanor Williams, a free Black woman. In 1783, Williams petitioned the House of Assembly for the rights and privileges of his mulatto children. However, when he died in 1786, he left everything to the children of his otherwise faithless marriage, and most of the executors he named were members of his wife’s (the Barrett) family. It is, therefore, with a fitting sense of irony that Marks (1938:211) notes the names of Eleanor Williams’s less privileged children: “One was named after the negro mother and one after Martyn Williams, a third bore the name, Elizabeth, of Martyn Williams’s wife.”

By the family’s own account, it was fear of losing her dower and guardianship of her children which made Elizabeth balk at re-marriage, or at publicly acknowledging one that was alleged (in an obscure family letter) to have taken place in a Roman Catholic Church in York (Barrett 2000:30). This strategic decision, like so many others, appeared designed to ensure that the wealth of the legal marriage did not diverge too greatly from the pathways of the great House of Barrett patrimony. A ban on re-marriage was probably a condition of Elizabeth Williams’s endowment by her husband’s will. Such a condition was routine in the wills of the propertied during the feudal and proto-industrial periods in England as well as in the colonies. It had also been more unconventionally deployed by William Dorrill in relation to his mulatto mistress and mother of his children, Elizabeth Anderson. She, however, chose the respectability of a first-time marriage to a subaltern White, her late keeper’s bookkeeper, over entitlement to a fragment of the property the whole of which (in any event) had been left to her children. As a non-wife, she could not be made trustee of the entire estate; nor could she be the bearer of proper dower rights.

We know that the decision by Elizabeth Williams and Sam Barrett not to marry had nothing to do with their being cousins. For, indeed, cousin marriage was a common strategy of the elite, although the Barretts seemed particularly incestuous in this regard. Richard, the eldest son of first-cousin lovers Elizabeth and Samuel, deepened the process of inbreeding by marrying and mating with his first cousin. This – and exact name replication – happened with bewildering frequency among the Barretts and other elite families. The imperatives of class endogamy made the resort to cousin marriage even more compelling for “nonresidentiary” colonies than elsewhere, given the peculiar demographic constraints. On the other hand, compared to the situation of a Thistlewood, the availability of White female cousins as marriage candidates represented a genealogical depth and breadth that was relatively uncommon.

27. See note 16.
in a place like Jamaica. Even where such marriages were loveless and barely fruitful, as was the case with Richard Barrett’s marriage, the scene was set for the transmission of property through the “proper” lines. Richard Barrett made generous provisions in his will for his mistress, Emily Gaynor, and his unrelated mixed-race children, to whom modest houses were bequeathed with the proviso that the possession of the houses not become “injurious” to Barrett Hall Estate. Most of his immense properties were safely passed on to White collaterals (Barrett 2000:112-13).

In keeping her positions as widow and as cousin-mistress separate and intact, and with two fortunes at stake, Elizabeth Barrett Waite Williams, matriarch extraordinaire, had calculated smartly. From her new location in England, she was able to play an active, and by all accounts, aggressive, role in ensuring that all legal disputes arising from counterclaims on her children’s various inheritances would be resolved in their favor. As we will see below, both the Colored offspring and legitimate nephews of legator George lose out, in the case of some disputed property, to Sam’s and Elizabeth’s powerful sons in Jamaica. Here, the twice-widowed matriarch has the remarkable advantage of being able to enlist the support and intervention of the older sons of her marriage, all of them powerful in their own right, in the cause of the Goodin-Barrett property interests. However, she is careful to maintain the unity of the larger Barrett clan (that is, its White members). She died in 1834 at the age of seventy-seven, “leaving her nephew Edward Moulton-Barrett and her son George Goodin Barrett co-executors of her ample Jamaican and English estates” (Marks 1938:425). According to Marks, “she had defied that convention most important in a woman’s life and had nevertheless remained a dominant and respected figure in her family group.” The bulk of her estate, moreover, went to one of her Barrett sons, George, and his children.

As pointed out previously, George Goodin Barrett (the uncle) made arrangements for his slave mistress and quadroon sons that were highly unusual by Barrett family tradition. Elissa Peters was bequeathed an annuity of “Fifty Pounds Current money,” a house to live in within five miles of the sea, and “three negro girls.” To each of his quadroon children Goodin Barrett left “two thousand pounds Current money of Jamaica,” the maximum allowed to colored offspring by law (Marks 1938:223). In addition he ordered that each of them upon attaining “the age of Seven years Be sent to England and to be there decently clothed maintained and Educated in a moral manner at the charge of his Estate and at the Discretion of their Guardians hereinafter named” (quoted in Marks 1938:223). Moreover, he earnestly desired that they should “not fix their abode in Jamaica but do settle and reside in such countries where those distinctions respecting color (which the policy of the West Indies renders necessary) are not maintained” (Marks 1938:224). Among the non-Barrett trustees appointed by George for the disposition of his estate and guardianship of his children were Leonard
Parkinson, his friend and business partner in the slave trade, Bryan Edwards, the planter-historian, and John Graham-Clarke, the fabulously wealthy slave trader of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, who later “came to own flour mills, collieries and glass works, ships, and land in Jamaica, as well as two large houses, one on Pilgrim Street and the other in Gosforth” (Barrett 2000:50-51). The latter’s daughter later marries Edward Barrett Moulton Barrett. Their first-born is EBB.

One of George’s quadroon sons, Thomas Peters “then residing in or near ‘New Castle’ in the care of John Graham-Clarke, was on coming of age to be made an Executor and trustee of his will” (Marks 1938:223). This was in a final codicil to George’s will, obviously significant as a last-minute determination to pass on a piece of the Barrett birthright to his racially disadvantaged first son. In 1795, Thomas Peters was only eleven years old. The partial investiture of his non-White children who quickly fade from the biographical accounts, however, should not be confused with George’s single-minded expansionist commitment to the powerful White Barrett dynasty. He stipulated as a condition for receipt of their legacies that his sister’s children, Edward (EBB’s father) and Samuel Barrett Moulton, “should by law and at the age of twenty-one take the surname of Barrett” (hence EBB’s baptismal name of “Elizabeth Barrett Moulton Barrett”). As noted above, his own children were forced to keep the name of their mother, Peters. Moreover, his last will and testament vested the “reputed” (illegitimate) White children of his brother Sam (who were additionally endowed in other Barrett wills) as his main heirs (Marks 1938:224). His own children, of course, were limited in their legal capacity to inherit property, and, while they were schooled and accommodated in England, it is questionable whether they ever received the full extent of their modest inheritance (Barrett 2000:60). Repeated obstacles were placed in the way of Thomas Peters’s attempts to redeem his authorized role as trustee and executor of his father’s estate. Predictably, he became embroiled in a number of lawsuits, pitting him against the other trustees, as well as the lawyers for his White cousins. A dispute over claims on the estate of their grandfather, Edward Barrett of Cinnamon Hill – which was being held in trust by his legitimate grandson and EBB’s father – arising from a debt of slave and livestock property allegedly owed the heirs of George Goodin Barrett, the original owner of this property, was finally settled in favor of the sons of Elizabeth Waite Williams and Samuel Goodin Barrett, the illicitly matched cousins. As White male collateral descendants, they had been their Uncle George’s main heirs. Thomas Peters disappears from the record.

28 The slave-owning families acted as trustees for each other’s fortunes, guardians to each other’s children, and married into each other’s families. In 1812, John Graham-Clarke’s eldest son, John Altham Graham-Clarke, marries Leonard Parkinson’s daughter, Mary Elizabeth (Barrett 2000:60).
While the obligations to fulfill the wishes of George Goodin Barrett regarding his children’s education were tolerated, any continuing intrusion of Elissa Peters into their lives was not. Elizabeth Moulton, EBB’s grandmother and George’s sister, wrote to John Graham-Carlein on March 20, 1799:

I was greatly astonished [sic] to hear of Eliza Peters being in England, as I never heard of her having the least desire to come, I only hope her being with Tom & William will not injure them, in their Education; I beg you will not let her have anything to do with them, that is not keeping them from their learning, the three Younger ones I should think, the sooner they are put to School, the better, the Mother I shall say nothing about. (Quoted in Barrett 2000:50)

Another condition of elite West Indian families was fulfilled when George’s sister’s children, the Moulton-Barretts, were sent to England for their education (as indeed were his), joining other branches and generations of Barretts who had made the journey back and stayed, or become long-term or chronically peripatetic sojourners. EBB was the first of the children of Edward, his nephew, born in England, and although her father (after perhaps one visit) never returned, some of his sons would, to become re-creolized, pick up the threads of local Jamaican and family-dynastic history, and fall conveniently, perhaps after an initial culture shock, into the “custom of the country.” Indeed, of the three sons who went to Jamaica to look after the family affairs, the two who survived had children with Black women only and spent the rest of their lives in Jamaica. By then, too, the racially “unsullied” genealogical capital is shrinking. Charles John, the third son, and one of the survivors, married his illegitimate mulatto children’s colored governess, “a well educated brown woman of good class,” who, according to Marks (1938:613), tricked him into marriage by feigning pregnancy, while Septimus, his younger brother, “following the custom of the country, ... had the usual ‘housekeeper’ arrangements by which there was at least one daughter” (Marks 1938:616).

Charles John, who lived to the age of ninety, essentially oversaw the gradual and final dissipation of the Moulton-Barrett family’s Jamaican patrimony. But, as Pares might remind us,29 this did not happen before much of the wealth had been safely transferred to the original “home,” England, where various branches of the family lived on to enjoy, display, and deploy it. In their heyday, the various extended Barrett family plantations included, but were not limited to, Cinnamon Hill, Cornwall, Retreat Pen, Oxford, Oxford,

29. Pares (1960:50) noted in his classic rejoinder to Adam Smith, “after some initial loans in the earliest period which merely primed the pump, the wealth of the West Indies was created out of the profits of the West Indies themselves, and, with some assistance from the British tax-payer, much of it found a permanent home in Great Britain.” Jamaica constituted the largest source of this transfer of wealth.
The total acreage of these estates amounted to the tens of thousands. Their English estates were vast as well. Hope End, for example, the estate Edward Moulton-Barrett bought to raise his growing family in, covered some 475 acres of land and had an asking price of £27,000 (Forster 1989:10; Barrett 2000:53). After suffering financial losses as a result of the successfully disputed Jamaican property, the Barretts were forced to give up Hope End, and they relocated twice before moving to the lodgings on Wimpole Street made famous by the Browning-Barrett love story. According to one source, “the Moulton-Barretts remained wealthy, but not as extraordinarily wealthy as they had been” (Garrett 2002:14). Upon his death in 1857, Edward Moulton-Barrett’s diminished estate amounted to £63,695.12s.1d, exclusive of the remaining Jamaican properties, in which he had had only a life’s interest and which passed on directly to his oldest surviving son, Charles John, under the terms of the latter’s great-grandfather’s will. Five of his other children received £10,950 each and three of them, including EBB, had been disinherited, although they were ultimately beneficiaries of their siblings’ generosity (Barrett 2000:137). The three disinherited children had all married against their father’s wishes. Two of the matches, EBB’s and that of her sister, Henrietta, proved particularly galling because the chosen mates were, among other things, “penniless.” Both Henrietta and her brother Alfred, the other disinherited sibling, followed family tradition at least in part by marrying their second cousins. Lizzie, Alfred’s wife, was the granddaughter of the consensually mated first cousins, Samuel Goodin Barrett and Elizabeth Barrett Waite Williams. The relationship between Lizzie and Alfred, thirteen years her senior, had developed after Lizzie had been sent from Jamaica

30. According to Marks (1938:347-48), the disputed property, “two parcels of slaves and some fifty steer,” represented a loss of approximately £20,000, plus the expense of hiring them back for use at an annual rental.

31. But presumably this figure included the compensation Moulton Barrett would have received under the terms of the Emancipation Proclamation for slaves that he owned in 1833.

32. It is not surprising that, having himself escaped and rescued most of his children – certainly his daughters – from the looming prospect of a White Jamaican dynastic decline, EBB’s father cannot reconcile himself to her choice, in Robert Browning, of a fellow West Indian Creole (or direct descendant of Creoles) of questionable racial and class geniture (given the presumption of racial and class genealogical “authenticity” on his own part). It – her choice of mate – disrupts the process of amnesia that is so critical to a satisfactory resumption of a proper English identity upon returning “home,” critical too to a smooth and untroubled rewriting, with all the proper metropolitan flourishes, of the story of empire and Britain the Great.
by her father, George Goodin Barrett (junior), to live with Edward and his family in London, apparently because her mother had become mentally unbalanced (Barrett 2000:135-37). Despite being disinherited and having “no steady occupation,” Alfred was still able to survive on the proceeds of Jamaican property:

The couple lived by borrowing on Lizzie’s inheritance, which was in trust subject to her mother’s life interest, under her parent’s marriage settlement and her great aunt Sarah Feltham’s will, but her mother lived to an advanced age. Finally, her brother Edward George gave her an annual income from his Jamaican estates instead and, on August 11, 1895, Alfred’s brother George died, leaving Alfred the residue of his property after some legacies (Barrett 2000:137).

EBB herself was the independent recipient of legacies based on Jamaican sugar profits: £4000 from her father’s brother, Samuel, who died in Jamaica, and £4000 from her grandmother and namesake, whose money was derived from the enormous holdings of her father, Edward of Cinnamon Hill (Markus 1995:93-4). Every single member of the family lived, directly or indirectly, from Jamaican property. The other branches of the House of Barrett, in Jamaica and outside, continued to thrive from active Jamaican operations well into the twentieth century.

The Barretts are an excellent example of a dynasty that actively maintained its exclusively White (or presumed so) economic and social enterprise for, ultimately, hundreds of years on both sides of the Atlantic. Education and marriage drew sections of individual families “home” to England where they settled and provided a secure and anchored referent of imperial-national belongingness on behalf of the transatlantically split dynasty. The translocal nature of their power was evident: Jamaican-born Sam Moulton-Barrett, EBB’s uncle, gets elected to parliament in England, just as one of his brother’s English-born sons eventually becomes an elected member of the Assembly after “returning” to Jamaica. EBB’s direct ancestral line did not become absentee owners until the death of her great-grandfather Edward in 1798, after which there was a twenty-nine-year hiatus that ended with the return of EBB’s uncle, followed by her brothers, to manage the family’s absenteeism-impaired Jamaican patrimony. However, House of Barrett property in western Jamaica was so extensive and ubiquitous that Hope Masterton Waddell’s account (1970) of contemporaneous Presbyterian and other missionary struggles to gain access to various estates in that region, for the purpose of proselytizing among the slaves, reveals Barrett connections at every turn. The wide diversity of responses among those connections to the rising tide of humanitarianism and abolitionism was reflected in the different fates suffered by their various estates in the 1831 slave rebellion.
CONCLUSION

I have provided evidence in this article to show the ultimate depth of class divisions among Whites in Jamaica, despite the spirit of egalitarianism which ensured overall White solidarity and Black social exclusion. As such, I chose to focus particularly on the “diverging modes or spatial-circuits of reproduction” of the different strata. The skewed demographic character of the White population and the conditions of surrogate estate management restricted the availability of White wives and access to the “dual marriage system” for White subaltern men. Easy access to coerced and more, or less, consensual “housekeeping” sexual services of enslaved Black women further strengthened the likelihood that the reproductive niche of the overseer (and associated) class would be entirely dependent on sexual and domestic relationships across race and statutory group. Whether or not they exercised choice in their interracial unions they were structurally restricted in their social means of human bodily, affective, and generational reproduction. Ultimately, most of these subalterns were locally bound single-generation Whites. As Olivier (1971:69) pointed out, “in a generation or two [they] became merged in the class described as the ‘free coloured people.’” On the other hand, the upper plantocracy was scrupulous in preventing such a merger – they had the means to do so – and in maintaining a strict separation between the two different race-class lines generated by the “dual marriage system,” which they enjoyed with impunity. Their means to such enjoyment included access to genealogical, financial, and cultural capital on a transatlantic basis. Part of the translocal dynastic power of these families was the ability to tap into both local and metropolitan sources of elite White wives, among the families of their business partners and associates as well as their own broad kin networks. Because women typically outlived their husbands, the absentee widow was often more critical to the maintenance of large family plantation property than has ordinarily been thought. Moreover, cousin marriage was common and highly approved as a strategy for keeping property within the extended family and for ensuring the racial “purity” of the lineage. In conjunction with an imposed restriction on testamentary transmission of property to Colored offspring, White genitors typically chose to keep their main properties strictly within the confines of their legitimate White families (sometimes, of necessity, through collaterals), often endowing their “outside” Colored children in marginal ways (if at all), or at least in ways that did not encroach upon the main family enterprise. When encroachment did take place, disputes were usually settled in favor of White co-heirs. Despite this, it is important for us to recognize that fabulous wealth often enabled “marginal” endowment to be sufficient to create a free Colored group of elite proportions in its own right. Some of the strategies pursued involved early manumission (if applicable), schooling in England, bequeathing of houses
or smaller properties or both, often in conjunction with a variable number of slaves, and petitioning the courts for “special privileges” for their mixed-race children. For most classes of White men, postmortem manumission of long-term slave mistresses, sometimes bolstered by small annuities and modest houses and house plots, was a fairly frequent practice.

Of course, locally anchored interracial marriages and full investiture of Colored heirs were not unknown, but for the most part the wealth of the Jamaican plantocracy ended up in Britain, as part of an imperially appropriated White British patrimony, transmitted through the channels of financial and genealogical capital, but based overwhelmingly on the forced labor of enslaved Africans.
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In September 1999, the University of the West Indies (UWI), in cooperation with the CARICOM secretariat and the Caribbean Development Bank, held a major conference on the theme of “The Caribbean in the 21st Century.” The discussions ranged widely over the history, geography, economy, society, politics, culture, and environment of the region and provided a mix of analytical insight and practical proposal. Those addressing the conference included three Caribbean prime ministers, senior officials from regional organizations, leading Caribbean academics, and policy advisors in nongovernmental organizations and the private sector. Among the conclusions drawn from the proceedings by the organizers of the conference, Kenneth Hall and Denis Benn (2000: xiii-xxix), were “an urgent need to revisit conventional economic policies and to adopt creative strategies capable of generating higher levels of growth with equity,” “the need to re-orient existing governance structures by promoting effective constitutional change and suitable public sector reforms,” “the demand for increased social equity as a basis for social stability,” “the adoption of suitable policies designed to promote art and culture as an integral aspect of the overall development of the region,” and the need for the Caribbean to think differently about its international relations given the diminishing “geopolitical and geo-strategic significance of the region” which had “reduced its bargaining position in both the hemispheric and wider global system.”

These are important observations which should be borne in mind in any contemporary discussion of development in the Caribbean. The region is currently facing a serious development challenge. It is by no means certain that the region, or at least some of the more vulnerable parts of it such as Haiti, Guyana, and the Windward Islands, can adapt to survive. The publication of two reports in 2005 setting out the range and depth of problems facing the region is therefore both welcome and timely. The first, by the World Bank enti-
tled *A Time to Choose: Caribbean Development in the 21st Century*\(^2\) takes up the same challenge as the UWI conference. It provides a massive and detailed empirical account of the economic challenges facing the region and sets out policies to deal with them. Given the importance of the World Bank in setting the development discourse and mobilizing resources from the international community, it is bound to be influential. For that reason alone it ought to be read and discussed by anyone with a serious interest in Caribbean development. At the same time, it is deeply flawed, not least because it overlooks precisely what the UWI conference did so much to assert, the unique specificity of the region and the importance of those who live and work in the Caribbean in understanding its true character and contributing to its development.

The second is the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC) report, *The Millennium Development Goals: A Latin American and Caribbean Perspective*.\(^3\) This is a contribution to the much wider development agenda approved by the United Nations in 2000. It set eight millennium development goals to be achieved by the year 2015 on the basis of the global situation during the 1990s. The *Millennium Development Goals* report provides a counterpoint to the World Bank report by emphasizing a broader development agenda. It also provides a commentary on the major social problems facing the region. In comparison to those in some other parts of the developing world, such as south Asia and sub-Saharan Africa, the problems in the Caribbean seem manageable and the prospect of meeting at least some of the development goals, quite good.\(^4\) Nevertheless, the ECLAC report identifies real poverty in the Caribbean, which is so often masked by the description of most of the countries as “middle-income” and not needing international assistance and support. This view is misplaced, particularly in regard to the smaller countries of the region, many of which remain crucially dependent on external support for their development and prosperity.

Together these reports provide a “snapshot” of the development problematic in the region. They provide some useful “new thinking” and a wealth of empirical material. It is, however, the contention of this article that these reports need to be set in context. The main argument presented in this “overview” of development is that development policy without a deep understanding of what
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makes the Caribbean different will be development policy that ultimately will not deliver the level and type of development that meets the region’s needs.

A Matter of Definition

Development is generally recognized as a complex multifaceted process of economic, social, political, environmental, and cultural change resulting in increases in the well-being of people and extending their rights and choices in the present without compromising the abilities of future generations to enjoy these benefits. In the Caribbean the economic, social, and political elements of development have held center stage in the last fifty years. Typically they have been (and are) represented in the form of rising incomes (greater Gross Domestic Product per capita), social progress (improved welfare through education and health programs and gender equality) and political freedoms (independence, administrative efficiency, and democracy). In the last fifteen years environmental issues have slowly risen on the development agenda as well as, more recently, cultural issues such as artistic expression and various forms of identity.

Any exploration of development in the region is therefore very wide. The focus of this article is on the traditional agenda – economic, social, and political development, in that order. This is not because these aspects are in any sense “superior” to other forms of development (although the economic dimension remains dominant within the development discourse and within the Caribbean), but because it permits the long view – it enables one to look back at development policy to situate where the theory and practice of development is now and where it may go in the future. In turn this may mean looking again at what constitutes development in the region.

In order to proceed, however, there are two issues that must be addressed. The first is a familiar one: the definition of the Caribbean. In presenting statistics and some of the current arguments on development this article cites extensively from the two reports released in 2005. The World Bank report focuses only on the independent Caribbean countries, so excluding the dependent and overseas territories of France, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and the United States of America. It also continues to exclude Cuba. The ECLAC report has a separate section for the Caribbean including the Caribbean Community (CARICOM) countries and all the dependent and overseas territories, but excludes from it Cuba, the Dominican Republic, and Haiti, which it treats within the Latin American dimension of the report. The definition of the region would thus still appear to depend on where you sit, and this necessarily makes comparability between countries difficult to determine (statistically and otherwise, for example, in terms of generalization and policy recommendation).

The other is Cuba, and more marginally, Haiti. It is difficult to include
Cuba in any study of development without recognizing its unique development model, which has implications for all the dimensions of development identified earlier. The analysis within the paper therefore does not generally hold for Cuba. The same also applies to Haiti to some degree. Its pattern of underdevelopment (if not its strategy and aspiration for development) mean that caution is needed in applying them to Haiti. To exclude from consideration some half of the population of the Caribbean is unsatisfactory but regrettably inevitable if one is to make better sense of the remainder. At the same time it can also serve as a reminder of the difficulties and of the failure of development in Haiti; and in Cuba of the existence of an alternative to the dominant capitalist development discourse and practice in the region. These are matters that are considered again toward the end of the article.

**Economic Development**

The World Bank report points to high but declining economic growth figures for the region. In the period 1961-2002 the average per capita growth for a median Caribbean country was 2.8 percent, higher than Latin America and broadly comparable to developed (OECD) countries but lower than east Asia. In the 1990s it was only 1.9 percent, and in a scenario the World Bank presents under the title of “Business as usual,” that is, no change to existing patterns and policies, it projects a growth rate of only 2.2 percent per capita per year to 2010, which means a slow decline. Faced with this gloomy future the World Bank argues that for the region it is *A Time to Choose* to break with the past and set out in new directions.

The future it sees for the region is one in which services dominate the economy, which is already the case in many countries. The contribution of agriculture and industry to GDP has steadily fallen, with the service sector being the main contributor to growth. Services accounted for some 62 percent of GDP in the 1990s (50 percent in the 1960s) – much higher than the average (45 percent) for developing countries. Tourism is a major contributor accounting for 18 percent of total GDP and 34 percent of total employment. The Caribbean has around half the world’s cruise market (fifteen million passengers annually) but the more lucrative “stopover” business (approximately the same number of visitors but accounting for more than 90 percent of total visitor expenditure) is facing difficulties from a “maturing” product at home (an established industry with a focus on beach resorts) and competition overseas, resulting in at best a static share of a growing global market. To combat this the Caribbean will need to reinvigorate its tourist industry through the development of niche products such as eco-tourism and up-market tourism.

By contrast, the World Bank sees no future in agriculture for export and only a limited future in industry. In general agriculture is marked by low pro-
ductivity and a lack of competitiveness. It is kept alive artificially, it argues, by various preferential schemes which are seen as increasingly unsustainable. Witness here the recent reform of the sugar regime in the European Union, which has dealt a possibly mortal blow to sugar production for export in several Caribbean countries, and the impending reform of the banana regime from 2006 that will do the same for bananas. The future of agriculture for export is thus limited again to the development of niche products such as organic bananas or speciality fruit and vegetables, or products which can be agriculturally processed in the region for export to the Caribbean diaspora and speciality food markets.

Industry’s share in GDP had dropped to 25 percent in the 1990s (38 percent in the 1960s). The much discussed apparel/clothing markets which benefited under special arrangements, especially with the United States, have not developed as anticipated, and the World Bank sees little real future for such enterprises outside of the Dominican Republic (and less so Haiti and Jamaica). Mineral extraction remains important in a few places, but only in Trinidad and Tobago is there any realistic chance for large-scale industry to develop (based on natural gas and its by-products) and to hold its own in a global, competitive market. Regrettably this development is not discussed in the report as neither is the potential for any industrial development at all. Given the importance once attached to industrialization in the region, this is a curious omission, implying that the region made a serious mistake in its development strategy in the past.

The Caribbean in most instances therefore has no choice other than to move into services in an even bigger way. The question is, “which ones?” The World Bank identifies the following: information and communication technology (ICT)-enabled products and services, offshore education, health services, and niche tourism. The effective use of ICT is seen as an essential ingredient in attaining competitiveness in both services and niche manufacturing sectors in the region. It can offset problems associated with small size and distance from markets while at the same time projecting the region abroad. Government support (nationally and regionally) would be needed to create a more competitive telecommunications sector (internet costs are currently too high) and provide services for small firms. The offshore education recommendation follows the successful establishment in the region of twenty-three offshore medical schools whose graduates together account for some 70 percent of the international medical graduates entering the United States. The need for medical schools is expected to grow as demand for medical practitioners exceeds the supply from North American medical schools, and tuition and associated costs in the Caribbean remain significantly below those in the United States. Government support is needed for accreditation and to encourage foreign direct investment in the higher education sector. Linked to the import of foreign-educated medical staff is the globalization of health services. Cuba was a leader in this field, although the model offered in the report is essentially private-sector driven and
seeks to capitalize on the advantages of proximity to the North American market, climate, an established tourism industry, well-trained health practitioners, and established health and medical services. The Caribbean could offer health and wellness spas and in some cases medical treatment and rehabilitation. Government support would be needed for regulations covering health insurance and the provision of professional services, as well as to facilitate synergies between the tourism and offshore medical sectors. Lastly, the report proposes the reinvigoration of the tourism product in the region. The Caribbean is the most tourism intensive region in the world, but its product has failed to evolve to meet new demands. Consequently, the report argues for new approaches and innovative thinking directed toward the creation and capture of niche markets (e.g., adventure and nature-based tourism) and the promotion of tourism to cater for the very rich. Developing tourism in these directions requires a more comprehensive approach than in the past, with government activity aimed at improving the “destination product” by providing a better infrastructure for tourism (roads, water, sanitation, hotel training, etc.) and nurturing the environment, rather than supporting specific tourism projects financially. There is also a stronger need to focus on the “stopover” element and on the small tourism enterprise sector (e.g., small hotels).

These proposals, with the exception of those for ICT (and even there in part), are extensions of the familiar pattern of “offshore” Caribbean development. They are small and specialized like the offshore financial centers. Generally they do not do much for local employment although they can, in certain circumstances, boost the local economy: for example, in Dominica the medical school is estimated to contribute 8.3 percent to GDP. “Offshore development” therefore provides some opportunities, but does not overcome the vulnerabilities that many small countries face in the global system, and all proposals of this nature are based on the continuation of a buoyant overseas demand. They thus continue dependence and are hostage to developments elsewhere. The recent example of attempts at regulation of the offshore financial centres (OFCs) by the OECD illustrates the perils. In the Caribbean eighteen states and territories had established OFCs, with some of them offering a substantial array of services. For example, the Cayman Islands are among the largest OFCs in the world. The OECD, through its “harmful tax competition initiative,” sought to impose, without consultation with the Caribbean OFCs, controls on their activities that would have seriously affected their attractiveness as OFCs, and hence their ability to do business. In this instance a vigorous campaign was mounted by the OFCs (with the support of powerful interest lobbies in the United States and elsewhere) and the proposals were modified and then shelved (Sanders 2002, Woodward 2004). However, the issue has not fully gone away. The European Union, for example, is committed to a Savings Tax Directive, which seeks to impose “fiscal transparency” on OFCs, so removing some of their comparative advantage (the maintenance of secre-
cy) in the provision of financial services. There is therefore no guarantee that attempts to close down OFCs will not occur again in the future, particularly if the effects of globalization on OECD countries are judged as too harmful, or the U.S. “war on terror” demands even greater financial surveillance.

The sectors chosen by the World Bank also depend on the local availability of well-trained human resources. This is a dimension of future Caribbean development that does need to be fully explored. The report identifies unemployment as “one of the most challenging economic problems facing the Caribbean,”\(^5\) with variable but still persistent high levels of unemployment (and underemployment in rural areas) and the worrying indications that employment growth slowed in the 1990s. Those aged 15-24 account for 40-56 percent of the total unemployed, with the burden falling most on poorly educated females. This leads, among other things, the report argues, to high and growing levels of alienation, addiction, and crime. In these circumstances there is a desperate need to improve opportunity.

Developing and improving education and skills is one obvious way of tackling this problem. Whereas access to education in the region remains better than in many parts of the developing world, the Caribbean has fallen in rankings that measure years of schooling (from 47 out of 92 countries in 1970 to 52 in 2000). There is a problem of school completion rates, and the numbers in tertiary education, at 15 percent in 2000, remain below the Latin American average of 26 percent. These numbers obviously matter if the “offshore” strategy is to capitalize on “knowledge-based activity.” Without appropriate education and then training it is difficult to see how this strategy can work. To realize these education goals the report advocates significant educational reforms and a greater involvement of the market. In tertiary education, for example, increased private financing, including higher fees and student loans, are proposed as a means to expand education at this level. Tertiary institutions are also urged to improve their services to the private sector through their involvement in curriculum development. The report also favors a greater role for regional agencies and the establishment of public-private partnerships in delivering training programmes.

The problem with this approach, as the report acknowledges, is that it can lead to “brain drain.” This is nothing new, but its scale is rarely appreciated and the outmigration of educated workers is not fully explored in the report. A recent study by Mishra for the IMF reports that 12 percent of the labor force from the Caribbean emigrated to OECD member countries in 1965-2000, with rates rising to 70 percent of those who had completed tertiary education and 89 percent in the case of Guyana.\(^6\) New ways will clearly need to
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be found to ensure that the Caribbean does not “subsidize” the development of developed countries through such “brain drain” or that it receives some return for it. In the meantime, the World Bank argues that the diaspora can be better harnessed for development. Estimates suggest that there are some three million Caribbean emigrants in the United States (including more than one million from Cuba), 300,000 in Canada, and around one million in the EU. The Caribbean has seen a tenfold increase in remittances from US$ 400 million per year in the early 1990s to US$ 4 billion in 2002, making the region (measured as a percentage of GDP) the largest recipient of remittances in the world. In the period from 1998-2003 remittances represented an average of 6 percent of regional GDP (and the figure could be much higher since the IMF study reports remittances as constituting 13 percent of the region’s GDP in 2002). Remittances thus exceed foreign direct investment flows and overseas development assistance (ODA) combined, both of which have declined in recent years. Yet as sizeable (and as important) as remittances are, the conclusion by Mishra is that “the total losses due to skilled migration ... outweigh the recorded remittance for the Caribbean region on average, and for almost all the individual Caribbean countries,” suggesting that remittances are at best only partial recompense for the loss of development potential that such high-level and high-education emigration entails.

Lastly, there is a problem of mounting and increasingly unsustainable debt. High debt levels have placed seven Caribbean countries amongst the ten most indebted in the world and fourteen among the top thirty. This is generating a significant problem for public finances with the almost inevitable concomitant of a cutback in the provision of government spending and the associated reduction of public services. The smaller countries of the eastern Caribbean were among the fastest growing in the region, but as debt doubled in the 1990s, their rates of growth slowed considerably, with Dominica recently experiencing a debt crisis. In other countries, such as Jamaica and Guyana, debt has long been an issue, but only Guyana has received any respite under the HIPC initiative. The high levels of debt represent a serious diversion of government revenues from development projects and can act as a deterrent to private investment. The debt problem is not well known outside (or even inside) the region and deserves greater consideration.

**Social Development**

The ECLAC Report seeks to put social objectives at the center of development strategy. It provides detailed commentary on a number of the millennium development goals, although insufficient data does not allow it to pro-
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Provide in-depth coverage of all the indicators for specific targets, particularly where the Caribbean is concerned. The report also argues that the extreme heterogeneity of the Latin American and Caribbean region (LAC) make generalization difficult, with frequent exceptions to be noted.

The problem of heterogeneity is well illustrated by the first goal: to eradicate extreme poverty and hunger. While LAC is making some progress to meeting the target of halving the number of people whose income is less than US$ 1 a day, countries with low levels of human development (Haiti) will not do so without very high (and recently unprecedented) economic growth rates. In the Caribbean a more realistic benchmark poverty figure is US$ 2 a day. On this measure progress has been made, but some countries with the lowest per capita incomes (Guyana and Suriname) will need to make greater efforts, mobilizing international as well as domestic funding. In relation to other developing regions LAC has made some modest progress but lags behind Asia.

In respect of the second goal: achieve universal primary education, LAC will not meet the target in spite of high primary enrollment rates. In the Caribbean these are at 95 percent, but there are also significant dropout rates, especially for boys. The high dropout rate obviously has enormous implications for development policies based on skilled human resources. The advantage LAC possesses on this goal (it has the highest enrolment rates in the developing world) is thus less than may generally be thought.

Goal 3 is to promote gender equality and empower women. In terms of eliminating gender disparity in primary education the entire region is on target. However, significant gaps exist in income earned by women. This is at its most marked among those with higher levels of education. There is no data on the Caribbean, but it is well known that in parts of the region, for example students enrolled at the University of the West Indies, women significantly outnumber men. As such, and even as the “world of work” is changing, existing patterns of discrimination persist and women are disadvantaged. They are, for example, still a minority in legislatures and in public life in the Caribbean.

Goal 4 is to reduce child mortality. All Caribbean countries (except Haiti) are on target to reduce child mortality rates to one-third of their 1990 levels, although some Caribbean countries (Belize, Guyana, St. Vincent, and Suriname) have made slower progress than expected. Once again, LAC as a group is more favorably placed than most other developing countries to reach this goal.

Goal 5 is to improve maternal health. While LAC has a lower maternal mortality ratio than other developing regions, it is unlikely to reach the target of reducing maternal mortality rates by three-quarters, owing to slow or no progress. Although there are some difficulties in obtaining data the evidence is that the Caribbean has a significantly higher maternal mortality rate (113 per 100,000) than the LAC average (87) with the highest rates in Guyana.
(133) and Suriname (153). The reasons for this clearly need investigation since they are probably linked to more than poverty.

Goal 6: combat HIV/AIDS, malaria, and other diseases. The Caribbean has the second-highest rate of HIV/AIDS in the world. Haiti is worst affected (5.6 percent) followed by four others with rates over 2 percent (Trinidad and Tobago, Bahamas, Guyana, and Belize). The main mode of transmission is sexual contact between men, although inevitably more women are becoming infected. The problem here, of course, is that the incidence of HIV/AIDS bears disproportionately on the most productive age group (20-45). Malaria is also a problem in French Guiana, Guyana, and Suriname.

Goal 7: ensure environmental sustainability. The report is very pessimistic about LAC meeting its targets in this area since the indicators show considerable environmental degradation in both built and natural environments. It points to the loss of biodiversity and of forests, air pollution, and the growth of slums. In Haiti some 90 percent of the urban population lives in slums, with figures above the regional average (31.9 percent) for Anguilla, the Dominican Republic, Jamaica, and Trinidad and Tobago. It also points to the need to include environmental considerations more fully into development programs and policies. The Caribbean has made some moves in this direction, and since many of them are small island developing states (SIDS) they have been included in the Barbados Programme of Action and its follow-up in Mauritius in January 2005. However, the Mauritius conference pointed to many weaknesses in environmental policies among both SIDS and the donor community, which had failed to support them as much as anticipated. On a more positive note, most Caribbean countries are on target in realizing a supply of clean drinking water and improving sanitation.

Goal 8: develop a global partnership for development. This covers access to markets in developed countries, debt, ODA, youth employment, and the provision of essential drugs and ICT. In most of these areas, as already noted in part, progress has been slow. In respect of trade, the Caribbean has complained of being marginalized in the current Doha Round. The region points to difficulties in getting their proposals for special and differential treatment for small and vulnerable economies on the agenda, and the devastating impact on them of the changes in the sugar and banana regimes. Guyana, for example, has pointed out that while it got US$ 8 million of debt relief in the recent G-8 summit, losses incurred by the sugar regime will reach US$ 40 million. ODA flows to LAC have fallen. The SIDS, which are supposed to be given special recognition, have seen flows halved in 2000-2003 compared to the same period in the 1990s. Access to drugs remains riddled with inequalities, and ICT spending at US$ 400 in LAC remains well below the US$ 2000-3000 in the developed countries.

There are clearly successes and failures, but overall LAC is better placed than many other regions in the developing world to reach (or nearly reach) the millennium development goals, though this has its own dangers for two reasons. First, the region has the world’s most unequal and concentrated pattern of income distribution. There are persistent pockets of poverty within medium and high-level income countries, and there is a growing inequality between the countries of the region, characteristics of the Caribbean as a subregion as well. The surest way to meet targets within countries would be to target the poorest, but there are clearly important political implications in such a policy. The difficulties facing the Hugo Chavez regime in Venezuela at the moment show some of the problems a policy of this kind would face.

Second, the fact that most countries feature in the medium-level category, or better in the Human Development Index, means they can be conveniently ignored by the international donor community. The Caribbean in particular suffers from being overlooked, being furthermore a region of mainly small states with low visibility and little political clout. Its visibility has serious implications for the region. While most of the millennium development goals embody the commitment of resources at the domestic level, these by themselves will not be enough to achieve the goals. External support is still needed. There is at present little sign that external support is (or will be) forthcoming.

**Political Development**

The importance of the political dimension in development emerged with the debate on the need for “good governance” in the 1990s. While originally concerned with sub-Saharan Africa, the imperative of good governance has spread throughout the developing world, including the Caribbean. A recent discussion of governance in the region, involving a large number of regional academics and policy makers, opens with the observation that

> [d]espite continuing debate on its ideological origins and the persistence of a variety of definitions regarding its specific content, there is increased recognition that the concept of good governance, broadly conceived, is an important requisite for the promotion of an optimal level of development, the guarantee of human rights and freedom, and the maintenance of social and political stability. (Hall & Benn 2003:x)

Within the Caribbean the practice of good governance for most states has involved two elements: the role of government in delivering development and the fostering of democratic governance to sustain development.

In the last twenty-five years there has been a substantial debate on the role of the state in development. There is still no consensus, although since the publication of the World Bank Development Report on *The State in a*
the state is widely seen as playing a “catalytic, facilitating role, encouraging and complementing the activities of private businesses and individuals” (World Bank 1997:3) within a broadly “neo-liberal” development paradigm. This demands an “effective state.” There are two elements to such a state. First, a state’s role must match its capabilities, which demands a sharper focus on fundamentals, particularly on core activities that are crucial to development (establishing a foundation of law, macroeconomic stability, basic social services and infrastructure, and protecting the vulnerable and the environment). Second, the state’s capability must be raised by reinvigorating its public institutions through a number of measures including designing effective rules and restraints to check arbitrary state actions and corruption, greater competition among state institutions to increase their efficiency, improved performance of state institutions through better pay and incentives, and making the state more responsive to the needs of people through broader participation and decentralization.

There is a distinction to be made here between two categories of state in the Caribbean: those that lack both elements and those who lack only the second. In the first category are Haiti and Guyana, and more marginally (and arguably) the Dominican Republic. The priority here, and particularly for Haiti, is political reforms to improve capacity and accountability. It almost goes without saying that these will be difficult to achieve and will involve long-term commitments, not only from those within the country but also from those outside (including regional agencies) who can promote and facilitate such changes. The priority in the second category is the building of institutions for an efficient, effective, and economical public sector. In the Caribbean the share of government expenditure in GDP has risen from 27 percent of GDP (1990-1997) to 32 percent GDP (1998-2003), which suggests the test of economy is not being met. Some of this increase is linked to increasing debt costs and to exogenous shocks (including hurricanes). Some also comes from the higher costs of delivering public services in small states (e.g., health and education in outlying islands). However, unless expenditure can be matched by government revenues (which at the moment it is not) then the public sector must do more with less. This puts a premium on programs of public sector reform designed to deliver efficient and effective administration. In the Commonwealth Caribbean such reform programs have been in place in a number of states for a decade or more, with so far mixed results. Only Jamaica shows mostly positive outcomes and a strong and sustained commitment to reform. The difficulties involved show this to be an area that needs further attention.

The record of democratic government (defined as liberal democracy) in the Caribbean is generally very good. Of course, there are exceptions. The twofold distinction identified earlier could also apply to the immediate prospects for democracy. There is a major crisis in Haiti and little apparent will to solve it by the political elites within the country. Guyana is currently stable
although the country remains polarized by race. The Dominican Republic presents a more hopeful picture although the political process remains highly personalized and factionalized. Cuba remains a unique problem in which the death of Castro and the transition from the rule of the Communist party to a more pluralistic system is long promised but seemingly as distant as ever. In all four, processes of change will need to follow a distinct trajectory tailored to individual circumstance.

Elsewhere the problems of democracy seem to cluster around a number of issues that have been identified in a series of conferences held in the region throughout the 1990s to the present day. They include apathy toward, and alienation from, existing political institutions, seen in declining turn-out for elections; increasing social anomie and disregard for social conventions in the breakdown of a culture of civil discourse and the rise of antisocial behavior; and growing corruption and political violence, linked to the growth of drug trafficking. In his book investigating “the Westminster experience in the Caribbean,” one of the region’s most distinguished political scientists, Selwyn Ryan (1999), points to failing political parties, bureaucracies under stress, and judicial systems in crisis. He also comments on regionwide political practices among the political elite which erode good governance, including authoritarian leadership styles, adversarial politics (political and ethnic tribalism), the cultivation of political patronage, and the encouragement of zero-sum attitudes in government in which “the winner takes all,” freezing out the opposition and acting against political consensus.

While these are significant deficiencies they nonetheless have to be balanced against the overall record of high and continuing liberal democratic processes (widely regarded, at least among the major donor countries and international agencies, as the essence of good governance) throughout the Caribbean. In the period 1980-2004, 66 general elections were held in the Commonwealth Caribbean, and everywhere governments have been changed by ballot. More recently, the “political corruption index” shows an improvement regionally from 16 in 1990-1997 to 6 in 1998-2002 (with the worst offender being Suriname at 106 and 43, respectively). And lastly, the Caribbean remains the most democratic region in the developing world (probably because it is mainly made up of small states, independent and dependent, since small states tend to be more democratic than large ones). In short, there is undoubtedly need for better governance, but a sense of proportion must also accompany policy recommendation.

The dominant development policy paradigm in the Caribbean today is neo-liberalism. It began with the structural adjustment crises in a number of countries in the 1980s. Before the 1980s two development paradigms held sway (see Payne & Sutton 2001). The first was the modernization paradigm of the 1950s and 1960s associated with the work of Arthur Lewis, which drew on the experience of “Operation Bootstrap” in Puerto Rico. The essence of the strategy was a program of “industrialization by invitation,” which sought to combine the labor surplus in the region with modern (largely foreign) capital to create industries to serve the regional and foreign markets. The state was to play an important role in developing infrastructure and providing fiscal incentives. It also promoted regionalism through the creation of regional trade mechanisms to offset the disadvantage of small size. Tourism was also encouraged (particularly following the Cuban Revolution, which “diverted” tourists to other Caribbean islands).

In some ways the policy was successful. The rates of growth in the 1950s and 1960s were around 5 percent (higher than any period since that time). But there was disappointment in two areas: unemployment and underemployment remained high, and the region was still dependent on the outside world for its development dynamic. These disappointments were turned into critiques within the University of the West Indies, resulting in a new paradigm of development associated with “plantation economy” (similar in many ways to the thinking of the Latin American “dependency” theorists) pioneered by Lloyd Best and popularized by George Beckford. This paradigm of development attributed underdevelopment to the historical and continuing legacy of the plantation and argued for a pattern of development that was regionally more specific and political in its aims. In this it was influenced both by the example of the Cuban Revolution and by the achievement of independence in a number of countries in the Commonwealth Caribbean, which nominally gave the state greater powers to advance development. Under the influence of independence the state took a more commanding role in the economy and regional integration was strongly promoted alongside an espousal in the international system of various Third World causes throughout the 1970s.

The debt crisis, U.S. policy under Ronald Reagan, and structural adjustment dealt a mortal blow to this paradigm. The politicos were replaced by the tecnicos. The discussions about development were no longer ones of grand design developed within the region for the region but about how best to administer the programs that were designed elsewhere under the neoliberal paradigm as expressed in the “Washington Consensus.” The 1990s onward witnessed the further entrenchment of this paradigm within the region as it sought the best way to accommodate to and benefit from globalization.
It has two elements. The first is predicated on closer integration with the global economy through developing greater competitiveness in some products and niche markets in others. It builds on studies undertaken in the various international and regional organizations and finds a particular expression through the concept of “strategic global repositioning” (SGR) advocated by Richard Bernal, the current director of the Caribbean Regional Negotiating Machinery. He defines it as

a process of repositioning a country in the global economy and world affairs by implementing a strategic medium to long term plan formulated from continuous dialogue of the public sector, private sector, academic community and the social sector. It involves proactive structural and institutional transformation (not adjustment) focussed on improvement and diversification of exports and international economic and political relations. Achieving SGR requires changes in both internal and external relations. The external relations are of paramount importance because of the highly open and vulnerable nature of these small, developing economies. (Bernal 2000:311)

The concept of SGR has found favor within the region and without. For example, it was commended in major meetings in the World Bank in both 2000 and 2005 as a strategy particularly suited to small states.10

The other is closer Caribbean integration. In 1989 the heads of government of CARICOM made a decision to reinvigorate the integration process (originally launched in 1968) through the creation of the CARICOM Single Market and Economy (CSME). This was to include a fully functioning common market, the harmonization of macroeconomic policies and eventually monetary integration. In 1994 regional leaders established the Association of Caribbean States (ACS) to encourage closer cooperation throughout the region and the proximate Latin American mainland. Neither has fulfilled its promise. The ACS has proved ineffectual. CARICOM has fared a little better. Following long delays, some key elements of the single market (free movement of goods and services) were established as of January 2006 between Barbados, Belize, Guyana, Jamaica, Suriname, and Trinidad and Tobago. There is also some limited free movement of labor. But the smaller countries of the Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States remain concerned about its effect on them, and the Bahamas has recently decided not to join. Little has been done to establish the single economy. The slow pace of change has led some to question whether the CSME is really that important to the region. It remains of significance for most political leaders and for the tecnicos, but fails to excite the public because of its “top-down” approach to integration. It also suffers, according to Norman

Girvan (former secretary general of the ACS), from serious defects in the original design, which retains too much national sovereignty for implementation. The completion of the CSME, he argues, requires agreement on the selective pooling of national sovereignty in defined areas – a policy most Caribbean leaders are at present unwilling to discuss, let alone implement.  

The current development strategy, compared to the 1970s and even the modernization vision of the 1950s and 1960s, is one where the specific regional dimension is missing. It is largely derivative, and “regional input” (e.g., Bernal 2000) has been limited. The dangers this approach of overlooking regional specificity can carry can be demonstrated using the two reports cited in my opening remarks. The World Bank report is a massive document providing a wealth of empirical evidence but presenting it very much within the approved (now post-Washington Consensus) thinking that permeates the bank. This type of thinking is very evident if one turns to the bibliography and the various studies that accompany the report. In them there is little use made of local consultants or national or regional studies. It is tempting to conclude that its authors in the bank are secure in their “paradigm” and that the World Bank has imposed a “one-size-fits-all” model on the region.

A similar critical view is held by the region’s leading development economist. In a presentation to the World Bank in June 2005, Clive Thomas argued that its report A Time to Choose “betrays a failure by its authors to pay proper and respectful regard to the institutional memory of the region’s discourses on economic matters,” thereby highlighting the failure of the bank to fully appreciate the debate on development policy in earlier years. He also criticizes its methodology on these grounds, arguing that the report pays insufficient attention to the historical and institutional context of the region and the microanalysis of firms. My proposition is that when these are sufficiently embedded in the analysis, it might well suggest different lines of departure, different emphases, and perhaps a different perspective from which to frame the development problematique in the region from that the report adopts.

In short, the report is not comprehensive enough in its vision nor mindful enough of the specific realities of the Caribbean region.

The ECLAC study tries to provide an alternative view. It takes to task the “one-size-fits-all” approach and argues that “gradual and partial reforms aligned with actual conditions in each country and with existing institutional structures have yielded better results than reforms that were not filtered through the sieve of practice, experience and internal discussion” (my emphasis). It also argues in respect of achievement of the millennium development goals that: “economic growth is a necessary but not sufficient condition for the reduction of poverty and inequality. The workings of the market must be given greater scope while at the same time improving the role of the state.” In short, it provides an endorsement of the mixed economy and argues for an approach sensitive to local realities.

I find the ECLAC approach preferable. But I would go further. At the very beginning I noted the exclusion of Cuba and Haiti from this article on the grounds that they were “atypical” Caribbean states. But what is a “typical” Caribbean state? Many years ago the celebrated anthropologist Sidney Mintz (1971) provided the answer in his depiction of the region as a “sociocultural area” defined by multiple historical, economic, social, political, and cultural criteria. Within this framework Cuba and Haiti would occupy the central place. They would, in fact, be the “typical” Caribbean state. In thinking again about development in the region the approach taken by Mintz should very much be kept in mind. Development policy demands a strong element of “regional specificity” if it is to be credible and is to work. Globalization may be linking countries and territories to different parts of the world like separate spokes in a wheel, but to extend the analogy, every wheel has a hub that gives it shape and strength. The Caribbean region is a hub and development policy must build from the center outward if it is to deliver the right kind of development – which is also sustainable development – to its people.

It follows that development must be culturally aware and environmentally sensitive. In the Caribbean there are moves to get the Caribbean Sea declared as a special area with special protection. In the world at large the Caribbean is probably better known for its music than for any other product. There must be a way in which such vital elements can be combined with economic, social, and political criteria to bring about a development policy in the Caribbean that is truly multidimensional and practically beneficial for all its peoples. In such an exercise there should be full engagement with all the region’s peoples and a frank appraisal of what has and has not worked in the past. This must encompass Cuba (and Haiti) as well. There are plenty of lessons that can be drawn from a rich historical past. These need to be recovered and integrated within the development discourse in the region to provide the roots for a “grounded account” of development against which more fashionable propositions can be tested, and if acceptable, grafted on to experience to promote new and vigorous growth.
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CARIBBEAN MIGRATION AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF A BLACK DIASPORA IDENTITY IN PAULE MARSHALL’S BROWN GIRL, BROWNSTONES

A good deal of the scholarship currently being done in ethnic and cultural studies, as well as many other fields within the humanities and social sciences, attempts to theorize or employ diaspora models and other frameworks that enable transnational analyses.¹ This essay is indebted to and builds upon this scholarship by exploring the relevance that diaspora models might have for the way we read Paule Marshall, as well as other writers like her, and African American literature in general. In fact, I would argue that the current emphasis on diasporic frameworks and issues of transnationality not only serves to illuminate aspects of Marshall’s fiction that have not been fully understood or appreciated, but also reaffirms the importance of her work.

Spanning nearly four decades and tracing roots, as well as routes, that are African American as well as Caribbean, Marshall’s narratives present an especially ripe opportunity for thinking about how migration and displacement, key terms of the diaspora experience, affect the formation of cultural identities in the twentieth century. Although the idea of diaspora is certainly not new, the questions that are currently being asked – about borders and boundaries and their inevitable permeability, about syncretism and hybridity and the necessary “impurity” of cultures and identities, for example – may enable a more adequate assessment of the particular strengths of Marshall’s fiction: its transnational and cross-cultural focus, its representation of migrant and hybrid subjectivities, its figuration of the diaspora as an organizing principle for Black identity.

Paradoxically, it seems that the diasporic dimension of Marshall’s work has also been the source of a certain amount of critical confusion or misperception, or both. Carole Boyce Davies, for example, has noted that writers

¹. In addition to numerous scholars whose work might be cited here, the works of Hall (1990) and Gilroy (1993) have been particularly useful for my own thinking on issues of diaspora and identity.
like Paule Marshall, Audre Lorde, Michelle Cliff, and Jamaica Kincaid tend to disrupt conventional notions of tradition and destabilize assumed canonical boundaries. Asserting the importance of migration in the work of these writers, Boyce Davies suggests that “the rigid compartmentalization into geography and national identity which academia forces on writers disintegrates when confronted by writers like Paule Marshall” (Davies 1990:70). In fact, the difficulties that Marshall’s work often poses for a canon-based (i.e. national) approach might have a lot to do with what some of Marshall’s critics see as a certain degree of critical neglect or underappreciation of her work. Rather than assume that Marshall’s texts belong to one tradition or the other, my strategy is to highlight the interstitial location of her narratives, that is, their hybrid or intercultural position. Indeed, I would argue that it is precisely this hybridity – Marshall’s dislocation vis-à-vis established boundaries of place, nation, identity, race, culture, and literary tradition – that engenders the search for a transnational Black diasporic identity in her fiction.

Studies highlighting the contributions of prominent Caribbean migrants such as Marcus Garvey, Amy Jacques Garvey, Claude McKay, George Padmore, C.L.R. James, W.A. Domingo, Richard B. Moore, Hubert Harrison, Cyril Briggs, and others suggest that Caribbean migrants and their descendants have participated and often played a key role in the articulation of certain cultural discourses, Black nationalism and pan-Africanism, for example, through which forms of Black identity have been mediated in the twentieth century. As a corollary to this observation, I would suggest that Caribbean migration, more generally, has had a significant impact on the formation of modern Black identities, particularly transnational and diasporic forms of Black identity. There is, of course, a well-respected and sizable body of scholarship on this subject, including studies that examine the historical trends and patterns, the size and scope, the push and pull factors, and the broad social effects that characterize Black Caribbean migration.

2. See, for example, two studies of Marshall’s fiction that appeared in 1995, one by Denniston and the other by Pettis. Denniston (1995:xi) claims that Marshall is among those Black women writers “who have enjoyed critical acclaim without widespread recognition.” Pettis (1995:6) notes that although “scholars of African-American and Afro-Caribbean literature … consider her among the premier American writers … significant numbers of Americans knowledgeable about literature remain ignorant of Marshall.” A more recent study by Hathaway (1999:10) attempts to “relocate” the work of Marshall and Claude McKay in terms of “a more pointed cross-cultural consideration of both authors that moves beyond these restrictive paradigms.” In this sense, my essay is in alignment with the general thrust of Hathaway’s argument, although my emphasis is on the ways in which the Black diaspora itself forms a construct, an “imaginary” if you will, that Marshall’s narratives help to invent and elaborate.

(to the United States and Great Britain, predominantly). The scholarship on Caribbean migration provides an important social and historical context for Brown Girl, Brownstones and my reading of Marshall’s 1959 novel is informed in many ways by this scholarship. However, I want to suggest that Brown Girl, Brownstones also amplifies this scholarship in significant ways. My reading of Marshall’s novel is intended to demonstrate that Brown Girl, Brownstones offers a complex and nuanced understanding of how Caribbean migration impacts cultural identity.

It is generally argued in the literature on Caribbean migration that Caribbean migrants to the United States, especially in the early phases, tended to downplay their ethnic difference and “assimilate” into a Black American racial identity (see, for example, Safa & Du Toit 1975, Sutton & Chaney 1987, and Kasinitz 1992). For example, Philip Kasinitz argues that the Caribbean migrants who came to the United States after 1965 were able to retain more of their “ethnic identity” than their earlier counterparts for whom, according to Kasinitz, “race, not ethnicity, was the most crucial factor shaping both where they lived and their political identity” (Kasinitz 1992:41). Constance Sutton and Susan Makiesky-Barrow (1987:105), in an earlier study that looks at Barbadian immigration before and after World War II, likewise suggest that the experience of the earlier migrants led to “an emphasis on racial rather than ethnic identity.”

While acknowledging the importance of these studies, I believe that this view of Caribbean migration and its effect on cultural identity might be usefully complicated. More specifically, it would be productive to rethink our understanding of cultural identity itself, as well as the related concepts of “race,” “ethnicity,” and “nation.” Our understanding of cultural identity, and the understanding that is implicit in Kasinitz (1992), Sutton and Makiesky-Barrow (1987), and other studies of Caribbean migration, typically presumes identity as “an already accomplished fact,” in Stuart Hall’s words. In contrast, we might think of cultural identity as a “production,” which according to Hall (1990:222), “is never complete, always in process and always constituted within, not outside, representation.” Understanding cultural identity as a “production” would entail a recognition of the fact that ethnic and racial identity are not static or fixed concepts, but rather fluid, open-ended ones subject to constant negotiation, modification, and transformation, a process that the either/or option between racial and ethnic identity seems to belie.

In his study Kasinitz (1992:35) states that, in contrast to the post-1965 Caribbean immigrants, “ethnic ties ... remained private” for the pre-1965 immigrants. He argues that ethnicity plays “an increasingly public role” in the lives of the post-1965 immigrants and that the “new” West Indian iden-

---

The identity that has emerged in the post-1965 period is distinctive both in terms of the “transnationalism” that it reflects, as well as the “uncertainties” and “contradictions” that mark it as an identity that is constantly being redefined (Kasinitz 1992:7, 2). Evidence from recent scholarship on Caribbean migration suggests that transnational loyalties of the kind Kasinitz (1992) ascribes to the post-1960s migrants were not uncommon in the earlier period. This scholarship also suggests that Caribbean migrants in the pre-1965 period negotiated a complex range of ethnic and racial identities and expressed these identifications through a variety of public as well as private institutions.

The split between private and public identities can be somewhat misleading, particularly in terms of the way in which it reinscribes a dichotomy between domains conventionally associated with the private and the personal and those associated with the public and the political. This reinscription of a split between private and public might have unintended consequences in terms of the reinforcement of what Marshall herself identifies as the “triple invisibility” of Caribbean immigrant women. I would like to suggest, in the close reading of the novel that follows, that *Brown Girl, Brownstones* enables a more complex and nuanced understanding of how cultural identities were, in fact, “produced” (through experiences that were both private and public, personal and political) in the context of Caribbean migration and the crucial role that Caribbean immigrant women played in this process.

Although Marshall herself is U.S. born (of Barbadian immigrant parents), the protagonists in *Brown Girl, Brownstones* are Caribbean immigrants and first-generation Caribbean Americans. The novel is set in the 1930s and 1940s and, thus, deals with the pre-1965 Caribbean migrant experience. One thread of my argument explores how Marshall thematizes issues of migration and cultural identity in the novel. I argue, for example, that Marshall’s representation of the Barbadian immigrant community reflects the central, if not predominant, role that women played in the production of Caribbean identity in the United States. I suggest that Marshall’s representation of Caribbean immigrant women problematizes the supposed split between the public and the political, on one hand, and the private and the personal, on the other. In addi-

5. Kasinitz (1992:32) states that for contemporary West Indian immigrants, “the idea that loyalty to one nation contradicts loyalty to another is fast disappearing.”
7. Marshall (1987:81) uses the term in an essay: “If African Americans have suffered from a kind of invisibility (a subject which Ralph Ellison brilliantly explores in his 1952 novel *The Invisible Man*), and if the Black foreigner has been treated to a double invisibility (as Bryce-Laporte, 1972, suggests in an article on Black immigrants), then the West Indian immigrant woman might be said to suffer from a triple invisibility as a Black, a foreigner, and a woman.”
tion, I discuss how the novel thematizes a debate within the Caribbean immigrant community over the social and political efficacy of various forms of racial and ethnic identification. My reading suggests that, rather than becoming “Black” or “assimilating” into a pre-existing racial identity, Caribbean migrants also helped to shape and re-position various historically conditioned Black and diasporic identities.

Another thread of my argument analyzes the discursive intervention that Marshall’s novel itself performs. In other words, Brown Girl, Brownstones not only reflects the historical realities of the Caribbean migrant experience and its effect on cultural identity, it also constructs cultural identity by re-positioning and reformulating prevailing discourses of race and ethnicity. My reading suggests, for example, that Brown Girl, Brownstones explicitly and implicitly invokes both James Baldwin and Marcus Garvey, Black nationalism and U.S. Black nativist racial discourse, West Indian “dialects,” and African American vernacular speech forms. The discursive positionality that the text thus constructs operates between and across established racial and ethnic boundaries and consequently reflects Marshall’s attempt to imagine new (that is, diasporic and transnational) subjectivities and generate new narratives of identity and belonging.

In her much-reprinted essay, “The Making of a Writer: From the Poets in the Kitchen,” Marshall (1983) pays homage to the Barbadian immigrant women of her mother’s generation, those “unknown bards,” as she calls them. Marshall (1983a:4, 12) attributes her “first lessons in the narrative art,” to these women and acknowledges “the rich legacy of language and culture they so freely passed on ... in the wordshop of the kitchen.” Marshall further immortalizes these women in her novel Brown Girl, Brownstones where Silla Boyce’s kitchen becomes the central meeting place and privileged domain for the women in the Barbadian immigrant community. Marshall’s emphasis on this female-centered domain identifies not only a discursive matrix that serves as one of the chief sources of her narrative art but also as an important site for the production of Caribbean diasporic identities.

In the essay, Marshall (1983a:6-7) emphasizes the essential role that “talk” played in these gatherings of immigrant women – talk as a cheap and readily available form of “therapy,” as an outlet for creative energy, and as a kind of portable homeland: “Confronted ... by a world they could not encompass ... and at the same time finding themselves permanently separated from the world they had known, they took refuge in language.” The passionate, incisive, and metaphorically rich talk that the Bajan women engage in thus serves as one of the concrete social practices around which a sense of “Bajanness” can still be maintained within the metropole. Insofar as this cultural practice tends to fall within the realm of what is conventionally considered “private,” its importance can perhaps be easily overlooked or discounted, especially in analyses that depend on unexamined dichotomies between “private” and
“public,” “personal” and “political.” However, the emphasis that Marshall gives in her novel, as well as the essay, to the Bajan women’s “talk” compels us to rethink these categories and the way that their use as analytical concepts can work to elide crucial questions of gender and consequently marginalize the role that immigrant women have played in the migration experience and the production of Caribbean identities.

Within the shared space of the kitchen, the Barbadian women are free to express — perhaps in ways that are not possible or at least not as constrained as when they find themselves in contexts that are male-dominated or Eurocentric, or both — not only the distinctive opinions and attitudes but also the unique (in this case, linguistic) forms and structures that define their Bajanness. Within this intimate, domestic space, Caribbean identity coalesces around the positions that the immigrant women take on a wide range of both “public” and “private” issues — child-rearing, marriage, religion, the war, the colonial status of Barbados, Roosevelt and the “New Deal,” etc. — and, perhaps more significantly, around the distinctive sounds, cadences, and accents of Bajan English itself: “Florrie had listened rapt, respectful to Silla, and now she said solemnly, ‘Talk yuh talk, Silla! Be-Jees, in this white-man world you got to take yuh mouth and make a gun’” (Marshall 1959:70).

As Marshall (1983a:7) points out in her essay, “it wasn’t only what the women talked about — the content — but the way they put things” that made them “poets.” What’s at stake here is not only the artistry of the Bajan women, what Marshall (1983a:8) refers to as “their poet’s inventiveness and daring with language,” but also the ways in which linguistic forms and structures can express, embody, and, indeed, produce cultural identity. As consummate practitioners of such forms, these women play a conspicuous and crucial role in sustaining Caribbean identity within the immigrant community.

A similar argument can be made for other kinds of cultural practices that tend to fall within the realm of what is conventionally defined as “private.” Culinary practices, for example represent another site wherein Bajan identity is reproduced: Silla prepares various “Barbadian delicacies” (including “black pudding,” “souse,” and “coconut or sweet bread”), which she sells to the Caribbean community as a way of augmenting her income. In fact, it is through such practices that a Caribbean identity, and the cultural heritage, communal values, shared ethos, and so forth that such an identity implies, is often passed on to a second, third, and beyond, U.S.-born generation. To delimit the effects and potential importance of these cultural forms and practices by confining them to a narrow category of “private” experience is to miss the fact that such practices can often be profoundly political, especially

to the degree that they mutually reinforce and serve as a foundation for other articulations of cultural identity.9

It must be said, however, that the Caribbean identity that is produced through the cultural practices enacted within the female-centered space of Silla’s kitchen is not a static, ahistorical identity. Rather, it is an identity constituted within the context of specific historical circumstances and consequently marked by all of the ruptures, disjunctions, ambiguities, and contradictions that are associated with such circumstances. To begin with, the Bajan identity that is enacted in Silla’s kitchen is an identity marked by displacement, a “deterritorialized” identity defined by its interstitial position between “home” (Barbados or “Bimshire,” in this case) and “this man country” (the United States). This Caribbean diasporic identity is also characterized by a profound ambivalence toward the Caribbean itself. Barbados is simultaneously the object of the immigrant’s nostalgic longing, a locus for memory and reminiscences of “home,” wherein Barbados is recalled as a place that is “poor, poor, but sweet,” and the site of brutal colonial oppression, abject poverty, and the lack of possibility (Marshall 1959:11).

In response to a comment made by Iris Hurley about “England and the crown,” Silla delivers the following scathing indictment of Barbados’ colonial legacy:

Iris, you now what it is to work hard and still never make a head-way? That’s Bimshire. One crop. People having to work for next skin to nothing. The white people treating we like slaves still and we taking it. The rum shop and the church join together to keep we pacify and in ignorance. That’s Barbados. (Marshall 1959:70)

Caribbean identity, as it is lived by these Barbadian immigrant women, is characterized not only by the discontinuities of the migration experience itself but also by the contradictions of the region’s colonial history. Bajanness is something that the immigrants simultaneously cling to and want to distance themselves from.10 At the same time that Marshall suggests in the novel that culinary practices function as an important site for the reproduction of Bajan identity, she also reveals how such “foodways” and the ethnic identity they embody are often seen as a sign of backwardness by the immigrants themselves. When Deighton, Silla’s husband, mocks Suggie, their tenant and fel-

9. See Hathaway (1999:103-4) for additional discussions of how Caribbean immigrants used “foodways” and language to both re-create homeland and to provide comfort and protection in an often hostile environment.
10. For an analysis of the contradictions and ambivalences of “home” in Brown Girl, Brownstones, especially in terms of how such contradictions and ambivalences are conditioned by gendered experiences, see the essay by Nair 1999.
low Bajan immigrant, for “stink[ing] down [the house] with codfish,” Silla agrees, “Like codfish does smell that sweet! She got to let the world and it wife know she ain long off the boat. Some these Bajan does come to this man country and get on worse than they did home” (Marshall 1959:23).

In contrast (but clearly related) to the intimate, domestic space that Silla’s kitchen represents, the Association of Barbadian Homeowners and Businessmen reflects a formal, institutionalized structure through which Caribbean identity is reproduced in the novel. The association, which, according to Percy Challenor, was “going to be the biggest thing since Marcus Garvey,” serves as a conduit for the Bajan community’s economic and political aspirations (Marshall 1959:196). Here Bajan identity is asserted and organized around a common set of economic goals: the ownership of property, the establishment of business interests, and the professionalization of the immigrants and their U.S.-born children. Predicated on a philosophy of “self-help,” the association’s strategy is to establish a fund “to which all members contributed and which in turn made small loans to members” (Marshall 1959:220).

In her study, Irma Watkins-Owens (1996) documents the prominent role that churches, benevolent associations, lodges, and fraternal orders played in the advancement of the Caribbean immigrant community and the formation of larger Harlem community during the early decades of the twentieth century. According to Watkins-Owens (1996:56-74), these organizations fulfilled several important functions for the immigrants, including providing mutual aid, assisting with economic and political adjustment in the United States, and enhancing status and influence. Watkins-Owens (1996:60,168) also discusses the role that these voluntary associations played in perpetuating “island traditions” and sustaining the immigrants’ continuing “identification with homeland.” The fictional representation within Marshall’s novel of the Barbadian Homeowner’s Association implicitly acknowledges the important part that these kinds of social institutions played in the lives of the early Caribbean migrants and at the same time reflects the complex ways in which questions of identity were negotiated within both public and private arenas.11

11. The case of Marcus Garvey and his UNIA is an interesting and instructive point of reference here. Watkins-Owens (1996:71) suggests, for example, that the UNIA functioned in many ways as a mutual aid society, at least in its early formation. In addition, although the research done by Watkins-Owens as well as other scholars such as James (1998) clearly demonstrates that the UNIA was not by any means a predominantly Caribbean organization (in terms of the make-up of its membership and/or the focus of its political agenda), Garvey’s ethnicity was definitely a factor in the rise and fall of the UNIA and of Garvey himself. Garvey was variously constructed (by the native African American intelligentsia and the U.S. government, for example) as a “foreigner,” a “West Indian,” a “Jamaican,” as well as a “Black,” a “Negro,” and his self-presentation was certainly complex enough to encompass ethnic and cultural as well as racial identifications. See also Martin 1976, Hill 1983, and Lewis 1987.
In addition to revealing one of the social mechanisms through which Caribbean traditions and identities were sustained by migrants in the pre-1965 period, Marshall’s representation of the Association of Barbadian Homeowners and Businessmen, perhaps even more significantly, registers the degree to which such traditions and identities were being actively contested and redefined during these years. In other words, ethnic identity and racial identity were not static, pre-given, unitary categories to which the migrants either conformed or rejected. Rather, these categories, like all identities, were fluid, malleable, “in process,” as Stuart Hall would say. Furthermore, these early Caribbean migrants played an active part in contesting and remaking the boundaries of various ethnic and racial identities and in creating the social and cultural conditions from which other configurations of identity could emerge.

One of the more contentious debates within the association revolves around the question of whether or not to change the name of the organization from “Barbadian” to “Negro.” This debate is sparked in the novel by a controversial speech that Claremont Sealy makes during an association meeting:

“You need to strike out that word Barbadian and put Negro. That’s my proposal. We got to stop thinking about just Bajan. We ain’t home no more. It don matter if we don know a person mother or his mother mother. Our doors got to be open to every colored person that qualify...” He paused and shook his head tiredly. “I know it gon take time. Wunna gon have to ruminate long, but I ain gon return till I see that word Barbadian strike out and Negro put in its place. I thank you!” (Marshall 1959:222)

On one level, Sealey’s speech can be read as a critique of the values that the association represents. This critique, advanced elsewhere in the novel through the increasing ambivalence of Selina, Silla’s U.S.-born daughter and the novel’s protagonist, toward the value system that the association and Silla both affirm, questions the association’s enshrinement of a materialistic ethos and its bourgeois vision of ownership and acquisition.

Although this value system is often characterized in critical assessments of the novel as the Bajan community’s internalization of the dominant culture’s capitalist value system (i.e. the American Dream), Marshall’s depiction of the exploitative economic arrangements that characterize Barbadian society does not seem to suggest that she is positing an uncorrupted Caribbean communal ethos in contrast to a corrupted Western ethos of rampant individualism (see, for example, Christian 1980 and Harris 1983).

Marshall’s concern is not so much the reassertion of an “authentic” Caribbean identity as it is the attempt to imagine a more inclusive and egalitarian set of values around which a cultural identity might be organized. When Selina rejects the association she is not rejecting a Caribbean or Caribbean...
migrant (an ethnic) identity per se, but rather the value system that underpins that particular iteration of Caribbean identity. Marshall’s depictions of the Bajan migrant community reveal the contingent nature of ethnic and racial identities, that is, the way they are always subject to contestation and transformation.

In addition to interrogating the bourgeois values associated with the association, Marshall questions the restrictive nationalist terms around which the association constructs its version of Barbadian identity. Claremont Sealy’s appeal to the association represents an argument for rethinking the question of cultural identity in ways that go beyond the national, or at least the national as it is narrowly conceived and expressed in the association’s founding principles and organizational rationale: in terms of exclusive membership based on birth, kinship, family, and country of origin. However, Claremont Sealy’s statement should not be interpreted as an argument for the Caribbean migrants’ “assimilation” into dominant forms of racial identity. As Selina points out to her soon-to-be lover, Clive Springer, Sealy’s speech was meant to take the association to task for “excluding other West Indians and American Negroes” (Marshall 1959:230). Once again, Marshall’s concern here has less to do with privileging racial over ethnic identity than with exploring alternative forms of identification that are inclusive rather than exclusive and that bridge rather than erase cultural differences. Her depictions also reflect the fact that ethnic and racial identities were constantly being contested and redefined during this period.

Studies by Sutton and Makiesky-Barrow (1987) and others have suggested that the migration experience often served to heighten the sense of a shared West Indian identity among immigrants from the English-speaking islands as well as to foster a wider Caribbean consciousness that encompassed immigrants from the Spanish, French, and Dutch-speaking islands as well.  

12. Given that the period with which the novel is concerned (the 1930s and 1940s) also saw the emergence of Caribbean and other Third-World nationalisms, it’s also possible to read this episode as a commentary or critique of nationalism conceived of more broadly. In this sense, the representation of World War II, which figures centrally, at least as a metaphor, in the novel, might also be relevant to this critique, particularly in terms of what it implies about Hitler, Nazism, and the potential dangers of a nationalist ideology taken to its illogical extremes. Indeed, Marshall’s (1969) subsequent novel, The Chosen Place, the Timeless People, directly takes up the question of Third-World nationalism and the unfinished project of liberation that remains even in the wake of independence. Nevertheless, the specific immigrant milieu that forms the setting of Marshall’s novel constitutes the most immediate reference for the Claremont Sealy episode, and Marshall’s reflections on nationalism resonate most directly in the context of the nationalist discourses that positioned the characters as immigrants, diasporic Caribbeans, “Negroes,” Blacks, and so on.

13. Sutton and Makiesky-Barrow (1987:98) state that “New York offers opportunities to build common understandings among West Indians not available in the Caribbean.” They also state that “just as England provides a unique context for merging West Indian
This insight is already implicit in Marshall’s novel insofar as *Brown Girl, Brownstones* suggests that West Indian and pan-Caribbean identities were also a part of the social and cultural milieu that shaped the early Caribbean migrants. These migrants were positioned by discourses that marked them as Black, or “Negro,” but also as Bajans, Jamaicans, Trinidadians, or otherwise, as well as West Indians or Caribbeans. The contentious debate that Claremont Sealy’s proposal sparks in the association reflects the degree to which questions of cultural identity remained a heavily contested terrain for Caribbean migrants – a terrain where both ethnicity and race mattered and where categories of race and ethnicity often overlapped, intersected and, in addition to being fluid, were subject to constant redefinition.

There is a very telling scene that occurs toward the end of *Brown Girl, Brownstone*. The scene also marks a major turning point for Selina who has been struggling throughout the novel with conflicting feelings about her Bajan heritage as well as her identity in general. In this scene, Selina has a profoundly unsettling interaction with Mrs. Benton, the mother of one of her white college acquaintances. Among other things, the scene reveals how a dominant discourse of race serves to position Selina and how she, in turn, positions herself within and against this discourse. On one level, Mrs. Benton appears to recognize and acknowledge Selina’s ethnicity. In other words, she is convinced there is “something different” that distinguishes “Negroes from the West Indies” from other Blacks – African Americans, presumably. But this ethnic “difference” soon turns out not to make a difference at all. In Mrs. Benton’s repertoire of racist stereotypes Selina’s ethnicity matters only in terms of the qualities that make “West Indian Negroes” better servants and the “delightful West Indian accent” that she prods Selina to “say something in” (Marshall 1959:287-89). Selina thus finds herself trapped by a cultural discourse wherein the articulation of race is based on a Black-White binary “with no intermediary position recognized or privileged to any notable degree by the white ruling class” (James 1998:110).

As a result of the traumatic encounter with Mrs. Benton, Selina experiences a painful but instructive vision of community:

concerns with broader notions of Black Commonwealth and Third-World issues, New York City nourishes a Caribbean consciousness that has not been actively promoted in the Caribbean.” In a similar vein, James (1998:121) suggests that “not only is it in the diaspora that fellow Caribbeans learn about their similarities and differences, it is also only in the diaspora that some of these similarities and differences are ever knowable at all.”

14. In addition to discussing the ways in which the Caribbean differs from the United States in relation to race, James also discusses the differences in the “articulation of race” between Hispanic and non-Hispanic Caribbean societies. According to James (1998:101), these differences account for the “distinct political path trodden in the United States by black Hispanic Caribbeans compared to their non-Hispanic counterparts.”
She was one with Miss Thompson, she knew, as she pulled herself up the subway steps to Fulton Street and saw the closed beauty shop. One with the whores, the flashy men, and the blues rising sacredly above the plain of neon lights and ruined houses, she knew, as she stumbled past the White Drake Bar. She paused across from the darkened Association building, where the draped American and Association flags billowed from the cornice. And she was one with them: the mother and the Bajan women, who had lived each day what she had come to know. (Marshall 1959:292-93)

In some ways it is tempting to read this passage as a sign of Selina’s acceptance of and perhaps even “assimilation” into a dominant racial identity. Her identification with Miss Thompson, the older African American woman who serves as a surrogate mother of sorts to Selina, as well as with the resonant cultural symbol of the blues certainly seems to invite and support such a reading. It is significant, however, that Selina’s experience of communion also includes her mother and the other Bajan women, and the flag of the association as well as the American flag. Consequently, the episode does not represent a rejection of ethnicity in favor of race so much as it does an attempt to locate the common ground shared by various, sometimes disparate, identities.

Although it can reasonably be argued that Marshall’s representation of an identity that encompasses Barbadian and other Caribbean migrants as well as African Americans is somewhat idealistic, her depiction does not represent a denial of the conflicts that have often characterized historical relations among these groups so much as it reveals a desire that the narrative attempts to enact. Although they are not necessarily foregrounded in the novel, these conflicts are acknowledged in Silla’s disdain for Miss Thompson as well as the association’s exclusion of African Americans. The fleeting and inchoate nature of Selina’s vision marks the Black diasporic identity that she dimly perceives as a potential that has yet to be achieved.

As many critics have noted, Selina’s search for identity has not been completed by the end of the novel. Dorothy Denniston (1995:32), for instance, suggests that “the resolution of the novel remains deliberately open-ended.” The vision of community that Selina experiences in the aftermath of her encounter with Mrs. Benton marks an important step in a journey that continues beyond the end of the novel. In addition, it is also significant that Selina

15. In her study of Marshall’s fiction, Denniston (1995:7) points out that while Brown Girl, Brownstones can be read as a Bildungsroman in terms of how the novel relates the story of Selina’s growth and development, her “coming of age,” at the same time it also “moves beyond Western literary paradigms” by focusing on the development of the “collective body” as well as the individual consciousness. I would suggest, in basic agreement with Denniston, that the meaning of Selina’s “coming of age” within the novel cannot be properly understood apart from the larger questions about cultural identity that the text poses.
is about to embark on a trip to the Caribbean when *Brown Girl, Brownstones* closes. Instead of a turn away from ethnicity, Marshall’s text signals an imminent retracing of Caribbean roots and routes in a continuing search for more inclusive and expansive forms of cultural identification. The protagonists of Marshall’s subsequent novels (Merle in *The Chosen Place, The Timeless People* and Avey in *Praisesong for the Widow*) pick up the journey where Selina leaves off, and these texts make it increasingly clear that the construction of a Black diasporic identity is a central preoccupation in the trajectory of Marshall’s oeuvre. Moreover, Marshall’s fiction demonstrates both the enduring appeal and the difficulties of invoking such an identity.

In addition to the thematization of these issues through various characters in the novel, *Brown Girl, Brownstones* attempts to enact, on a discursive level, the diasporic consciousness that Selina begins to envision at the end of the novel. Marshall’s novel re-positions African American literary discourse by articulating constructions of Caribbean ethnic identity alongside African American constructions of race. The simultaneous deployment of these discourses of identity within the narrative highlights the points of contact between such discourses, the degree to which they overlap, and the ways in which they inflect and amplify each other. In this sense, the novel explores the potential and attempts to establish the discursive framework for a diasporic Black identity. Of course, the narrative also unwittingly reveals the points of disjunction between such discourses, the degree to which they diverge, and the ways in which they contradict or conflict with each other. In other words, *Brown Girl, Brownstones*, once again, reflects both the practical challenges and the ideological efficacy of enacting a Black diasporic identity.

The studies by Watkins-Owens (1996) and James (1998) suggest that, at the same time that the identities of the early Caribbean migrants were inevitably reshaped by their experience in the United States, the presence of the migrants also helped to reshape the meaning of race and the nature of racial discourse in the United States. These studies show that Caribbean migrants had a marked impact on radical politics and a range of social institutions (both formal and informal, public and private) that affected the larger Black community. The nature of this impact can be broadly characterized in terms of a more pronounced and clearly articulated anticolonial stance and the cross-cultural, transnational perspectives Caribbean migrants and their descendants frequently brought to the table. Marshall’s novel makes an analogous impact on African American literary discourse by redefining the meaning of race in the context of a Caribbean migrant experience.

16. Watkins-Owens (1996:10) states that, as a result of the entry of Caribbean migrants during the early years of Harlem’s formation as a community, “new definitions were forced upon historic conceptions of race which previously defined the boundaries of black communities.”
I would like to briefly illustrate this point by demonstrating how *Brown Girl, Brownstones* invokes the key figures of James Baldwin and Marcus Garvey. My contention is that Baldwin and Garvey function as metonyms for an African American discourse of race, on the one hand, and discourses of Caribbean ethnic identity, on the other. The juxtaposition of these figures in the narrative works to redefine each discursive position in the context of the other. The invocation of Baldwin, for example, expands African American constructions of race to include the experience of Caribbean migrants. This re-signification of Baldwin within Marshall’s novel works to position the discourse of Blackness as a diasporic, and ultimately transnational, cultural identity. This positioning of Black identity is reinforced by the concomitant invocation of Garvey, which once again foregrounds the anticolonial and diasporic dimensions of the racial discourse. Garvey himself is re-signified in Marshall’s text, not only to emphasize his cultural meaning for the Caribbean immigrant community, but also in terms of placing him within a diasporic and transnational pantheon of Black leaders.

The key references to Baldwin in Marshall’s novel take up the African American writer’s profoundly insightful formulations regarding the psychological dimensions of Black-White race relations in the United States. The first instance is an explicit reference that occurs in the context of a conversation between Selina and her lover Clive. When Selina attempts to explain the uneasiness she felt in the company of a group of White classmates, Clive paraphrases Baldwin:

> He gave a short laugh that was hollow at its center. “Maybe our dark faces remind them of all that is dark and unknown and terrifying within themselves and, as Jimmy Baldwin says, they’re seeking absolution through poor us, either in their beneficence or in their cruelty. I don’t know.” (Marshall 1959:253)\(^\text{17}\)

The second instance is an implicit allusion that occurs in the aforementioned episode with Mrs. Benton. The emotionally charged and ultimately explosive interaction between Selina and Mrs. Benton reenacts one of Baldwin’s paradigmatic interracial scenes:

\(^{17}\) Here is the relevant passage from Baldwin’s (1955:28-29) essay, “Many Thousands Gone”: “Time has made some changes in the Negro face. Nothing has succeeded in making it exactly like our own, though the general desire seems to be to make it blank if one cannot make it white. When it has become blank, the past as thoroughly washed from the black face as it has been from ours, our guilt will be finished – at least it will have ceased to be visible, which we imagine to be much the same thing. But, paradoxically, it is we who prevent this from happening; since it is we, who, every hour that we live, reinvest the black face with our guilt; and we do this – by a further paradox, no less ferocious – helplessly, passionately, out of an unrealized need to suffer absolution.”
“Oh, please say something in that delightful West Indian accent for us!” The woman was standing over her now, brightly smiling, insistent. As she gave Selina a playful shake the punch glass slid from her limp hands to the floor and broke, splintering the woman’s brittle voice and its hold on Selina. Leaping up Selina savagely flung off the woman’s hand; the woman fell back, her startled eyes arcing past Selina’s, and struck the lamp, which teetered and then crashed to the floor. Just before the darkness exploded in the room, Selina was at the door, viciously shoving aside the dazed Margaret, then rushing out, down the hall, veering sharply into the living room. (Marshall 1959:290)

Baldwin’s analysis of the dynamics of race, especially as they are played out within the Black-White binary system that is unique to the U.S. context, is an essential part of the novel’s ideological framework. This analysis informs not only Selina’s encounter with Mrs. Benton, but also the character of Miss Thompson, the African American hairdresser who bears the physical and emotional scars of racial violence. But the racial discourse that Baldwin’s formulations epitomize also encompasses the experience of Silla and all the other Bajan characters, including Deighton, who admits with bitterness that “here and in Bimshire they’s the same. They does scorn yuh ‘cause yuh skin black” (Marshall 1959:83).

If the references to Baldwin function as a metonym for the text’s engagement with African American racial discourse, then the allusions to Garvey represent a sign of its investment in Caribbean discourses of ethnic identity. Aside from Percy Challenor’s comment about the association being “the biggest thing since Marcus Garvey,” Garvey’s presence remains largely implicit, his legacy reflected in the distinctive political views of the immigrant characters, in their hopes and aspirations, and in the cultural traditions they try to maintain in “this man country” (Marshall 1959:196). Marshall makes this implicit reference to Garvey explicit in her essay, “From the Poets in the Kitchen”:

If F.D.R was their hero, Marcus Garvey was their God. The name of the fiery, Jamaican-born black nationalist of the 20s was constantly invoked around the table. For he had been their leader when they first came to the United States from the West Indies shortly after World War I. They had contributed to his organization, the United Negro Improvement Association (UNIA), out of their meager salaries, bought shares in his ill-fated Black

18. The scene from Brown Girl, Brownstones appears to enact the explosive racial tension that Baldwin (1984:28-29) so eloquently evokes in his essay: “In our image of the Negro breathes the past we deny, not dead but living yet and powerful, the beast in our jungle of statistics. It is this which defeats us, which continues to defeat us, which lends to interracial cocktail parties their rattling, genteel, nervously smiling air: in any drawing room at such a gathering the beast may spring, filling the air with flying things and an unenlightened wailing.”
Star Shipping Line, and at the height of the movement they had marched as members of his “nurses brigade” in their white uniforms up Seventh Avenue in Harlem during the great Garvey Day parades. Garvey: He lived on through the power of their memories. (Marshall 1983a:5)

Garvey also lives on in the anticolonial perspectives he did so much to promulgate. These distinctive political views are often expressed through Silla and the other Bajan characters. They constitute, like Baldwin’s analyses of race, an ideological framework that underpins Marshall’s novel. This framework informs, for instance, Silla’s vivid recounting of her childhood in Barbados:

“School, ha!” Her sardonic laugh twisted the air. “Yes, you might call it a school, but it ain the kind you thinking of, soul. The Third Class is a set of little children picking grass in a cane field from the time God sun rise in his heaven till it set. With some woman called a Driver to wash yuh tail in licks if yuh dare look up. Yes, working harder than a man at the age of ten ...” Her eyes narrowed as she traveled back to that time and was that child again, feeling the sun on her back and the whip cutting her legs. More than that, she became the collective voice of all the Bajan women, the vehicle through which their former suffering found utterance. (Marshall 1959:45)

The juxtaposition of this anticolonial discourse and the discourse of racial identity that the references to Baldwin invokes reflects Marshall’s attempt to construct a narrative that positions both discourses within a framework for Black diasporic identity. The connections between the two discursive positions are admittedly not fully articulated in Marshall’s first novel, except perhaps for the implied linkage of a shared “Blackness.” In subsequent novels, *The Chosen Place, The Timeless People* and *Praisesong for the Widow*, Marshall explore the idea of common ancestral culture as the basis for this diasporic linkage. Of course, this idea of a shared diasporic culture – both historically and in terms of Marshall’s fictions – has had both its successes and its problems.

Garvey’s legacy is also implicit in the West Indian identity that the Bajan immigrants continue to assert. This West Indian identity, sustained and reproduced through a variety of formal and informal institutions and public and private practices, co-existed alongside racial identities with which they sometimes overlapped and sometimes conflicted. Watkins-Owens (1996:81) quotes A.M.E. minister William Ferris who noted that “the Garvey movement, by marshaling the West Indians en masse, made manifest the characteristics in which the West Indians differed from the American Negroes.” Watkins-Owens (1996:81) further states that “the presence of the UNIA leader helped to focus ethnic awareness in ways not so apparent before his organization
galvanized such spectacular appeal in Harlem.”19 The representation of these West Indian and Caribbean identities in *Brown Girl, Brownstones* highlights the role these Caribbean migrants played in the formation of a range of ethnic and racial identities in the early part of the twentieth century.

The interweaving of these discursive threads – Garvey and Baldwin, African American racial discourse and Caribbean discourses of identity – within Marshall’s novel reflects her attempt to construct a discursive framework that unifies and connects these sometimes disparate and dissimilar experiences. Marshall’s hybrid novel encompasses Caribbean, Caribbean immigrant, and African American experiences. The novel reveals the gaps and disjunctions that exist between these experiences at the same time that it explores the commonalities that might be found between them. If, as Hall (1990:225) suggests, “identities are the names we give to the different ways we are positioned by, and position ourselves within, the narratives of the past,” then *Brown Girl, Brownstones* attempts to provide a new narrative of identity, one that imagines a community that transcends narrow national and ethnic boundaries. Marshall’s first novel thus prepares the discursive and ideological ground for what emerges more clearly in her subsequent novels as a transnational Black identity organized around the concept of the African diaspora. This identity, in all of its historically contingent forms, obviously continues to be a productive and powerful idea for Black intellectuals, artists, and writers.

19. Watkins-Owens (1996:81) also claims that “Garvey and the controversies surrounding him helped to shift the nature of traditional politics to encompass ethnic as well as racial concerns.”
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In the politically charged world of scholarship on Cuba, it is salutary to comment in one review essay on four quite different volumes, each complementing the others. Three are single-authored, two on island Cuba (by Antonio Carmona Báez and Rafael Hernández) and one on Miami (by Miguel A. de la Torre). All three draw on theory and concepts and are male-authored and place-centric (Cuba/Miami). The fourth (by María de los Angeles Torres) is an edited collection of the personal testimonies of women seeking a place in between the hardened politics of Cuba and Miami.

Carmona Báez, Puerto Rican, is the only non-Cuban. At the Transnational Institute in the Netherlands, he is among leading opponents of neoliberal globalization, and State Resistance to Globalisation in Cuba sets out to track Cuba’s record in resisting the 1990s neoliberal trend. The introduction sets out the tenets of neoliberal globalization, anti-imperialism, socialism in a sea of capitalism, state capitalism, and the implications for studying Cuba, especially its party/state apparatus, after the collapse of the Eastern European socialist bloc. The concept of Gramscian hegemony is invoked to explain
global acceptance of neoliberal thinking and Cuban counterhegemonic discourse in maintaining a state-led economy.

Carmona Báez identifies four pillars of the Cuban Revolution—unity, continuity, state supremacy, and popular participation. Analyzing the causes and consequences of Cuba’s 1991-96 economic crisis, he describes the gradual disintegration in the 1980s of a working model of Cuban economic integration in the Eastern European socialist trading bloc CMEA—foreunner to Cuba losing its Soviet backer in the 1990s and simultaneously having to withstand a tightened, then thirty-year, U.S. embargo. The Revolution was transformed to a “mutated social, political and economic project that is struggling to survive” with “new formulas for maintaining state control” (p. 37). His analysis of radical changes—legalizing citizens’ use of hard currency (especially remittances from family abroad), building up tourism, opening up to foreign investment, and formalizing *cuentapropismo* (self-employment), embraced in the name of safeguarding the gains of the Revolution—is spot on.

For the period 1996-2000, when Cuba’s social and economic indicators pointed to recovery, he draws similarities between some of the trends typical of neoliberal globalization and Cuba’s new policies regarding production and capital accumulation—in the ways *cuentapropismo* and the *sistema de perfeccionamiento empresarial* (restructuring of state enterprises) impacted economically, socially, and politically, repositioning military and civilian forces. He points to close connections between those from military and civilian bureaucratic circles (and families abroad) and a new technocratic-entrepreneurial bloc, or proto-class, accumulating money and property, often at the expense of state resources and cementing new divides and inequalities in an otherwise booming tourism sector, prostitution, and racism.

He ends by returning to two major questions posed at the outset: Why does the Cuban Communist Party/state apparatus continue to exist? To what extent is the process of social, political, and productive restructuring in Cuba shaped by global trends and pressures? The study of Cuban socialism, he concludes, reveals that states do have the capacity to resist and denounce global trends, yet “no matter how hard the state leadership may try, some global trends are hard to resist” (p. 225). Shifts in Cuban society have made the political and economic structure more vulnerable and created cracks in the four pillars. What are possible future scenarios? Carmona Báez would like to see a new world order grounded on socioeconomic justice and more popular participation. In the meantime, will the Cuban party/state apparatus disintegrate from rising contradictions from within, resulting from post-1989 policies, as much as, if not more than, those from abroad?

Turning our attention to Miami, de la Torre examines the role of religion in the ascension of Exilic Cubans (his term in contradistinction to Resident Cubans) to unmask structures of oppression from within. “For many Cubans in the Miami community, everything good, holy, pure, true, and sacred is
the antithesis of Castro and his regime. Belonging is measured by the intensity of righteous indignation directed toward Castro” (p. xvi). La Lucha (the struggle) is a religious dichotomy between the Exilic “children of light” and Resident “children of darkness.”

He begins and ends La Lucha for Cuba with the “Elián Saga” that hit world headlines in 2000. The struggle between father/Resident Cuban and great-uncle/Exilic Cuban for custody of five-year-old Elián González, rescued from the sea, fast assumed biblical proportions. “Pray for Elián” was the Exilic Cuban slogan. Elián became the miracle child, poster Christ in street vigils and at the shrine of Our Lady of Charity (Miami’s Virgen de la Caridad del Cobre, Cuba’s patron saint). Santería followers claimed Ochún had spared Elián’s life. Exilic Cuban Jews proclaimed Elián the Moses of the year 2000 who would lead his people to the promised land (Cuba). Adventists claimed him the Messiah.

De la Torre conceptualizes this as an “ajiaco Christianity” – borrowing from Cuban ethnographer Fernando Ortiz’s metaphor of the Cuban stew, or ajiaco. As a theology of the diaspora, he argues, it is deeply rooted in the theoretical constructs of postmodernism, postcolonialism, and liberation theology, subverted to Miami’s Exilic Cuban religious and political fervor. The religious dimensions of political battles reveal a continuing dichotomy between good (Exilic Cubans) and evil (Resident Cubans/Castro), the latter infidels in a holy war. Biblical invocations justify Exilic Cuban armed secret organizations, bomb attacks, and assassinations, including attempts on Fidel Castro himself. All but Exilic Cubans and their supporters surely cannot fail to see the parallels with modern-day fundamentalism and terrorism.

De la Torre uses the biblical story of Babylonian captivity in Psalm 137 to explore ethnicity in the construction of a Cuban identity in Babylon designed to protect power and privilege. Rich and powerful caudillos (strong men) foster a siege mentality parallel to that on the island and Exilic intra-oppression. In a cursory view of male-dominated phases of Cuban history (Amerindian conquest, African slavery, Chinese indentureship, U.S. emasculation), he eschews machismo as the metaphor for Exilic Cuban business and political elites to wield male, white, sexist, ethnocentric, class privilege to effeminize and domesticate the non-elite male “Other.”

Will there be a post-Exilic Miami? The rise of Generation Ñ, counterpart to Euro-American Generation X – light-skinned, middle-class, bilingual, well-educated, successful, more moderate professionals – is one marker of change. But the hold of la lucha, cloaked in religiosity, only stiffened with Elián. De la Torre concludes, “Nothing else, for now, matters” (p. 139).

By Heart/De Memoria is a poignant antidote. A moving collection of women’s testimony to the heart wrenching that can accompany exile and migration, the book is dedicated to their mothers and the memory of Lourdes Casal, Ana Mendieta, and Raquel Mendieta Costa “who, despite their deaths,
continue to form part of our bridges” (p. v). The journeys and forbidden spaces begin in Miami, looking toward the island, and end with an island gaze on exile.

Editor María de los Angeles Torres pens a thoughtful introduction situating the contributors in their post-revolutionary exile generation: 1960s Pedro (Peter) Pan, 1970s Freedom Flights, 1980s Mariel boat lift, and 1990s “low intensity” exiles. In “Where Ghosts Dance el Guaguancó” she highlights her 1960s experience as a Pedro Pan child, sent by her parents under the U.S. State Department-coordinated operation to “save” children from communism; 1970s intense island homecomings and sense of mission with the Antonio Maceo Brigade, formed by radicalized offspring rejecting their parents’ exile generation; and 1990s deep disillusionment: “I did not want to renounce the island, my nation, nor did I want to accept exile on its terms,” but rather to seek a place “where nations are fluid, where they are sustained by collective and personal recollections” (p. 5).

Contesting exile/nation boundaries and the right/left imaginary defines this anthology. The women carry traumas of a divided Cuban/U.S. existence, though not all experienced exile in a strict sense, as they returned – sometimes frequently. Those who became part of a politicized 1970s generation did so against the wishes of their parents, identifying with the Revolution. Others, friends of fleeting returnees, left later; for them, return had different connotations.

Through their poetry, prose, and art, they express their fears, hopes, dreams, frustrations, and longing. Achy Obejas opens her poem *The Boat*: “we don’t seem to leave the country/you and I, always with an open map” (p. 16). The island for Liz Balmaseda, growing up in 1960s Miami, became a fantasy, poetic place between memory and reflection. Nereida García-Ferraz’s family made the decision to leave in the early 1960s but were only able to do so on a 1970 Freedom Flight. Her return to the island from Chicago, where she was already a figure in the art world, was a major creative influence.

Terese de Jesús Fernández’s experience was born of watching childhood friends leave, becoming the “other” who stayed. Her title “From This Side of the Fish Tank” refers to the glassed-in passenger waiting area of Havana’s airport. Daughter of writer Pablo Armando Fernández, she became close to those returning, her family home becoming theirs in Havana. She and her father having experienced political marginalization, she now has a university post in Italy, returning to her family every summer. She is the only one not caught in the Cuba/U.S. divide. Josefina de Diego, daughter of writer Eliseo Diego, whose home also became a second home for “returnees,” grew up with her grandmother’s childhood memories of living in New York. Her family almost left in the 1960s, but were prevented by her mother’s ill health. Her essay, “Through Other Looking Glasses,” draws on her grandmother’s love of the classic *Alice in Wonderland*.
Mirta Ojito was sixteen when she and her parents left in 1980, her uncle coming for them in the Mariel Boat Lift. “La Salida: The Departure” documents the traumatic process of being stripped of identity and treasured possessions – where does self end and home begin? Carmen Díaz also left through Mariel. “The Recurring Dream” reflects on youthful dreams of revolution and joining the guerrilla before she became a physics scholar in what she describes as 1970s authoritarian political culture: “I left because that world became too narrow for me” (p. 121). Now, in her dreams she says goodbye to revolution.

In “Only Fragments of Memory,” the late Raquel Mendieta Costa wrote of the excitement of 1960s revolution. While relatives left in the 1960s, her immediate family stayed; it was only decades later that her break with official history took her into exile. Madelin Camara’s “Words Without Borders” describes her journey as part of the 1980s generation, coming of age in search of philosophical positions beyond the Havana/Miami divide. She was one of many Cuban intellectuals and artists to seek this in neighboring Mexico, later moving to the United States.

The collection ends with island resident Tania Bruguera expressing in her art the loss felt when people left. Exile severed contact, and to explore that loss violated official political stands. Drawn by the work of Ana Mendieta, a Pedro Pan child who returned to work in Cuba, she recreated Ana’s work, and this led her to a multifaceted project on the longing for those who leave – nostalgia in reverse.

*Looking at Cuba: Essays on Culture and Civil Society* takes us back to the island. The 1999 Cuban edition was a compilation of “think-piece” articles by Hernández, one of Cuba’s leading contemporary political thinkers, some published in Cuba, some abroad, in the years 1993-99. The English-language edition includes a subsequently published text of 2001.

In the first defining essay, “Looking at Cuba” (*Mirar a Cuba*), Hernández sets out to debunk four myths:

First: “To be credible the author of a work on Cuba must be outside the country or be a ‘dissident within’”(p. 11). How can it be, he asks, that “the identity card that certifies an intellectual free spirit is more available to escaped officials, repentant Stalinists, turncoat functionaries, ex-professors of dogmatism, and former straw men of cultural conformity than it is to those who always sought and fought for room to think and act on behalf of freedom, independence, and the progress of the nation?” (pp. 12-13).

Second: “Fidel Castro is the source of the [Cuban] revolution and all its evils” (p. 13). Revolution is more than the imprint of leadership and ideology. Politics is the art of winning external and internal support and forging consensus. In the 1990s, a decade of lessening consensus and increasing discontent, Fidel Castro, having fine-tuned the art, was, he argues, the only one who could spearhead a viable transition to a more decentralized and
democratic system with the least trauma. Significantly, Havana, Miami, and Washington all recognize this.

Third: “Cuban socialism consists of a political system and an ideological discourse. Civil society has been suppressed” (p. 15). Cuba is not “the transfiguration of a doctrine or reification of a totalitarian philosophy” (pp. 15-16). He celebrates Cubans’ “political culture” and asks, “doesn’t that population have knowledge, maturity, and culture enough to face and understand the real changes the country needs?” (p. 16). The corollary question is, “Should we regret having created these demanding citizens?” (p. 18).

Fourth: “Cuba is the same as ever. It’s just going through a process of superficial or contemporary changes” (p. 19). Will Cuba need more than one party in the future? The answer, he declares, will depend on the party’s capacity to push through change without losing touch with people.

Subsequently, he explores multiple concepts of civil society, from the classical Hegelian to the modern, and the role of intellectuals, with a critique of Jorge Castañeda’s *Utopia Unarmed* and the Latin American cultural left. On Cuba, he concludes the net result of foreign policy relations, especially regarding the former USSR and the United States, “has been that Cuba’s external policies are more open, pluralist, and flexible than domestic ones” (p. 97). “The gradualist line taken by the reform process in Cuba has been recovering zones of consensus from the bewilderment provoked by the shock of the crisis. But this process does not evolve free of outside interference. The main external factor is the nature of the relationship with the United States” (p. 109).

“On Discourse” opens with a quote from Lewis Carroll’s *Through the Looking Glass*, when Alice asked whether you can make words mean different things. “‘The question is,’ said Humpty Dumpty, ‘which is to be master – that’s all.’” Musing on popular and political language, he concludes, “A stereotyped discourse is caught on the horns of a dilemma. Either it must undergo a profound transformation, or else it will go on reproducing itself as before, condemned to lose its way, fall out of daily use, and be ignored or abandoned because it has ceased to communicate” (p. 126).

Political debate or monologue? That is the final question. He argues convincingly that there has been real debate in 1990s Cuba on thorny, previously isolated or ignored topics and that in academia and in literature, art, film, and theater, “what is under thorough review today is the very foundations – and meaning – of socialism as a social order and culture in Cuba” (p. 132). The more charged the international atmosphere, the greater are the limitations, yet debate grows. Nor is it limited by geographical or political frontiers, with a certain convergence between Cubans on- and off-island.

Clearly, the intricate relationship between civil society and state is crucial to Cuba’s future. Summer 2005 saw a palpable popular mood change, not least among the majority sector in Cuba that is non-White and has experi-
enced exclusion as a result of 1990s reforms. A sobering final thought, as one who has studied and written on race in Cuba in a Caribbean context, is how far race is central to Carmona Báez’s “cracks in the pillars,” marginal to de la Torre’s “post-Exilic Miami” (where non-Whites are a minority), and thus accorded little space in Hernández’s “convergence” and de la Torre’s “bridges” to that “place in between.” A question for each of the authors, all of whom come from broadly similar White middle-class/intellectual backgrounds and gloss over the race issue, is whether this might prove a driving force for future change. This does not, however, detract from the significant intrinsic value of each.
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The relation between cultural production and political struggle, and between the aesthetic and the material as expressions of social relations, are absolutely central themes within Caribbean studies in all of its disciplinary and interdisciplinary guises. A key question for the field as a whole is what role it might play in generating new approaches to “cultural political economy,” which is emerging as an effective bridging concept at the intersections of anthropology, sociology, economics, political theory, and literary and cultural studies.

Both of the books reviewed here navigate the distinctively Caribbean confluence of two theoretical traditions: a class-centered tradition of anticapitalist political theory and praxis and an aesthetics-centered tradition of anticolonial cultural theory and praxis. Joy Mahabir describes her approach as “historical materialist” while Shalini Puri describes hers as grounded in “Marxist cultural theory.” Both also incorporate questions of racial, gender, and sexual hierarchies. Each book engages with a wide range of cultural objects and sites: literary and theoretical texts, musical lyrics and performance, Carnival and public festivities. Thus while focused mainly on literary studies, these texts contribute to the increasingly prevalent transdisciplinary Caribbean cultural studies methodology that encompasses high art and popular culture, performance and politics, theory and history. Indeed, the very relation between the aesthetic and the political is at the core of each author’s concerns.
Equally importantly, each book not only attends to the interaction of African and European cultural elements in the making of Caribbean modernity, but also gives significant weight to the complex inclusion of Indo-Caribbean, Chinese-Caribbean, “mixed race,” and other underexamined elements. Puri, in fact, makes this central to her argument. *The Caribbean Postcolonial* is an important contribution to recent debates on hybridity, not because it offers a new grand narrative of Caribbean hybridity (in fact it argues explicitly against such projects) but rather because it demonstrates the need for a carefully historicized, contextual, and conjunctural analysis of discourses of “cultural hybridity.” Drawing on the wealth of such discourses in the Caribbean, it examines how different understandings of cultural hybridity have been contorted into very different national and transnational projects, often with conflicting implications for the resolution of racial, ethnic, class, gender, and sexual inequalities.

Poised between “Marxist cultural theory” and Caribbean postcolonial theory, Puri ultimately offers a feminist postcolonial vision of a progressive Caribbean future that might connect “a poetics of hybridity to a politics of equality” (p. 1). In contrast to the tendency in canonical postcolonial theoretical statements to claim hybridity or creolization as either an abstract principle or a new master narrative of the postnational condition that now prevails everywhere, she convincingly calls for a further specification of particular Caribbean elaborations of hybridity (such as *mestizaje*, creolization, douglarization, *jibarismo*, etc.) in order to explore “the specificities and histories of each term” (p. 3). This alone makes this a valuable book, which will contribute to teaching in this area.

Part I offers a trenchant critique of contemporary “postnationalist” claims for hybridity and a careful comparative reading of late nineteenth- and twentieth-century discourses of hybridity in the work of Caribbean writers and theorists including Jose Martí, Jose Vasconcelos, Kamau Brathwaite, Derek Walcott, Oswald de Adrade, Wilson Harris, and Edouard Glissant. These chapters, though difficult going at times, reward the reader with a much better understanding of the political, cultural, and historical distinctiveness of different discursive contexts for the circulation of ideas of “cultural hybridity.” Puri masterfully compares and contrasts diverse manifestations of (and manifestoes for) magical or marvelous realism, transculturación, mulatto aesthetics, cultural cannibalism, *mestizaje*, and *antillanité* as expressions of Caribbean nationalist modernity. She shows how, far from destabilizing the nation as postcolonial theory might imply, these “discursive complexes” in fact have served historically to consolidate the nation by glossing over social inequalities.

In Part II, Puri turns from theory to textual readings of the aesthetics and poetics of hybridity in a wide range of Caribbean texts. Several chapters focus on Afro-European creolization including readings of Glissant’s “forced
poetics,” Brathwaite’s poetry, Walcott’s play Pantomime, and a novel by Erna Brodber. The two final chapters highlight the tension between “creole” and “dougla” hybridities in Trinidad through an analysis of the relation between Afro-Creole Carnival and Indo-Caribbean Hosay, and readings of a novel by Ishmith Khan, a chutney-soca song performed by Drupatee Ramgoonai, and a short story by Ramabai Espinet. Finally, Puri calls for a “dougla poetics,” which references the “dis-allowed” mixture of Afro-Creole and Indo-Caribbean cultural identities, opening up a space of challenge not only to colonial racial orders but also to postcolonial nationalist projects (both Afro-Creole and pan-Indian) of purification, separation, and control.

Like other recent work on Black sexual politics, Puri defends the opening up of spaces of public articulation of female sexual agency and acknowledgment of intra-racial inequalities including domestic violence. Her work is distinctive in terms of its combination of theoretical complexity, geographic breadth, and fine-grained analysis of particular texts. It is also valuable because it gives sustained attention to Latin American, Afro-Caribbean, and Indo-Caribbean identities, and the relation between them, while at the same time keeping in sight indigenous peoples, Chinese, and other Caribbean ethnic minorities.

Mahabir’s tools for combining class analysis and cultural analysis are somewhat more blunt-edged than Puri’s. Her historical materialist perspective “means reading texts to uncover their ideological relationship to history, since they inevitably reflect the economic, social, and political conditions of their production, while offering an ideological view of these conditions” (p. 2). She describes her area of interest as “progressive Caribbean artists” whose work is “centered on class struggle, resistance, and revolution” (p. 2) and includes in her scope the paintings of Wifredo Lam, the poetry of Martin Carter, Edouard Glissant, and Ramabai Espinet, writings by Jacques Roumain and Merle Hodge, and the calypsos of David Rudder. In this body of work she identifies a multiplicity of “resistant discourses” that might be described as underground, subaltern, or as she argues in the first chapter, “contrapuntal.”

Although Miraculous Weapons offers a compelling overview of the traditions of resistance and revolution that run through a diverse range of Caribbean artistic works, at times the reading seems overly reductive. For example, Lam’s paintings are situated in terms of a brief social history of Chinese indentured migration into Cuba and a brief biographical history including his initiation into Afro-Cuban sacred knowledges and the reception of his work in European avant-garde circles. Mahabir then proposes that Lam’s contrapuntal visual rhythm, Afro-Caribbean iconography, and stylistic techniques function as an Althusserian “interpellation” of revolutionary subjects. In a belabored critique of Judith Butler, she argues that the viewer’s responses to the paintings are based in “materiality or class relations” rather
than “psyche and individual existence” (pp. 27-28). Politicized visual culture in this “materialist” interpretation is a direct reflection of ideology, and ideology is a direct reflection of class position.

By drawing together everything from the Haitian Revolution, to marronage and Carnival, Mahabir risks collapsing all Caribbean “resistance” into a singular anticolonial, anticapitalist, anti-imperialist modality, losing some of the nuances and internal conflicts that Puri so carefully identifies in her “conjunctural” and “contextual” readings. In theorizing a common thread of “intellectual marronage” in the poetry of Carter, Glissant, and Espinat, for example, Mahabir contends that she “concretely establishes links between Caribbean texts whose correspondences are often sensed but not yet adequately elaborated within [postcolonial] literary criticism” (p. 36). Yet the notion of marronage as “a cultural and ideological process of anti-imperialism” (p. 38) seems overly broad for the task. Not only does it gloss over the complex social and political histories of various Maroon communities, but the readings of specific poems do not convincingly uphold the argument. It is difficult to follow Mahabir’s argument when she ventures into claims that the unmasking of capitalist relations is not stated directly in some poems, but is somehow implied by subterfuge simply by an alignment of the poetic voice with the peasantry and proletariat.

In a chapter on the “Caribbean peasant novel” Mahabir reads Jacques Roumain’s *Gouverneurs de la rosée* through the lens of his communist ideals as a novel about peasant class struggle and Marxist social transformation, rejecting other readings that have emphasized elements of religious or cultural struggle. In the next chapter she reads Merle Hodge’s *Crick Crack, Monkey* as a critique of the postcolonial system of education, positing the academy as a site of class struggle. In both of these chapters, we find a strong program of Marxist-Althusserian literary interpretation and a kind of ahistorical reading of revolutionary class struggle as a uniform project across time and space, whether under colonial capitalism or today’s “global capitalism.”

Mahabir explicitly rejects Puri’s advocacy of a “dougla poetics” on the grounds that “progressive discourses of creolization have left out Indo-Caribbean contributions to this process” (p. 58). Yet this is precisely Puri’s argument: her concept of the “dougla” is specifically contrasted both to the nationalist ideology of creolization and to the “purist” cultural separatist movements, whether African, Muslim, or Hindu. Mahabir instead argues that the fusion of calypso and chutney rhythms in recent soca music in Trinidad “is used to effectively convey an ideology that is anti-capitalist” (p. 121). In her analysis of David Rudder, Mahabir proposes that rhythm itself plays a transgressive role as a part of a Caribbean culture of resistance and can be analyzed apart from lyrics as “an ideological language” of class struggle. A brief epilogue on Carnival as a “counter-space that threatens capitalist relations” (p. 142) also seems to foreclose the possibility of alternative and contested
meanings of Carnival in specific times and places, such as those explored by Joseph Roach in *Cities of the Dead: Circum-Atlantic Performance*.

After reading these two books one is haunted by the larger question of how to understand the relations between art and politics, aesthetics and ideology, cultural production and material relations. This is an old question, but it still elicits continuing debate. In considering the emergence of a “douglas poetics” and its political implications there is a question that begs to be asked after the London bombings of July 2005. Is there not a difference between a performance of chutney soca by a communist artist in Trinidad, a diasporic politics of African and Asian cultural fusion performed in London by Apache Indians, and the strange new cross-fertilization of Caribbean anti-imperialist revolutionary ideologies with the anti-Western terrorist tactics of Al Qaeda practiced by “Jamaican bombers” Richard Reid and Lindsey Germaine?

Mahabir’s trans-historical materialism leaves us unable to specify the different ways in which a postcolonial revolutionary ideology grounded in the inequalities of global capitalism might be put to very different uses. Puri’s conjunctural understanding helps us to think about how and why each of these cultural projects is distinctive, but her call for a “douglas poetics” is not yet specific enough to enable us to disentangle the relation between aesthetic form and different varieties of douglas politics.

Both authors nevertheless give us a glimpse of an emerging field of Caribbean “cultural political economy” which might allow us to fruitfully bridge nineteenth-century debates about slavery and emancipation, twentieth-century debates about imperialism and national independence, and twenty-first-century debates about the future of the Caribbean. Caribbean history offers a rich and complex legacy of diverse theoretical, political, and cultural projects that have grappled with the nexus of the aesthetic and material realms, as well as the economic nexus of the spiritual and physical realms, the mundane and the transcendent, the bodily and the eternal. Thus Caribbean studies has a crucial contribution to make to enriching contemporary understandings of the ontological projects of the arts and social sciences as a whole.
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New research on Caribbean tourism solidly locates it within the regional shift from “incentive-induced exports” like bananas to “service-based exports” like data processing, offshore finance, and novel forms of mass tourism (Mullings 2004:294; Duval 2004). Earlier studies may have made mention of the similarities between plantation economies and tourism development, but new models like the all-inclusive resort demonstrate a near identity of form and structure with plantation systems: foreign dominance over ownership and profit leaves little multiplier effect for the Caribbean islands playing host to enclaved resorts. Agricultural exports have been in free fall since the end of preferential trade protocols, and export manufacturing after the North American Free Trade Agreement is in steep decline. If new service economies seemed to offer a solution to economic and social disorder, the reaction to the events of September 11, 2001 demonstrated the fragility of service-based exports and, in particular, of new kinds of tourism. It took four years for international tourism to rebound to pre-9/11 levels;\(^1\) with the perceived threat of SARS and avian flu, as well as the Iraq war and the weak U.S. dollar, official projections of the industry’s near future are “cautiously optimistic.”\(^2\)

Fortunately, there are reasons to be cautiously optimistic about the state of Caribbean tourism research as well. The pages of the two books under review here spring to life with characters that readers will not soon forget. Denise Brennan and George Gmelch provide compelling accounts of the hidden worlds and innermost thoughts of people involved in Caribbean tourism, bringing to light the diverse desires, disappointments, strategies, and failures offered by the region’s dominant industry. While Brennan focuses exclusively on the sex trade and Gmelch does so only partially, the commonalities across the range of experiences described in these books – between the Dominican sex worker performing love in the hope of securing a relationship that will lead to a visa and the Barbadian bank teller who trucks in congeniality as much as currency exchange – give pause to the distinctions one might commonly draw between different kinds of emotional labor without effacing the specificities of laboring in any kind of tourism. These two works thus complicate negative assessments of tourism’s impact on the Caribbean (e.g., Patullo 1996) while adding to a growing body of literature on Caribbean tourism that illuminates the intimate side of neoliberal economic restructuring (e.g., Kempadoo 1999, Cabezas 2004, Kingsbury 2005).

That said, these are very different books. Brennan’s is an ethnographic monograph buttressed by theoretical arguments about gender, work, and globalization and illustrated with richly described third-person narratives of the lives of individual sex workers in the city of Sosua in the Dominican Republic. Hers is the work of a sole researcher who was affiliated with an HIV/AIDS-prevention NGO and who conducted outreach among sex workers while undertaking classic ethnographic fieldwork. Gmelch’s book takes the form of a series of first-person narratives recounting twenty individuals’ histories and experiences in the tourism sector in Barbados. The research is rooted in his long record of study on Barbados, and took the form of collecting oral histories and editing them so that they would be “topically coherent and interesting for readers” (Gmelch, p. 38). Interview subjects were then asked to review the edited histories and suggest changes. Brennan develops a number of important theoretical arguments along the way; Gmelch seemingly sidesteps them, although his reflections pack a solid analytical punch. Perhaps because of these stylistic and formal differences, the books complement one another extremely well, and would work nicely together in classes on tourism and Caribbean studies.

Gmelch opens his book with one of the most succinct and engaging overviews of the history of tourism I have ever read, beginning with Thomas Cook’s 1841 chartering of a train to carry passengers to a temperance rally. He traces the development of Cook’s enterprise and the rise of the travel agency, and shows how the Caribbean emerged as an important tourist destination for European elites. He also discusses the cultural history of the beach – first shunned, later embraced as a cure-all, and, by the 1920s, as a site for
The advent of jet air travel permitted the rise of mass tourism as distances shrank and costs dropped. Gmelch describes the decline in export agriculture, the effect of free-trade agreements and structural adjustment, the rise of the all-inclusive resort and the debates over tourism’s economic impact on local economies. There is a brief account of the history of Barbados, and a chapter about the relationships between hosts and guests on which tourism is founded, interactions in which one party “is at leisure while the other is at work” (p. 25).

The bulk of the book consists of individual personal accounts of tourism. These are grouped into five chapters based on the location of the encounter with the tourist: the airport, the hotel, the beach, the attractions (bus tours and the like), and government offices. Each chapter generally contains a number of narratives from representatives of different occupations within each site (the bartender, the chef, the head housekeeper, the head of security, the manager, and so on). Many of the narratives are followed by a short epilogue in Gmelch’s voice, a sort of “where are they now” account of the person’s life after the initial interview. Each chapter is also preceded by a short introduction by Gmelch. A concluding chapter draws out some of the main themes that emerge from these narratives.

Reading the book from start to finish is very much like arriving in Barbados as a tourist: we encounter the people we would meet and interact with in pretty much the same order as if we were to step off a plane, go through immigration, find a porter for our luggage, and then exchange some money. I took a guilty pleasure in reading some of the narratives, for they afford a behind-the-scenes look at aspects of the hospitality industry with which we are all familiar yet which those of us who have never worked in it routinely take for granted. Reading a housekeeper’s assessment of the class position or slovenliness of guests she may never meet face to face is a humbling reminder of the privileges conferred upon travelers when they become guests, for example. It is humbling, too, to learn that many of the people Gmelch interviewed take from their experience in tourism a sense of the wideness of the world as well as wonder at it, a desire to learn more and perhaps travel more themselves, and an appreciation of the mixture of blessing and curse that tourism has become for many Caribbean people.

Brennan’s book, consisting of an introduction, six chapters, and a conclusion, is organized in four sections. In the introduction we meet Elena, recently released from two days in jail and reconnecting with her German boyfriend/client Jurgen, whose promises of love eventually translate into cohabitation and something approximating heterosexual marriage. Despite the economic advancement Elena gains from the relationship, things rapidly go sour as the extent of Jurgen’s alcoholism is revealed and as he comes to resent Elena’s repeated requests for money. In the end, Jurgen leaves, and Elena is left just as destitute as she began. The introduction thus tracks the
continuum from sex work to consensual marriage and back again, a pattern that permeates the lives and hopes of the women involved in sex tourism in Sosua who pin their fortunes on the promise of transnational ties and the wealth that can flow from them.

Indeed, one distinction between sex tourism in Sosua and elsewhere is the importance of transnational connections involving wire transfers of money from abroad, clients’ return visits, faxes (but not yet email), and the hopes of women – sometimes realized – of following their clients-cum-husbands to Germany and other northern countries (Brennan, p. 22). Another important distinction, which in many ways facilitated Brennan’s research and helped ensure her own safety while in the field, is the absence of pimps or direct coercion into the sex trade. Perhaps more significant in comparison with other sites of transnational sex tourism like Thailand is the fascinating, already-globalized history of Sosua itself. The first section of the book describes Sosua’s “transformation from a quiet farming community into a commercialized, tourist hot spot” (p. 52). Sosua has a long history as an expatriate enclave, first when the United Fruit Company set up a banana plantation there and later, during World War II, when it became a resettlement site for Jewish refugees fleeing Nazi Germany. The latter gave the town lasting ties to Germany, including locally produced German-language newspapers, which later sparked the complicated relationships of fantasy, desire, and money that connect this town on the north coast of the Dominican Republic with Germany. A postcard announces, “Welcome to the DDR: the Deutschen Dominikanischen Republik” (p. 54). The settlement of German Jews also led to a spatial segregation that structures tourism and the sex trade, dividing Dominicans who live in poverty-level conditions on one side of town from expatriates and descendants of the Jewish settlers who live in a modern enclave, across a small bay to the east.

The bifurcation of the town, its pull for internal migrants and international sex tourists, and the booming businesses on both sides of Sosua led to its being perceived as a source of both wealth and moral depravity, fueling any number of contradictory dreams of prosperity or penury for the Dominicans, expatriates, and tourists who end up there. Sosua is a place to make money but also, for Dominicans, a place of danger. Random police arrests and the threat of AIDS and other diseases complicate Dominicans’ assessments of the benefits of tourism, sex or otherwise. Expatriates bemoan the loss of a simpler way of life and the tropical serenity that they say brought them to Sosua in the first place. For many, Sosua has become a “paradise lost” (p. 73) and everyone blames others for this decline, even as Sosua maintains its mystique and attraction. Brennan does an excellent job discussing the racialized hierarchy of labor, belonging, and attachment to Sosua, and the manner in which Dominicans have become de facto criminalized by the politics of racial insecurity that many expatriates and corrupt police officers promote.
The pithiest part of the book is the second section, on what Brennan calls transnational courting practices and the “performance” of love. Here she documents how sex workers seeking more lasting transnational connections and the monetary gain that comes with them enact love, devotion, and desire in the hope of turning their clients into more lasting boyfriends or even husbands. The relationships and emotions here are complicated, she shows, not simply crass or calculating. Communication technologies, in particular the fax machine, stand out as central to women’s strategies. The distinction between relationships por amor and por residencia or a visa becomes quite blurry at times, and the continuum between tourism, sex tourism, marriage migration, and migration (p. 17) animates a continuum from performed love to real love and back again that characterizes “marriage in a sexscape” (p. 94), and creates “headaches” (p. 100) for Dominican women migrating abroad, who are all presumed to be gold-diggers. The section includes a brief discussion of the history of Dominican migration abroad, as well as the book’s main material on male sex workers.

The third section consists of two ethnographically dense chapters on the everyday lives and advancement strategies of Sosua’s sex workers. There is an important distinction between what Brennan terms “dependents” (women who work with Dominican men) and “independents” (those who work with foreigners) (p. 132). Dependents work in groups under the authority of bar owners while independents essentially freelance. Dependents are often housed in cramped dormitory-style rooms behind a bar, while independents maintain rooms in boarding houses. Dependents and independents dress and do their make-up differently, partly because of their class background and/or aspirations and partly because of what the market – that is, Dominican versus foreign men’s tastes – demand of them. Brennan characterizes the dependents’ strategies for working and advancing as less risk-taking than those of the independents, who, as lone agents, sometimes must actively pursue their clients and often have little social support to fall back on should they encounter violence or other difficulties. It is striking that a woman’s ability to save money is more determinant for her success than whether her clients are Dominican or foreign (p. 162). Brennan pays brief but competent and convincing attention to the connections between sex work and the feminization of poverty brought about by structural adjustment and the changing political economy of the Dominican Republic. Interestingly, one of the many transactions that constitute sex work includes the education, of sorts, of the foreign tourist in the ways of global poverty. For some men, this surely adds to the mystique, but for others it seems genuinely to spark concern or a desire to aid that the men and maybe the women sometimes experience as love.

Despite the affective ties that sometimes develop between women and their clients, the independents who secure transnational ties and even visas or marriage abroad generally find that disappointments and a return to poverty
in the Dominican Republic lie in store for them. There is interesting material in the fourth section on “transnational disappointments” on the increase in German internet attention to Dominican sex tourism and the stereotypes that have accreted onto the transnational imagination of Dominicanidad in comparison to other sites of sex tourism like Brazil or Thailand. What emerges here is that sex tourism is a market; and it is an international, competitive market where various sites, in effect, vie to demonstrate their comparative advantage. Clients learn, too, that women perform love for visas; and so clients, sharing tips over the internet, learn to perform, too – hoping that their own performance of love will garner them free sex (p. 200).

Brennan began conducting fieldwork in 1993, and the conclusion of the book discusses changes that have occurred in Sosua since then, including a general decline in tourism along with the development of all-inclusive resorts, which have hurt the small-scale tourist sector. The police forced bar closures after her main period of fieldwork, and the sex tourism business has taken on a less visible public presence. What becomes apparent in her discussion is the extent to which sex tourism is like any other internationally driven tourism market, subject to the same whims, shocks, and shifting styles as any other product.

Despite Brennan’s emphasis on women’s agency, she presents an overall narrative of returning to the same place one started from: some women may get ahead in the end, but most of the ones we hear from end up back in the Dominican Republic, often less secure than they were when we first encountered them. Brennan is critical of research on globalization that emphasizes “the crossing and recrossing of things” to the neglect of “social and economic facts” (p. 46). She seeks to provide an account of “real people’s experiences in a real place,” not “free floating people in an imaginary third space” (p. 15). But what experiences are not “on the ground?” I agree that we need to discuss transnational processes in places and histories but this does not “ground” the discussion any more or less than attention to imagination. This is a recurring issue in Caribbean studies, women’s studies, and anthropology – the mythology of the material – and it paradoxically reinstates the equivalence between the categories woman, sexuality, and materiality that feminist theorizing has long sought to displace.

The overall narrative in Gmelch’s book is somewhat different: it is more a movement along a trajectory, transforming the tourist worker along the way, and destabilizing any assessment of the multiplier effect of the industry and leaving open the question of whether real people in real places do not simultaneously traverse the figments and fantasies that tourist encounters generate in both hosts and guests. Taken together, the two books provide rigorous and sensitive analyses of the biggest business on the planet on small islands that loom large indeed in the touristic imagination.
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This is fascinating, well-researched, and properly historicized ethnography. Forte undertakes the complex and subtle task of elucidating the dynamics of an idea, “Carib,” and the ways it is invoked, debated, contested, and expressed in the context of the modern community of Arima, Trinidad. As any Caribbean scholar knows, the notion of “Carib” is central, not only to past history or, indeed, regional etymologies of place, but also for the way in which it evokes the whole story of colonial encounter, conquest, and postcoloniality throughout the region. Truly this is a concept that comes not merely freighted with meaning but with a whole baggage-train in tow. Against this background Forte admirably responds to the need to present more than functionalist-style description of contemporary performances of identity, and the politics that surround it, by offering a thoughtful account of the historical antecedents of contemporary meanings and the ways in which colonial and nationalist politics have created this context.

The nature of indigenous persistence in Trinidad is demographically and historically problematic, as is the case for all “indigenous” groups throughout the Antilles. This is because the absence of certain standard markers of indigeneity stand in apparent contradiction to the insistent presence of claims to Caribness and an inheritance of certain kinds of cultural traditions. As a result, the disappearance of indigenous populations has been repeatedly declared, from the sixteenth century through to the present day, yet the insis-
tence of local voices on their inherent and indomitable indigeneity continues to challenge the much better publicized declarations of politicians, archaeologists, anthropologists, and historians alike.

In the original schematic of colonial ethnology, the cannibalistic and rebellious Carib stood in counterpoint to that other chimera of ethnological categorization, the Arawak, who appear as tractable, pliant, and also conveniently absent. For these reasons any invocation of the notion of the Carib is already a complex statement of identity, historical rootedness, and a particular kind of political and social orientation. The truth or credibility of such an invocation cannot be reduced to a positivistic catalogue of historical or archaeological facts, but must be interpreted in light of the long and vicious history of colonial and neocolonial politics in the Caribbean. In such an intellectual context a study such as Forte’s should not be understood as offering a definitive analysis of these issues, but rather as a situated account of how such issues continue to play out in the context of contemporary Trinidad.

Forte thus carefully maps the origins and rhetorics of the idea of “Carib” and shows how this is politically and culturally deployed by the people of Arima and its environs. The strength of this analytical strategy is enhanced by a keen sense of historical change, particularly as Forte follows it from nineteenth-century colonial antiquarianism through to the globalized and networked presence of Carib identity today. Perhaps what is most striking in this historical presentation is the way in which the forms of media and categories of investigation and verification may change but the content of the idea of “Carib” itself has remained relatively limited in scope and necessarily paired with its counterpart, the Arawak (or, latterly, “Taino”).

Forte begins with an account of the colonial era in Trinidad, noting the various forces at work in producing Carib identity, and then moves to consider the way in which that identity became spatially and intellectually emplaced within Trinidad, particularly at the Arima mission which has subsequently become known as “the home of the Caribs.” This is followed by an extended analysis of how the “Carib” have been written in the various textual sources in tandem with the way in which the idea of indigeneity itself has also emerged. This sets the scene for a close examination of the politics of indigeneity and “Caribness” in Trinidad and especially of ways in which the Trinidadian nationhood in part anchors itself in these twin ideas, despite the marginal place that communities such as Arima hold within the modern state of Trinidad. Crucial to this process, as analyzed by Forte, is the role of the “cultural broker,” preeminently the Santa Rosa Carib Community organization, which has both spearheaded efforts of cultural revival and acted as a clearinghouse for those seeking to “visit” and “know more about” the Caribs in Trinidad. This presentation is complemented by a more conventional ethnographic account of contemporary Carib festivals and their projection onto the national stage of Trinidad, as well as an examination of the ways in which
global connections with other indigenous reviverist movements and the use of internet websites have allowed an even wider projection of the idea of “Carib” survival in Trinidad.

Despite the interest of these materials it would have been relevant to include some clearer assessment of other “Carib” cultural movements, such as those in Guyana, Suriname, French Guiana, Belize, Dominica, and Venezuela, especially given the large populations that such movements represent. Likewise, the invocation of the category “indigeneity” certainly should have included reference to Alcida Ramos’s book on this notion as it has been deployed in Brazil. Nonetheless, this is an excellent volume that clearly shows the limits of an overly exoticized anthropology interested only in supposedly pristine natives or isolated forest dwellers and which brings to the fore the modernity of tradition in the Caribbean.
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This book is well written and well researched, and adds substantially to the corpus of criticism on French Caribbean literature. Ambitious in content and scope, it seeks to situate French Caribbean literature, in terms of theme and technique, within the broader framework of twentieth-century French thought. To this end, Nesbitt reads a wide range of French Caribbean authors, from canonical figures like Aimé Césaire through those of more recent vintage, such as Maryse Condé and Daniel Maximin, to the Anglophone Haitian-American writer Edwige Danticat. At the same time, he reassesses the stature of such historical figures as the Guadeloupean anti-Napoleonic resistance leader Louis Delgrès. While the Caribbean link to metropolitan discourses is largely demonstrated here, it can at times appear that the primary role in establishing a French Caribbean discursive framework was played by French metropolitan writers.
Nesbitt’s approach inscribes the regional texts in their historical contexts, showing how they “underscore the antinomical status of Antillean existence” as part of a literature that “calls for a transformation of the subjective and objective dependency it portrays” (pp. 46-47). Yet in leading off his discussion of the French Caribbean historical experience with analyses of such thinkers as Hegel, Marx, Lukacs, Jean Hyppolite, and Alexandre Kojève, Nesbitt in fact implicitly claims that these authors provided the key discursive tools that French post/colonial writers later appropriated to dismantle the citadel of colonialism. For example, Césaire’s *Cahier* is described as a canonical work of resistance which “consistently places its own stated intentions in contact with the forces that would eliminate human freedom,” but which also reflects “the poetic discourses of Rimbaud and Lautréamont that inform it” (p. 81). Turning to *La tragédie du roi Christophe*, Nesbitt points to the key role played by Césaire’s incorporation of aspects of Hegelian philosophy at a critical juncture, and stresses his “mixture of such heretofore-distinct discourses: that of European historical and philosophical discourses of the revolutionary period with the mythical figures of the black Atlantic” (pp. 137-38). And in his evaluation of *Présence Africaine*, Nesbitt posits Alioune Diop’s contribution to the journal as being patently steeped in the engagement of Sartre’s existentialist philosophy, diluting the Africanist component implicitly integral to Diop’s thought and writing.

Turning his attention to Maximin’s *L’Isolé soleil*, Nesbitt accords pride of place to the role of jazz in the text, since its grounding in the Black experience renders it “a counter-model of subjective experience forged in the black vernacular” (p. 154). Through an extended discussion of artistic parallels between Coleman Hawkins and Maximin, he seeks to suture the latter’s discursive framework and its conjoining of “historical processes of both mnemonic recovery and imaginative transformation” (p. 153) to musical techniques of improvisation and aesthetic play. Yet this worthy goal encounters its limits when he tries to recount “the novel’s principal project of articulating a Caribbean historical experience” (p. 155), for this discussion of the novel’s genesis and structure appears to sideline the centrality of key Caribbean historical figures and events to the elaboration of the plot. Perhaps more importantly, any analysis of the astonishing capacity for linguistic (re)invention that is the primary characteristic of Maximin’s groundbreaking reimagining of the Caribbean historical condition here borders on the inadequate. This duality of perspective continues in his chapter on Edouard Glissant, where Nesbitt points both to Glissant’s “call for the construction of an independent national consciousness and politics” (p. 173) and to his “explicit reappropriation and reconstruction of dialectical negation, Hegel’s primary contribution to Western thought” (p. 175). In sum, though, this reading does ultimately valorize Glissant’s oeuvre as a project of social transformation (p. 185) aimed at unearthing and exposing the “suffering and lost possibility” that are integral
to the departmental experience (p. 183). Nesbitt concludes his Caribbean survey with a chapter on Condé and Danticat, framing the former’s intertextual excavations of memory as “written under the sign of Proust” (p. 196) even as they plumb “the theme of Antillean alienation and reification” (p. 197). At the same time, Condé’s mastery of irony and caricature is also said to make her “a Caribbean Flaubert” (p. 195). Danticat’s *The Farming of Bones* “creates a field of interaction between history ... and a subjective, poetic voice” (p. 210), one that seeks to recover the subjective possibilities erased through violence.

In setting out to read the “multiplicity of Antillean experience” (p. 196), Nesbitt provides new and much-needed perspectives on both canonical and contemporary examples of Caribbean writing. In analytical terms, his command of theory and the depth of his archival research are beyond question. Yet at the same time, it seems that the pride of place accorded to the metropolitan perspective shortchanges the conjunction of Caribbeanness, identity, and revolt that has long framed writing from the region. By implicitly locating this writing as the product of, or a response to, a European mindset instantiated by Hegel, Marx, Bourdieu, Foucault, and Sartre, the innovativeness and spirit of resistance of a Condé or a Césaire, or indeed an articulation of a more Caribbean-centered appropriation of metropolitan discourses remains somewhat hard to find. What is at issue, ultimately, are the ways in which Caribbean authors draw on intraregional and extraregional patterns of thought and experience to generate techniques and thematics of identity adequate to the complex challenges of Caribbean representation. And while this book effectively locates Caribbean writing within a larger, more canonical French framework, as an assessment of “the legacy of modernity in the French Caribbean” (p. xvii), the claim of transformational force instantiated by these complex entanglements of canon and colonialism might have benefited from further separation from the metropole.
In *Family and Identity in Contemporary Cuban and Puerto Rican Drama*, Camilla Stevens offers a close reading of Puerto Rican and Cuban plays from two periods: the 1950s-1960s and the 1980s-1990s. Her intent is to present an allegorical interpretation of the family as nation throughout the historical, cultural, and political processes that have affected the two islands differently. In describing the theoretical framework for the analysis of the plays chosen, she writes, “the domestic plays I analyze allegorically perform a political desire to (re)tell a national identity story. The private family story refers implicitly to another story, a public discourse on collective identity” (p. 6). The issues she takes up represent many of the themes that Puerto Rican and Cuban scholars have used in discussing their theories of identity, racial relationships, and class boundaries, as well as their subsequent role in nation-building or cultural nationalism in the absence of Nation, as is the case in Puerto Rico. The novelty of Stevens’s project lies in the importance she grants to theater in providing the meanings of the trope of the family for nation-building, including divergent critical voices in the analysis of Puerto Rican and Cuban realities.

Stevens argues that the capacity of theater for generating and preserving cultural memory holds significant potential for the study of identity in dramas: “Just as a ghost constitutes an apparition, a materialization of something unseen, staging the image of the family and the spaces it inhabits concretizes and makes present discourses that might otherwise seem abstract or distant” (pp. 216-17). The form of the book is presented creatively, framed as a theatrical piece. The first chapter, “Curtain-Raiser: A Family Affair: Theater and Nation in Cuba and Puerto Rico,” serves as an introduction to the theoretical discourses Stevens will draw on. “Act I: 1950s and 1960s” includes “Scene 1: Four Failed Puerto Rican Family Romances,” which houses the works of the theatrical production of the 1950s, and “Scene 2: Tearing Down the House: The End of an Epoch in Cuba” dealing with the breakdown of the prerevolutionary family to make way for the future. Act II is dedicated to the theater of the 1980s and 1990s with Scene 1 aptly titled, “Reimagining National
Community: Performance and Nostalgia in Recent Puerto Rican Drama,” and Scene 2 “Ties that Bind: Staging the New Family in Revolutionary Cuba.” These “scenes” suggest that theater has taken on a role as protagonist in revolutionary Cuba, while in Puerto Rico it is struggling to assert its relationship to “subjectivities” rather than to one collective imaginary (p. 120). This latter period benefits from the discussion of the role of realism and experimentalism in theater in the Cuban and the Puerto Rican context. In the concluding chapter, “Exit: From the House to the Stage: Haunted Family Scenarios in Cuban and Puerto Rican Drama,” Stevens finishes her theatrical journey, asserting that the family trope continues to repeat itself in Puerto Rican and Cuban theater because the particular circumstances of each continue to present a fertile scenario for scenes of self-determination and discussions of identity.

There is commendable work in the individual analyses of writings from the 1950s by Francisco Arrivi, René Márques, and Myrna Casas from Puerto Rico, and Abelardo Estorino, José Triana Virgilio Piñera, and Rolando Ferrer from Cuba. The 1980s-1990s selection for Cuba – work by authors such as Roberto Orihuela and Estorino – is, likewise, well chosen and the discussion of the role of theater in revolutionary society is well done. In the 1990s in Cuba, Stevens depicts the disillusionment and breakdown of the *nueva familia cubana* through the work of Miguel Cuartas Rodríguez and Alberto Pedro Torriente. Meanwhile, her selection of Puerto Ricans for this time period – Luis Rafael Sánchez, Myrna Casas, Roberto Ramos Perea, and Antonio García del Toro – who serve for her particular project, leaves out important voices and parallel theatrical activity that would have helped to contextualize the ongoing discussion of the family drama as the trope of the Nation.

One important omission in this book concerning Puerto Rico is Lowell Fiet, whose critical writing appears in the weekly newspaper *Claridad* and in many journals and reviews in Puerto Rico and the Caribbean. He coincidentally also published in 2004 his rendition of Puerto Rican theater, *El teatro puertorriqueño reimaginado: Notas críticas sobre la creación dramática y el performance* (“Puerto Rican Theatre Re-Imagined: Critical Notes on Dramatic Creation and Performance,” Ediciones Callejón, 2004). In this study he points out that when reading certain texts about Puerto Rican theater, one often wonders where “these scholars” (meaning those writing from a distance) get their information, since sometimes they do not accurately portray what a play meant when it was performed (p. 275), nor what the reception has been or who is really being followed by the audience. This is important especially when considering the role of theater in the collective imagination. It is also a reminder that lesser-known theatrical productions need to be published and documented more aggressively in our islands, so that scholars living outside of the Caribbean may have a fuller picture of how theater is

1. A review of Fiet’s book will be published in *NWIG* 80 (3&4).
actually perceived and passed into collective memory.

The points of contact between the books by Fiet and Stevens deserve more dialogue, as do the issues that must be reflected upon when using theater to its maximum expressive capacities on the stage. Camilla Stevens’s single focus on drama in the ongoing discussion of identity and nation-building in the Hispanic Caribbean is most welcome. Through both its strengths as a scholarly text and its omissions, it underscores the need for studies of reception, criticism dissemination, and translation of theatrical works across the Caribbean.
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Jonathan Goldberg is one of the most distinguished critics of English Renaissance literature and culture. A founding figure of American New Historicism, his contributions embrace ground-breaking editorial work, classic literary criticism such as *James I and the Politics of Literature*, and the more recent *Sodometries*. His writings have transformed our understanding of the relations between literary creation and historical context, and brought a welcome theoretical rigor to the field. Like many of his cultural materialist counterparts in the United Kingdom, such as Jonathan Dollimore and Alan Sinfield, Goldberg has become increasingly interested in how contemporary theoretical debates around issues of gender and sexuality map onto early modern representations of same-sex desire.

*Tempest in the Caribbean* is one further consequence of Goldberg’s attempt to read the early modern through the lens of late modern representations of race, gender, and social status. Taking as his focus Shakespeare’s *The Tempest*, he examines how a diverse range of twentieth-century “anticolonial” (p. ix) texts by Aimé Césaire, Roberto Fernández Retamar, George Lamming, Michelle Cliff, and Jamaica Kincaid offer ways of challenging what he sees as the patriarchal and heterosexist assumptions that have come to define the play. The result is a slim but theoretically dense book that takes
three broad directions. The first is to critique the homophobic of Fernández Retamar’s classic essay, “Caliban,” first published in 1971, through a close reading of Lamming’s works, and in particular Water with Berries, where Goldberg senses the possibility of imagining “the generation of Caliban outside of normative modes of social/sexual reproduction” (p. 37).

In the book’s central chapter, “Caliban’s ‘Woman,’” Goldberg foregrounds two striking textual cruxes in the play – the Folio’s reference to Caliban’s mother Sycorax as “he,” and the transposition of “wife” for “wise.” He contends that such problems “suggest how complex a mapping of sex and gender will necessarily be in the volatile context of the play’s writing and rewrites” (p. 62), following the ways in which the work of Sylvia Wynter and Michelle Cliff “provide sites of possibility written across diasporic existence ... the antidote to the lethal binarisms that pit groups against each other, clinging to older paradigms of exclusive identity” (p. 105). Not surprisingly, such statements develop in the book’s short final chapter into a full-blown critique of western humanism, rationality, and education. Taking his cue from Miranda’s attack on Caliban and his “vile race” (p. 119), Goldberg uses Spivak’s Critique of Colonial Reason to launch an attack on Locke, Kant, and Hegel. Returning to Lamming, he argues like the good deconstructionist he is “that the gift of language, meant as a tool of enslavement, has instead allowed Caliban a being that was thought impossible” (p. 136) within western Enlightenment accounts of ontology. However, to ensure that the return to the canonical texts (Shakespeare, Kant, Hegel) is still seen as valid, Goldberg concludes that “old sites of denigration can serve as resources for new social imaginings, new social actors, new ways of thinking. A desirable future may be possible if we can recognize and respect alterities and can refrain from imposing false unanimity” (p. 147).

The problem with such conclusions is that they have been made over the last twenty years by historically minded critics working outwards from poststructuralist theory. Goldberg’s commendable attempt to cross disciplinary boundaries also threatens to fall between two stools. He is not sufficiently versed in postcolonial theory and Caribbean studies (praise for Spivak and condemnation of Gilroy aside) to be convincing in his close readings of particular texts, while on the other hand his rich but allusive asides into Renaissance studies will not satisfy those working within the field. There are unnecessarily fierce attacks on certain figures, including Rob Nixon, whose key work in the 1980s transformed analysis of the play’s colonial reception, and Paul Gilroy’s Against Race, “an ill-named project” according to Goldberg, which “claims (dangerously, I believe) to be against race” (p. 142). At such moments the book veers around, apparently unsure of its approach. Is it a slice of reception theory of a particular Shakespeare play, a theoretical text on queer theory and postcolonialism, or another critique of western Enlightenment thinking? Of course for Goldberg it is all of these
things. However, in less than 150 pages of prose, this is not possible. By the end of the book, it is not even clear who Goldberg is trying to address within the academy. Shakespeare scholars can find more successful accounts of the play’s reception within postcolonial contexts, while postcolonial and Caribbean students and academics can certainly find a plethora of texts addressing the patriarchal and heterosexist bias of the European literary tradition. *Tempest in the Caribbean* feels like Goldberg desperately in search of a subject suitable for his talents.
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There is no other English-language book as comprehensive in chronicling the history of Cuban cinema as Michael Chanan’s. Originally published as *The Cuban Image* in 1985, it examined Cuban cinema to 1979. Revised and republished under its new title in 2004, it includes three new chapters describing contemporary Cuban cinema through 2000.

The book charts Cuban cinema from its rocky beginnings as a small industry in the Hollywood studio vein, to later films adopting a European aesthetic, to the twenty-first century. Six chapters are devoted to demonstrating how central the development of a revolutionary cinema was within Cuban culture during 1959 and through the euphoria of the late 1960s. The ICAIC (Cuban Institute of Cinematographic Art and Industry) was established a mere three months after the revolutionary government’s founding and played a key role in creating, exhibiting, and distributing cinema throughout the country and the world. Chanan’s book is rich with detail and is solidly grounded in an effort to situate the production of films in a sociohistorical context. For example, he maps the narratives of classic 1960s films in the chapter “Four Films,” which examines what are arguably the most famous works of Cuban revolutionary cinema, including “the most-written about” film *Lucia* (1969, dir. Humberto Solás) and *Memorias del subdesarrollo* (“Memories of Underdevelopment,” 1968, dir. Tomás Gutiérrez Alea). A major strength of this work is the level of
attention given to ICAIC’s political battles, debates, and creative processes over different time periods. The production processes of various films, along with their popular reception, are also included. Chanan performed extensive archival research and conducted in-depth interviews with film critics, directors, historians, and producers. His level of access was extremely valuable in uncovering the political nuances of ICAIC’s inner workings.

What is less nuanced is the way Chanan dismisses Cuban cinema made before the revolutionary period (during the studio era of 1930-50). Citing the work of Enrique Colina and Daniel Díaz Torres from the 1970s, he dismisses prerevolutionary melodrama as the “expression of reductive one-dimensional ethics” (pp. 78-81). His critical treatment of the “old” Cuban cinema is reductive in that it labels a whole oeuvre as the product of false consciousness and fails to take into account new scholarship that has been written on the subject (e.g., by scholars such as Ana M. López and Julianne Burton-Carvajal) since the first edition of his book was published. Chanan may not agree with these newer approaches to conceptualizing melodrama, but he could have acknowledged them. Chapters 7 and 8 discuss the first feature films of the 1960s, and the ways in which Italian neorealism and the French New Wave influenced the new experiments. In interviews with Chanan in 1980, Sergio Giral said that in retrospect he considered his La jaula (“The cage,” 1964) to be “too influenced by Godard,” and Humberto Solás and Oscar Valdes, who co-directed Minerva traduce el mar (“Minerva interprets the sea,” 1962), said they looked back on that film as “a naive experiment” (pp. 164-65). These anecdotes make compelling reading because these early films flesh out the evolution of Cuban cinema but are not often described in the canon of classic works.

A book on this subject could not be complete without mention of Julio García Espinosa’s treatise “For an Imperfect Cinema” (1969) which dominated the discourse on Cuban cinema throughout the 1970s and 1980s. Chanan describes the importance of this essay by linking it to a larger pan-Latin American cinema movement characterized by a gritty style and militant sense of urgency. This was a cinema that did not want to foster a glossy aesthetic and “lull the audience into passive consumption” (p. 305). It was cinema with a purpose, characterized by film director Sara Gómez as “inevitably partial ... the result of a definite attitude in the face of problems that confront us” (p. 306).

Chanan deftly recounts the major debates surrounding the role of art and the artist within a revolutionary socialist state, discusses Castro’s oft-cited 1961 speech entitled “Words to the Intellectuals,” and compares differing accounts of the series of speeches given at the National Library. The final speech in that series culminated in the famous statement that “within the Revolution, everything, outside it, nothing” (p. 140), signaling that if artists were clearly adherents of the revolutionary project, they could be critical (in dialectical fashion) of how society was developing, but that those working
outside the system should not create art to potentially undermine the revolutionary project. This debate is central to discussions of films such as T.G. Alea’s penultimate film, *Fresa y chocolate* (“Strawberry and Chocolate,” 1993) (pp. 463-74), and the biggest debate on this topic – the subsequent banning of *Alicia en el pueblo de Maravillas* (“Alice in Wondertown,” 1991, dir. Daniel Díaz Torres) – is well rendered in the final chapter.

Filmmaking in the face of Cuba’s “Special Period” is detailed in the final chapter. In addition to issues of co-production, Chanan touches on newer themes found in more recent films, such as what critic Désirée Diaz calls “‘The Ulysses Syndrome’: the trope of the journey, found in these films in a myriad of forms ... migration, departure, return, internal exile, the impossible promise” (p. 22). Discourse on Cuban nationalism has expanded to include the diasporic (read: exile) community. This invokes what Ana López calls “Greater Cuba,” that is, how the exile community is in dialogue (or lack thereof) with artists on the island.

Despite a few minor shortcomings, *Cuban Cinema* provides an indispensable aid for teaching and researching the history and cultural politics of Cuban cinema.
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How far have CARICOM (Caribbean Community) countries come and how much further do they have to go to improve the status of women and to achieve gender equality in the region? *Gender Equality* comes eight years after the fourth UN-sponsored Conference on Women, held in Beijing in 1995. A document known as the “Platform for Action” (PFA), which details the policy recommendations developed at that conference and ratified by CARICOM countries, is the basis of this examination. *Gender Equality* continues the local conversation between activists from women’s movements
and agencies representing governments and regions such as the CARICOM secretariat and assesses successes and uncontested problems in the 1990s.

The United Nations declared 1975-1985 the “Decade for Women,” proposed a list of policy priorities specifically for women and girls in their member states, and held three conferences designed to address women’s issues and gender inequality — Mexico City in 1975, Copenhagen in 1980, and Nairobi in 1985. Ten years later a follow-up conference was held in Beijing. Caribbean women became active participants and researchers on the international scene and continue to lead the political struggle at home for gender equity and the inclusion of women’s rights on individual national agendas. Distinguished Caribbean women served in the position of secretary general for two of the UN conferences: Lucille Mathurin Mair (Jamaica) in 1980 and Dame Nita Barrow (Barbados) in 1985.

Continuing this tradition of international engagement, all authors in Gender Equality are well-known activists/scholars/academics in the area of women’s issues and rights. Among this group are those who also prepared pre-conference documents for the CARICOM secretariat and the United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM) for Beijing, and crafted materials for the next phase of assessments, known as the “Beijing + 5 Review” meetings. Co-editors Gemma Tang Nain and Barbara Bailey, and the authors of the rest of the essays (Linnette Vassell, Gaietry Pargass and Roberta Clarke, Andaiye, Denise Noel-DeBique, Sonja Harris, and Eudine Barriteau) function as a collective with certain themes echoing throughout this very intense text.

The essays look at specific Caribbean government responses to the needs of women. Through data analyses and in-depth discussions of political, social, and economic concerns, the authors contextualize these national affairs in terms of the fiscal constraints resulting from structural adjustment programs, the collapse of primary export markets, and the ongoing process of globalization that often eliminates the domestic share of goods and services produced. Integrated into every chapter are policy recommendations for governments, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), and regional agencies to consider as mechanisms for transforming the quality of life for women and those who depend on them. Each chapter focuses on a particular issue or set of themes addressed in the Beijing PfA, such as political power and decision-making, violence against women, economic empowerment, health, education, and institutional advancement for women. Further, although some chapters attend to a specific Caribbean country, the general feeling is that all CARICOM nations face similar distresses. On the other hand, there are some explicitly positive outcomes, such as women’s political empowerment in Belize, that are not replicated elsewhere.

Gender Equality tracks the progress made by using quantitative indicators supported by qualitative research that supports and undergirds the “several nuances of gender differentiation” (p. xv). The introduction by Gemma Tang
Nain is indicative of the overall contents of the text. Linnette Vassell’s discussion of redefining power and power relationships argues that these issues cannot be considered without taking account of the context of globalization and “the effects on states, social movements and individual women and men in family and community” (p. 2). This insightful chapter is a comparative discussion regarding the barriers to women’s leadership. Here, the Belize “Women’s Agenda” is showcased as a positive example of how women have been empowered in the region.

Gaietry Pargass and Roberta Clarke examine the ways in which states and non-states respond to domestic violence. The recommendations include governments taking responsibility for the eradication of violence against women and being held accountable for failures to do so.

Andaiye, a Guyanese activist, writes about women’s poverty in the CARICOM community, linking it with power and making four critical points that have not changed – that the sexual division whereby women and girls continue to provide “caring” labor continues, that the gap between men and women is not narrowing, that the gender of the household head is not, by itself, a significant determinant of poverty, and that the new export sectors pit female labor against that of men while not increasing the access that poor women have to secure employment.

Barbara Bailey’s research shows that education has not proved to be the vehicle for Caribbean women’s economic, political, and personal empowerment. Despite overall high achievement and participation at the secondary and tertiary levels, the majority of women continue to be positioned in the lowest sectors of the capital market, earn lower wages than men, suffer higher rates of unemployment, experience greater levels of poverty, are under-represented in decision-making positions, and lack real personal autonomy (p. 136).

Ironically, Denise Noel-DeBique states, “it is with the spread of the HIV/AIDS pandemic in the Caribbean that the issue of gender began to feature more prominently in the health sector” (p. 166). She argues that maternal mortality and morbidity among young women must be considered matters of social justice, and health systems must be responsive to the rights of women to live free from violence.

Perhaps one of the most disheartening signs of the lack of progress is the chapter by Sonja Harris, who points out that reviewing institutional mechanisms requires an assessment not only of the strengths and weaknesses of existing structures, but of the mechanisms used to create a transformational process. Changing the name of a bureau does not constitute social transformation. Further, the national machineries do not seem to have the capacity to respond to new issues brought by the process of globalization, and that carries consequences for women in the region.

Eudine Barriteau concludes that “the contradictory conditions in the Caribbean mirror developments for women in other regions of the world” (p.
While there is a widespread belief that women in the Caribbean have “made it,” the essays in Gender Equality underscore how fragile and porous any gains have been (p. 203). Future research must target the ideologies that support the status quo. Gender Equality provides the analyses, interpretation, and data for the next step in gendered research in the Caribbean.
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The essays in Dominican Migration are concerned with the very nature of transnationalism. Each chapter reflects the usefulness of defining transnationalism either “narrowly,” i.e. reflecting “highly institutionalized activities and constant population flows between countries,” or “broadly,” demonstrating “a low level of institutionalization and sporadic physical displacement between two countries” (p. 32). Both perspectives prove valuable in the study of Dominican migrants.

The first three chapters delve into the impact of migration on Dominican political involvement. In Chapter 1, Ernesto Sagás and Sintia E. Molina outline the civil unrest and economic upheaval that followed the assassination of dictator Rafael Trujillo in 1961. The migration wave that followed rid the Dominican Republic of political opponents and provided the United States with much-needed cheap labor (p. 14). Additional surges followed in the 1980s and 1990s. Chapter 2, by Jorge Duany, begins with a richly annotated review of the discourse on “transnationalism” and explains that “each group of migrants develops a distinctive brand of transnationalism, based on its own historical legacy, cultural practices, settlement patterns, mode of incorporation into the host society, state policies of sending and receiving countries, and other factors” (p. 33). For Duany, the framework of transnationalism promotes closer examinations of “traditional discourses on statehood, nationality, citizenship, ethnicity, race, class, gender, and other master narratives in the social sciences” (p. 47). In Chapter 3, Ernesto Sagás
reminds us that Caribbean politics, beginning with the struggles of political exiles for independence and democracy, have always been transnational (p. 54). Examining the participation of Dominican transmigrants in the political system of their native country, Sagás traces their evolution from dominicanos ausentes (absentee Dominicans) to dual citizens who exercise full membership in their homeland.

A central theme of Chapters 4, 5, and 6 is the importance of secondary cities in analyses of transnational migration. José Itzigsohn’s essay on Dominicans in Providence, Rhode Island, details three ways the population maintains ties to the homeland: economic (remittances, import/export of goods), political (participation in Dominican campaigns, support of Dominican candidates in U.S. politics), and sociocultural (organizational participation, sending money for hometown projects, sports clubs). Carol Hoffman-Guzmán finds that middle-class Dominicans in South Florida are less likely to engage in “typical” transnational behavior, presenting an interesting twist on this issue. She argues however for a “localized transnationalism” to describe migrants “increasingly tied to local places and people, while still retaining strong connections with their homeland, both symbolically and through active communication and interchange, thanks to today’s advanced technology” (p. 99). These transnational migrants have not relinquished their cultural identity in the wake of prosperity, but have found ways to utilize their relative positions of privilege to make choices about cultural retention (p. 125). The recent phenomenon of Dominican migration to Spain is the subject of Chapter 6. Domingo Lilón (with Juleyka J. Lantigua) notes that this migration is distinct because it consists mostly of Dominican women with little formal education, coming from small towns in the southwestern region of the Dominican Republic. Despite low-paying rigorous domestic jobs, “the cultural, social, and even racial alienation of Dominicans in Spain promotes the maintenance and development of narrow transnational cultural practices, and a constant flow of remittances and communications with relatives back in the Dominican Republic” (p. 151).

Chapters 7 and 8 focus on women and the liberating potential of transnationalism. Karin Weyland’s essay on the transformative power of women’s labor in Washington Heights examines the experiences of Dominican women as they negotiate between cultures and struggle under the burdens of gender discrimination and exploitative capitalist systems (p. 155). Nevertheless, these women recognize and embrace their increased independence and power derived from transnational positions that allow them to support families back home (p. 158). Nancy López’s essay on second-generation Dominicans raised in New York City considers the distinct experiences of young men and women and their views on education. López argues that “changing gender roles are being fashioned and reshaped in a transnational space” (p. 178) and
that women, reflecting on the experiences of their mothers, increasingly view education as a means to sidestep burdens placed on them as females.

The final three chapters analyze Dominican transnational experiences through literary criticism and ethnomusicology. Janira Bonilla tackles issues of assimilation and identity formation represented in Julia Alvarez’s *How the García Girls Lost Their Accents* and Junot Díaz’s *Drown*. Both texts recount the transmigrant’s disillusionment with life in America as the authors “question the construction of race, class, and gender both on the island and in the United States” (p. 201). Díaz looks unflinchingly at the daily struggles of economic exiles, while Alvarez’s “girls” bemoan the fact that their upper-class origins and European lineage have little value in their new home. In her essay, Sintia E. Molina argues that Dominican and Dominican-American writers are “in the process of constructing their historical memory and permanently inscribing it in New York City through literature” (p. 241). These works express the often harsh realities of life in America as perceived and experienced by their authors. In Chapter 11, Thomas van Buren and Leonardo Iván Domínguez provide a rich overview of Dominican musical life in New York City from the 1920s onward and explain the significance of popular religion, folklore, and contemporary musical fusions as transnational expressions. These chapters contribute to the “multidisciplinarity” of this volume by deviating from the sociological perspectives of earlier essays.

*Dominican Migration* poses salient questions about how and why Dominicans migrate while examining the multiple impacts these population flows have on sending and receiving societies. As a multidisciplinary study, it pushes the discourse of transnationalism beyond socioeconomic analysis. Ultimately, this book strengthens transnationalism as a conceptual framework through which we can better understand Dominican diasporic experiences and those of transmigrant communities at large.
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News is not only transmitted through choice of topic. The layout, use of graphics, type and length of articles, and ordering of information within the article, as well as the particular sources cited, all communicate significant information to the reader. However, when specific linguistic practices or superstructures of news-making are being analyzed, it is important to note the twin processes of selection and combination that precede writing. Before a word hits the page, journalists and editors not only select what readers get to read, but also by combining the information that they do include in a certain manner, they influence how it is to be interpreted. Therefore, what gets left out of the story, that is, information considered either irrelevant to the narrative or not important enough to print, may also provide interesting insights into how the story is being told or “constructed” by a news outlet (Henry & Tator 2002).

When reporters and columnists want to favor a particular point of view in an article or news story, they can do so by quoting a source that reflects this viewpoint while legitimately claiming that they are merely reporting a factual account of what has been said. The use of official police or other authoritative sources rather than leaders and members of the targeted community as legitimate is a common practice used to marginalize these communities. Along with pointing out the functions of sources and quotations in news analysis, it is important to identify exactly who it is that is acting as the source of information in the news.

In Images of West Indian Immigrations in Mass Media, Christine Du Bois examines the role of the media in constructing the “bad boy” image of West Indian immigrants living in the Chesapeake Bay region during the 1980s and 1990s. She also examines the preoccupation that West Indians have with “reputation” and “respectability” and explores how this influences the communities’ response to certain negative portrayals of West Indians in the mass media. By analyzing newspaper, magazine, television, and cinematic treatments of Afro-Caribbean peoples, Du Bois is able to show how the media consistently finds what it is looking for, rather than uncovering what is there to be understood about West Indian people.
The book is divided into seven well-written and researched chapters. Chapters 1 and 2 outline the research methods and examine the preoccupation that West Indians have with “respectability.” Chapter 3 highlights the stereotypes that are reproduced consistently in the stories that are covered in the news. Chapter 4 sketches some of the ways Chesapeake area advertisements have portrayed West Indians. Chapter 5 analyzes West Indian characters in television entertainment with particular emphasis on Hollywood films. Chapter 6 explores the variety of efforts that Chesapeake area West Indians have made to improve their ethnic reputations. Finally, Chapter 7 examines the dilemmas of reputation for West Indians.

Du Bois conducted the research for this book between 1992 and 1994 among immigrants from the Anglophone Caribbean, including Guyana, who lived in the Chesapeake Bay region. Using content analysis, participant observation, and in-depth interviews, she examines the way in which a small segment of violent criminals who come from the Caribbean are portrayed as if they represented the entire community. Her sample included fifty-four people of West Indian origin, mostly middle- and lower-middle-class and evenly divided along gender lines. Ten countries were represented, though a majority of the interviewees were from Trinidad and Jamaica. Du Bois also interviewed non-West Indians, including several law enforcement officers, social activists, teachers, reporters, employers of West Indians, and workers in the justice system. She supplemented her research by engaging in a wide variety of social activities, including a trip “home” to Jamaica with some informants.

Du Bois puts forth six reasons for a media bias in the United States against Jamaicans. She notes that (a) the intense market competition pushes some reporters and news editors towards sensationalism; (b) there is a prejudice in the production of images which stretches back to the negative stereotypes that are associated with Blackness; (c) pack journalism encourages reporters to cover a story in a certain way; (d) journalists and law enforcement officers have become partners in the production of images of the criminal; (e) reporters tend to appreciate sources who can do all the summarizing for them about a story; and (f) West Indian criminals strive to enhance their reputations by engaging in activities that leave no question about their hypermasculinity which, ironically, plays into stereotypes that cast them as “uncivilized” thugs.

Critical discourse analysis of language and text as presented in this book offers readers a good tool to deconstruct ideologies of the mass media and other elite groups, and to help identify and define social, economic, and historical power relations between dominant and subordinate groups. The book is particularly important at this juncture because it takes an ethnographic and quasi-quantitative research approach to the intersection of several broad trends of the last century: global immigration, the spread of the mass media, and the stubborn vicious problems of ethnic and ideological hatreds.

This highly readable book makes an important contribution to Caribbean
and migration studies, particularly with respect to the image of the “outsider” in North America. It nicely documents the experiences of many Caribbean people living in the transnational diaspora and would be appropriate for undergraduate or graduate courses on Caribbean or migration studies, race and ethnic relations, or critical mass media. Undergraduate students in particular will find Du Bois’s writing style accessible and easy to replicate using resources like Lexis-Nexis, a database freely available in virtually every university library. The book will be an eye-opener for any undergraduate in the United States who likes to believe that the ugliness of systemic and institutional discrimination is something that happens only in other parts of the world.

With increasing migrations around the world, the proliferation of the global mass media sources, and growing fear of “dark” migrants among “host” populations, minority populations worldwide will continue to be vulnerable to media misrepresentations of them. The forms the problems take will depend on who owns, creates, and regulates media products, which differ from country to country, as well as on the ways media consumers use, interpret, and react to media products, which differs among cultures. This makes Du Bois’s new book a valuable addition to the study of assimilation and acculturation in the international diaspora.
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This book is a welcome addition to the literature on voter turnout, particularly in Puerto Rico where empirical studies have been few and far between. It
addresses the question of why, given the similarities between formal political institutions in the United States and Puerto Rico, elections in Puerto Rico tend to have a much higher voter turnout. This question is interesting given that many of the formal institutions governing elections in Puerto Rico would seem to point to lower levels of turnout. In addition, as Cámara Fuertes points out, Puerto Rico also has many of the demographic characteristics that have traditionally correlated with low voter turnout in the United States: a high percentage of young voters, low levels of education, and low income levels.

The book begins by looking at Puerto Rican voting behavior from a comparative perspective. Although Puerto Rico is initially compared with European and Latin American countries, the main reference for comparison throughout the book is the United States. This strategy is useful and makes for a quasi-experimental research design that Cámara Fuertes uses quite effectively to pinpoint the variables with the most explanatory power in the Puerto Rican case. He argues that we need to look at three factors: mobilization, political parties, and culture.

In Puerto Rico, unlike the United States, political parties direct their mobilization efforts toward all sectors of the population, regardless of socioeconomic class and age. And while most political party mobilization in the United States is targeted toward the older population, the opposite is true in Puerto Rico. The implication of this is obvious. In both cases, the young have lower participation rates than older citizens. However, in Puerto Rico the difference is much smaller than in the United States. Studies have shown that one of the main factors to influence the likelihood of voting is contact, that is, those who are personally contacted have much higher turnout rates than those who are not. Indeed, one possible explanation that has been advanced in the literature for the low turnout rates of Hispanics is the fact that political parties and other politically active groups tend to contact them considerably less than they do White, middle-class voters. Cámara Fuertes reports that while 32 percent of those sampled in Puerto Rico reported being contacted by political parties, only 24 percent of those in the United States did.

Clearly, Puerto Rican political parties are more effective at mobilizing voters than U.S. parties are. Cámara Fuertes traces the reason for this to the differing ideologies of the two party systems. While American political parties identify themselves along a left-right continuum, those in Puerto Rico are very similar in their orientations, having both accepted a similar welfare-state ideology which appeals mainly to the lower and middle classes (p. 103). Because this ideology aims at reducing economic inequalities and, therefore, threatens the wealth of the upper class, political parties have necessarily had to mobilize the lower classes. As Cámara Fuertes notes, the distribution of government funds is especially important to those with lower incomes and, thus, “through the distribution of such help they are mobilized into the political process” (p. 107).
The book’s argument regarding the third variable, culture, is somewhat less convincing. Cámará Fuertes writes that “the Island’s political culture is more alive and more conducive to electoral mobilization, while in the United States it appears to be more sober” (p. 115). He does not present much evidence to support this view, however, except for a few anecdotes from campaign workers. In addition, this explanation suffers from the weakness that besets many cultural explanations: is the “culture of the vote” the cause or the effect of high voter turnout? In other words, the high propensity to vote might not be due to culture at all but rather to factors such as the need for political parties to mobilize all sectors of the population. In addition, if high voter turnout is a cultural characteristic of Puerto Ricans, would they not take this with them when they migrate to the U.S. mainland? However, what we find is that compared to Cuban and Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans living in the United States have much lower voter turnout rates, even though they do not face the registration barriers that other groups have to cope with, such as proof of citizenship.

The implications of this study go beyond the particular case of Puerto Rico. From the findings it is evident that although institutions and the voters’ demographic characteristics may influence voter turnout, other factors are more important. The evidence from Puerto Rico suggests quite convincingly that the effects of demographic variables traditionally associated with lower voter turnout (lower age and socioeconomic class) can be overcome by increasing the efforts of political parties to mobilize these sectors of the population. It also suggests that the increased participation of lower-income voters encourages political parties to continue to advocate redistribution policies.

This book represents a valuable contribution to the study of voter turnout in general and will encourage an interesting debate on the subject. Because the argument is presented in a clear and concise manner, it should appeal to those who want to use it in undergraduate as well as graduate courses.

WILLIAM A. PETTIGREW
Lincoln College
University of Oxford
Oxford OX1 3DR, U.K.
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The 1807 statute abolishing the transatlantic slave trade reflected, perhaps for the first time in parliamentary history, the concerns of a general public committed to an ethic of disinterested benevolence. Philip Gould’s study of early antislavery literature recovers the sentiment that fueled the early abolitionists’ passion. Like several earlier studies of antislavery (most importantly those of David Brion Davis), Barbaric Traffic confronts the commercial and capitalistic interests inherent in the abolitionist crusade. Unlike earlier slave trade scholars, however, Gould illuminates the sentimental aspects of those interests. He describes how early abolitionists pre-empted their opponents’ accusations that antislavery was anticommercial by articulating how commerce could both reverse and advance human progress. He documents how antislavery writers judged commerce according to the cultural categories of civility. This enabled abolitionists to reconcile disapproval for slave trading with support for other commercial activities by stressing the primitive savagery of the slave trade to disassociate it from other civilizing forms of commerce. Gould develops this theme by showing how the brutal excesses of the trade in Africans provided evidence, for antislavery writers, of the consequences of unregulated capitalism. In this way, he outlines the protean meaning of free trade in the eighteenth century because the slave trade provided an example of a commerce that could not be free until it was regulated. According to Gould then, abolitionism began as a jeremiad against unregulated commerce.

Barbaric Traffic also describes some of the cultural determinants of racial and national identities in the Atlantic world at the turn of the nineteenth century. Gould’s expert analysis of well- and lesser-known antislavery poems (including those by Thomas Morris, Bryan Edwards, Ann Yearsley, James Montgomery, William Roscoe, and Hannah More) emphasizes the ideological elasticity of race and its relationship to an emerging culture of manners. Later in the book, Gould points to the captivity narratives of Americans held in North Africa during the same period to discuss some of the ethnic determinants of the national imaginings of the new United States. He also examines the early autobiographical literature of the Black Atlantic to highlight the inadequacy of
racial categories for this period. The book’s final chapter compares antislavery literature with contemporaneous discussions of disease to provide another example of the eighteenth-century North Atlantic mind trying to support a liberal capitalist ideology while appreciating the market’s pernicious potential.

As an assessment of the cultural topoi of early antislavery, *Barbaric Traffic* focuses less than other studies of abolitionism on the larger questions surrounding the causes of the ending of the transatlantic slave trade. This leads to some misplaced emphases within the narrative. For example, Gould overstates the secularizing impact of the “commercial jeremiad” on the evolution of abolitionist thought and undervalues the critical part played by religious revivalism in the mid-eighteenth century as a model for personal decision and commitment. As a challenging work of cultural and literary criticism, his book says far more about the late-eighteenth-century Anglophone Atlantic world of letters than it does about the slave trade, and he should be commended for his geographical and conceptual breadth. While his discussion brings fresh interpretations to a vast array of antislavery literature (including work by Jonathan Edwards, Thomas Clarkson, Joseph Priestly, John Newton, Noah Webster, Olaudah Equiano, and Malachy Postlethwayt), his discussion seems, in its presentation, overly subservient to the texts. He often quotes heavily, fails to order the extracts according to his argument, and includes long excerpts that repeat parts of the thesis introduced in previous chapters. As a result, *Barbaric Traffic* sometimes reads too much like an anthology of early antislavery literature. Gould also assumes rather too much about his readers by habitually surrounding contentious terms (such as justice, liberty, freedom, and many others) with quotation marks as a substitute for fully explaining their charged meaning. Gould records his texts’ historical context carefully enough for his work to be genuinely interdisciplinary. It is ironic, however, that he employs such a wide variety of the sophisticated tools of literary criticism on texts with far more historical significance than literary value. As a result, *Barbaric Traffic* will disappoint and sometimes frustrate historians poorly versed in, or resistant to, cultural studies.

Nevertheless, Gould’s contention that early antislavery writers attributed the brutality of the slave trade to its lack of regulation suggests the need for a re-examination of the early history of the British slave trade and the reasons why it developed with comparatively little state management from 1712. Unlike other accounts of early antislavery, Gould’s exposition outlines far more than the rhetorical strategies of the authors. *Barbaric Traffic* adds to our understanding of late-eighteenth-century attitudes to commerce, civility, and race. Because historians have known for some time that antislavery thought legitimized emerging liberal capitalism (a literature which this book summarizes beautifully), the principal value of Gould’s account lies in the nuanced appreciation he brings to the role of race and commerce in discussions of the slave trade. He argues convincingly that the mutually constitu-
tive relations of sentiment and capitalism forged racial and cultural boundaries. In the process, he reinvigorates early antislavery literature as a subject for discussion, not as a route to understanding the causative role it played in ending slavery but rather as a crucible in which nineteenth-century attitudes to race, manners, and commerce and their interrelationships were cast. This contribution will delight historians and literary critics alike.
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In Avengers of the New World, Laurent Dubois has crafted a nuanced yet highly readable narrative of the Haitian Revolution. Although largely a synthesis of the secondary literature written in the last twenty years, the book is strongly influenced by the classic work of Beaubrun Ardouin, Gabriel Debien, and C.L.R. James. Published in the bicentennial year of Haiti’s independence from France, Avengers locates the Haitian revolution as a seminal moment in the “Age of Revolutions” as well as in world history. The Haitian Revolution – the only successful slave revolt in the world – not only challenged the stability and logic of slave societies throughout the Americas, but also revealed and then expanded the limits of republican universalism. For, as Dubois notes, “if we live in a world in which democracy is meant to exclude no one, it is in no small part because of the actions of those slaves in Saint-Domingue who insisted that human rights were theirs too” (p. 3).

The chapters are arranged chronologically, the first three addressing pre-revolutionary colonial tensions. Chapter 1 treats the colony’s early history, including European settlement, the extermination of the indigenous Tainos, the rapid intensification of the slave plantation system, and the evolution of White Creole animosity toward distant metropolitan authorities. Chapter 2 focuses on Saint Domingue’s enslaved population: their steadily increasing levels of importation; distinctions that Whites made between slaves of different African origins and locally born slaves; slaves’ tasks on plantations;
and forms of slave resistance. Chapter 3 traces the growth of racist discourse and practice in the colony throughout the eighteenth century. With the onset of the French Revolution, free men of color in the colony struggled – sometimes violently – with colonial Whites over who deserved citizenship. Many Whites feared that, after enfranchising some free men of color in 1791, the National Assembly would abolish slavery altogether.

As Dubois demonstrates, however, slaves in the north did not wait for such a decree. The fourth chapter details the August 1791 slave revolt, examining the slaves’ organization, motivations, and tactics. Rebels consecrated the revolt beforehand by perhaps two Vodou ceremonies, and once the revolt began, Kongo-lese-born veterans of civil wars brought valuable fighting experience. They often claimed allegiance to the king of France as their protector while invoking the language of republicanism. The revolution was indeed a “uniquely transcultural movement” (p. 5).

Chapters 5, 6, and 7 take up the early years of the revolution, from the spread of revolt in the north in 1791 to the French Republic’s emancipation declaration in 1794. As the insurgency spread, and as the French Revolution grew more radical, French commissioners offered freedom and citizenship to slaves who would join the French forces in fighting the Republic’s new enemies, Spain and England. Still, one rebel leader, Toussaint Louverture, appears to have waited to join the French until the National Convention formally abolished slavery in February 1794.

Chapters 8-11 detail Louverture’s subsequent rise to power from a French general to the colony’s self-proclaimed “Governor for Life.” As Dubois explains, Louverture balanced the need to rebuild the plantation system with a desire to preserve freedom, finally militarizing plantation labor and enshrining widely resented labor obligations in a new constitution for the colony. Sadly, while “committed to defending liberty at all costs, Louverture had turned himself into a dictator” (p. 250).

Finally, Chapters 12 and 13 relate Napoleon’s failed attempt to regain control over the colony and reimpose slavery. After Louverture’s capture, insurgent armies led by Dessalines rallied against Napoleon’s troops in what they rightly understood as a war of independence to preserve freedom. Once victorious, Dessalines and his officers chose to rename the former colony “Haiti,” a name attributed by the Tainos. Dubois argues that the new name marked more than a break from the past. Rather, Dessalines’s use of this and other indigenous imagery indicated the monumental significance of the revolution as an event that “avenged” the new world: “Haiti was to be the negation not only of French colonialism, but of the whole history of European empire in the Americas” (p. 299).

Though he focuses on the most famous revolutionary figures, Dubois also highlights some lesser-known individuals of the period. The voices and stories of these people are peppered throughout the book, forming compel-
ling threads that enhance the larger political and military narrative and bring to life the everyday struggles of colonial inhabitants. Thus, in Chapter 2, we learn about the complex relationships among slaves, hired plantation managers, and plantation owners from letters written by the enslaved slave driver Philipeau. In letters to his absentee master, Philipeau boldly yet unsuccessfully complained about the manager’s mistreatment of slaves and poor business decisions. Madame de Mauger, Philipeau’s owner, dismissed his concerns (pp. 36-39). However, in Chapter 6 we learn that slaves on Mauger’s multiple plantations, emboldened by the spreading revolt, ousted and replaced their abusive managers (pp. 132-34). As this anecdote illustrates, the revolution had altered the balance of power, allowing slaves to respond collectively to their mistreatment by taking control of the plantations. Still, the Mauger slaves continued to work the land; like slaves elsewhere in the colony, rather than destroy the plantations, “they began to make them their own” (p. 134). By 1802, Philipeau had left the plantation with his family to work his own land, which he had purchased sometime after emancipation (pp. 278-79). Dubois’s inclusion of stories like Philipeau’s both humanizes the account and vividly reminds readers of the varied forms of resistance undertaken by slaves, some of whom only gradually dared to challenge the slave system.

Avengers of the New World is a welcome addition to the growing literature on the revolutionary Atlantic World. Readers new to the Haitian Revolution will especially benefit from Dubois’s lucid explanation of an enormously complex period.


ASHLI WHITE
Department of History
State University of New York, Stony Brook
Stony Brook NY 11794-4348, U.S.A.
<aswhite@notes.cc.sunysb.edu>

Sibylle Fischer’s Modernity Disavowed adds to a recent and long overdue trend that places Saint-Domingue at the center of the Age of Atlantic Revolutions. It helps to correct the denigrating views of the Haitian Revolution that have characterized narratives – at least outside of Haiti – for so many years. But
this work stands out because of the author’s approach: in a field dominated by historians, Fischer turns to literary criticism. Consequently, she brings novel theoretical and methodological tools to bear on interpretations of this seminal event and its aftermath, and the outcome is a provocative study that calls into question fundamental assumptions about this period.

Fischer contends that the Haitian Revolution is crucial for understanding the limitations of key concepts of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, namely modernity and its political manifestation, the nation-state. She traces how, in reaction to the foundation of the first free and racially equal republic, radical antislavery ideology was deliberately excised from visions of what constituted a modern nation. Whereas the Haitian Revolution politicized the issue of racial subordination, other countries and colonies – in Europe and the Americas – consigned slavery to the realm of moral and social action. In this way, the radicalism of Haiti was defused, and its ideals were erased from “canonical” modernity (p. 33). The act had repercussions throughout the Atlantic world, as this strain of modernity concealed the promise of radical antislavery ideology for other nations and colonies.

The process of de-politicizing Haiti is the “disavowal” of modernity, and the term works in two senses in Fischer’s analysis. In the first, “disavowal” means simply denial, while the second has psychoanalytic specificity, referring to the refusal to acknowledge something traumatic. Although Fischer admits that not every case requires the psychoanalytic interpretation of “disavowal,” she employs the notion of the Haitian Revolution as trauma – not to locate its victims (which for her seems an analytical dead end), but rather to grasp the politics behind coping with the Revolution’s shocking implications. She argues that “disavowal” is a tactic used in certain circumstances, and she seeks to uncover the who, what, and why of each instance when it comes into play.

In her inquiry Fischer focuses on three geographical sites: Cuba, Santo Domingo/the Dominican Republic, and finally Haiti itself. The broad scope reflects the transnational character of radical antislavery or, as she puts it, the fact that “heterogeneity is a congenital condition of modernity, and that the alleged purity of European modernity is an a posteriori theorization or perhaps even part of a strategy that aims to establish European primacy” (p. 22). So in order to discover what was sacrificed to the Eurocentric version of modernity, Fischer must contest its standards at every opportunity.

This impulse applies to sources and subjects as well. Finding moments of disavowal, given the nature of the archives, is no easy task, and Fischer draws on a variety of evidence, ranging from the traditional works of her discipline, such as poems, novels, and plays, to more unusual texts, including trial records, constitutions, songs, and wall paintings. Through close readings of these sources, she pinpoints the occasions when radical antislavery surfaced (albeit obliquely) and was rebuffed. Among elites in Cuba and Santo Domingo/the Dominican Republic, Haiti represented what had to be shunned
in these colonies’ bids for nationhood. The results were Creole nationalisms that adopted metropolitan criteria more often than those of their nearby Caribbean neighbor. As Fischer shows, even Haiti struggled with radical antislavery as it tried to put its principles into practice. The transition was plagued by powers hostile to the Haitian experiment, yet internal pressures also pushed Haiti to shy away from the transnational aspect of antislavery. In fact, Haiti’s leaders could not escape the nation-state model when they created their government.

With these examples Fischer wants to challenge the notion that the form and content of modernity – as codified in the early nineteenth century and persisting through the twentieth – has the capacity to resolve the problems (for instance, racial inequality) that still plague us today. This is a powerful message that deserves to be heard and discussed. However, at times, her prose obfuscates the point rather than elucidates it. The work assumes that readers know a great deal about Haiti, its revolution, and the era generally, and this supposition is perhaps best reflected in the organization of the book. Although the Haitian texts come chronologically first, sometimes several decades before those from Cuba and Santo Domingo/the Dominican Republic, they are considered in the book’s final section. Fischer states somewhat opaquely that the sequence “was a matter neither of choice nor of coincidence” and contends that the “customary procedure” of following a more structural narrative would compromise her argument (p. 273). But ultimately, the rarefied organization makes it difficult for the average, informed reader to follow her line of reasoning. As a result, she creates the potential for promulgating the very silences she tries to reveal. Modernity Disavowed, even as it seeks to bridge gaps among academic fields and audiences, could end up speaking only to specialists and reinforcing the insularity of the ivory tower and the atomization of its disciplines – which, one could argue, are products of the modernity that Fischer wants to overturn.
The title of this book provokes immediate head-scratching. How can so vast a theme, stretching over such a huge chronology (from early exploration to modern postcolonial days), and ebbing back and forth through such massive political change, be brought together into a meaningful whole? Perhaps the most remarkable feature of this volume is that the editors manage to pull it off.

The original five volumes of the new Oxford series attracted some strong publicity, and some hostile reviews. Given the vast subject matter, and given the large number of historians involved, it was bound to be uneven. And, because the focus was the British Empire, some critics came well-armed with an array of anti-imperial criticisms. Today, seven years after the first volume was published, it seems hard to see what all the fuss was about. The series has settled down to become a standard set of essays which offer range, originality, and in places provocative rethinking of major historical issues. I regularly use three of the five volumes, and never come away from them less than satisfied. I had my own initial doubts: given the remarkable outpouring of scholarship on all fronts, do we, today, need reference books in the old mold? But my doubts have been removed because this enterprise is not in the old mold.

It was also clear that the bountiful material in the five volumes could be presented in any number of ways, and that some of the earlier essays pointed toward bigger themes which could not be handled in the initial format. The fact that the early volumes have spawned further, intellectually compelling volumes is a sign of the success of the original enterprise. Of the thirteen essays here, five appeared in the original volumes, though they have been revised. But this book, and the original volumes they emerged from, also reflect a transformation in the publisher.

The dowdy old spinster that once was the O.U.P. has clearly decided to smarten up her appearance and catch the eye. In this splendid volume she does more than that. The Black Experience is a volume which will be of primary importance for a wide range of historians, and not simply those interested in the historical experience of people of African descent. This is a volume that speaks to some of the major historical forces of the past three centuries. Inevitably, given the subject, its range is vast and the essays might not have
cohered easily. But in the lead editor, Philip Morgan, the publisher found a historian whose intellectual grasp and clear editorial steer is able to provide the critical intellectual and historical foundations to the whole. The editors’ introduction is a model of clarity and precision, making sense of the mass of detail that follows and arguing for the coherence of the collection. It was clearly not an easy task, but they have carried it off with persuasive aplomb.

On the whole, the subjects on offer speak for themselves – slavery, free labor, the Caribbean, cultural impacts between Africans and outsiders. Others are less obvious and sometimes more interesting for that. Frederick Cooper’s exploration of African workers in the “imperial design” is a powerful and revealing essay of great sweep and thoughtfulness. Appiah’s chapter, which is hard to place, is at once less substantial and more thought-provoking than most others in the volume. It is a curiosity of the collection that the essays that seem less empirical, more theoretical, and in some cases speculative belong to more recent years. Scholarship on the twentieth century, oddly, relies less on detailed empirical research than does scholarship on the earlier periods. Yet this also raises another great attraction of the collection. The essays vary greatly in their very nature, from the demographic to the cultural, from the literary to the economic. This is surely how it should be when trying to create a rounded study of the complex and changing relationships between Africa and the British, between empire and the postcolonial world.

Not everyone will be happy with what they find here – or with what they fail to find here. Yet it is hard to see how, given the constraints of space and authors’ interests, a better volume could have emerged. Each chapter has something new to say on important issues, and though they may be uneven, one from another, they manage to cohere into an important and intellectually satisfying whole. Morgan and Hawkins have managed a demanding task with great editorial skill. The end result is an important volume which embraces the best of historical originality and intellectual vigor.
This book is a historical account of the odyssey of Jamaican men who enlisted for military service in British regiments during World War I. Though largely historical in its approach, it provides useful sociological insights into the nature of racism and discrimination experienced by these men. It also explores the colonial efforts to undermine a sense of Black manhood and to devalue military valor, which has long served to affirm certain aspects of masculinity. In addition, it assesses the angst associated with the above challenges and tracks how such frustrations were managed.

The book opens with an account of a wage dispute that led to rioting at Frome’s sugar estate in 1938. Smith immediately connects this incident to the involvement of a member of the British West Indies Regiment, St. William Grant. The point here was to ascertain how the experiences of men such as Grant radicalized them, how they handled their discontent throughout the Empire and how such frustrations heightened nationalist sentiments. In spite of the reservations of the Colonial and War Offices regarding the recruitment of Black soldiers, it was the allegiance of these Jamaican volunteers to the notion of Empire that eventually led to the establishment of the British West Indies Regiment (BWIR) in 1915. Death and sacrifice in defense of the Crown and Empire pervaded the military and masculine imaginary of these colonial subjects.

In a very problematic formulation Smith argues that this affinity to values and ideals of Empire might have served to mitigate the quotidian experiences of racism and discrimination experienced by these volunteers (p. 40). Black soldiers were discriminated against in terms of housing, promotion, medical treatment, and wages. It would have been more fruitful if Smith, rather than accepting this position at face value, had interrogated some of its underlying causes. Perhaps then he might have better appreciated how such blind loyalty reflected the contradictions associated with a thorough internalization of global White supremacy. Smith could have provided more expatiation of the colonized mind here. Such an exposition becomes more critical in light of his reference to the resolution of the declaration of fealty to King and Empire by Marcus Garvey’s Universal Negro Improvement Association (p. 43).
According to Smith, “Many white military men believed black soldiers lacked sufficient self-discipline and rationality to be an effective force on the modern battlefield” (p. 61). Added to this attitude of contempt was the tendency to infantilize Black soldiers. In the end, Black Jamaican men were given the limited options of volunteering and being subjected to official obstruction and discrimination, or being regarded as cowardly and less worthy to be called men (p. 74). These volunteers were often deployed as labor battalions. Despite these challenges, the BWIR became an important part of the war effort on the Western Front and later in Italy, in the process eliciting the pride and admiration of Jamaicans who envisioned themselves as making their mark globally. Indeed, when these BWIR soldiers were deployed on the front line “they performed as well as other units in the British army” (p. 89).

Though Smith is not always maximally attentive to the complexity of male subjectivity in the text, he reserves his best insights in this regard for Chapter 5, “‘Their Splendid Physical Proportions’: The Black Soldier in the White Imagination.” He notes for instance that Blackness signified unrestrained expressions of sexuality and emotions, while Whiteness represented emotional and sexual repression, qualities presumably more appropriate to warfare and military discipline (p. 101). Upon the arrival of the West Indian contingents, attention soon focused on their physical form, which tended to objectify them. Not surprisingly, there were expressions of concern about the sexual desires of Black men for White women, which were expressed in terms of threats to imperial order and calls for segregation of the races to deal with unrestrained Black sexuality and what was described as the “Black peril,” that is, the weakness of Black men for White women (p. 114). In this regard, White women were chastised for “ignoring the boundaries of Empire” (p. 114). In this context of hostility, volunteers were at times detained in France after being falsely diagnosed as lunatics.

In addition to their experiences, these BWIR soldiers were politicized by the discourse of pan-Africanism articulated by Claude McKay and later more powerfully by Marcus Garvey. They remained convinced that their military service deserved more than a “return to irregular employment” (p. 152). Finally, Smith notes that for veterans who remained in Jamaica, “land acquisition, a symbol of black independence since slavery, became the central demand” (p. 154).

*Jamaican Volunteers in the First World War* is a useful contribution to the literature on Caribbean men who volunteered to serve in the British regiments and who experienced humiliating racism. Though Smith’s work deals exclusively with the travails of Jamaican men, he does not fully engage, conceptually, the phenomenon of masculinity. There is an undertheorization of gender, and more specifically of masculinity, in this book. In addition, the relationship between military service and the counterdiscourse on decolonization in Jamaica remains largely underdeveloped. These points notwithstanding, Smith’s work is a compact and useful contribution to a subject that has long been neglected in the academic literature of the Caribbean.
This outstanding book by Muriel McAvoy recounts the business dealings of Manuel Rionda, one of the most significant entrepreneurs in the Cuban sugar industry during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. It is based principally on her exhaustive study of the personal papers and business records of Manuel Rionda, on deposit at the University of Florida library in Gainesville. The collection, donated by the descendants of Higinio Fanjul (Rionda’s nephew), is an extremely rich source of materials for historians with an interest in the sugar industry and Cuba.

Rionda, born in Spain in 1854, followed his brothers to Cuba, but ended up spending most of his time on Wall Street. He founded Czarnikow-Rionda, the leading New York sugar brokerage of the early twentieth century, which marketed the output of many Cuban sugar mills to refiners in the United States and around the world. His brothers died relatively young, and Manuel became the senior member of an extended family, and deeply concerned with placing his nephews in prominent positions in the sugar industry in New York and Cuba. With family members, he built sugar mills and organized the Cuban Trading Company in Havana, which did a sizeable import business.

A striking aspect of the family history, which McAvoy skillfully portrays, is its transnational character. In many ways the family and its enterprises provided bridges between capitalists in the United States and Cuba – as sugar brokers, as suppliers of machinery and equipment, and particularly before 1910 by financing the sugar crop of their mill-owner clients. As the scale of sugar production expanded, the corporate form spread to more Cuban mills, and foreign banks became increasingly important participants in Cuba’s sugar industry. Through Rionda’s story, McAvoy demonstrates the opportunities and difficulties that this development meant for Cuban sugar-mill owners. The bankers found useful partners in Rionda and his clan because of their industry, expertise, and political connections in Cuba. Rionda, in turn, was able to realize his dream through the foundation of a “mega” sugar company in 1915, the Cuba Cane Sugar Corporation, which owned over ten mills and accounted for a sizeable portion of the island’s production. Rionda
was the first president of Cuba Cane, and remained a significant stockholder even after resigning the office. Readers are treated to Rionda’s version of the boardroom intrigue and corporate infighting surrounding Cuba Cane.

As much anguish as the bankers might have caused him, it probably paled in comparison with the actions of the Cuban and U.S. governments. Rionda played a prominent role in Cuban-U.S. sugar relations during World War I and its immediate aftermath, culminating in the collapse of 1921. Then, from 1926 to 1928 the Cuban government restricted production and allocated quotas to individual sugar mills, in the hope that by restricting output Cuba would help to support the price of sugar. This policy was continued under the International Sugar Agreement of 1931. The U.S. adoption of a higher sugar tariff in 1930, followed by the Jones-Costigan sugar quota system in 1934, were regulatory measures with momentous consequences for Rionda’s business and the Cuban economy more broadly. Through the correspondence of Rionda, McAvoy is able to illustrate the intersection between business and politics in both countries.

The depression put Rionda’s businesses through the proverbial wringer. He and his clan emerged prosperous, although not in the dominant position they had held earlier. Manuel Rionda breathed the rare air of high politics and high society in New York and Havana. McAvoy’s excellent work provides a fascinating portrait of a dynamic entrepreneur whose experiences illuminate the evolving international sugar industry and Cuban-U.S. economic relations before the Revolution.


PEDRO PÉREZ SARDUY
137 Mount View Road
London N4 4JH, U.K.
<sarduy@blueyonder.co.uk>

That Cuba should have become a preferred tourist destination of the early twenty-first century is not, I believe, because it’s the largest of the Caribbean islands, nor because of the exhuberance of its nature, or its genuinely hospitable people, lethal cocktails, famous cigars, its food, or its eclectic architecture. The dilemmas facing Cuba and the debates, both domestic and international, imbued with a boldness of contemporary thinking, have awakened in
people of different cultures and all ages a romanticism imbued with nostalgia for the known and unknown. Stereotypically, this was the musical phenomenon of Buena Vista Social Club, which served to heighten the island’s attraction, its human and musical mix. Few today would doubt that Cuba’s music and dance have played a vital part, and, as a book on the subject, *Cuba and Its Music: From the First Drums to the Mambo* is vital too.

*Cuba and Its Music* is an ambitious project whose repercussions in a different genre might be on a par with those of Buena Vista. Grounded in frequent trips to the island and an extensive bibliography, this book by Ned Sublette is a first for an English-reading public: a didactic and accessible steer through part of Cuba’s turbulent history and its music, whose parameters embrace cultural anthropology, sociology, politics, and history, as well as musicology and music.

Not that long ago I met up with an old friend, Rembert Egües, a Cuban pianist and composer living in Paris, son of Richard Egües, the famous flute player, composer, arranger, and founder of the memorable Aragón Orchestra. I said I was reading a book that was like a history of Cuban music written for non-Cuban readers. Rembert was at the time showing me some of his compositions and, not familiar with the book, his rejoinder was that the history of Cuban music was yet to be written. He challenged me to answer how many knew about the work of “Peruchin,” one of the greatest Cuban pianists of all time. What Rembert was trying to say was that justice hadn’t been done to Pedro “Peruchin” Justiz – whom, not by chance, Sublette mentions several times in his book.

While not purporting to be *the* book on the history of Cuban music, this is, at the very least, the most serious in its approach. Ned Sublette, himself musicologist and musician, has delved deep and unearthed the great Cuban musicians forgotten by most Cubans as well as non-Cubans – or those on the verge of being forgotten, like “Peruchin.”

The torrent of chronological detail, scores, anecdotes, and often little-known, succulent gossip doesn’t detract from its being easy to read. Not many authors achieve what Ned Sublette has in writing this book. While his first visit to the island was not until the early 1990s, he has known how to blend academic documentation and oral research with respect and authenticity. To paraphrase novelist Gabriel García Márquez, it might be said that Cuba’s musical history is not how it was lived by the musicians and their fans but how it has been remembered and told. As Cuban musicologist Helio Orovio confirmed to me in the gardens of the National Union of Artists and Writers in Havana, sipping a glass of rum on the rocks, “Ned is a serious researcher.” This, coming from Orovio, not given to dispense praise, was high recognition.

I had three uncles, my mother Marta’s brothers, who were self-taught musicians – only one still alive today. The elder was Ramón Sarduy, who was a master of improvisation on the guitar and loved *boleros*. Then there
was Miguel, who was inseparable from his patched-up guitar and played as well as sang every kind of music. They called him Categua. The youngest was great on the tumba (conga drum), long before it was allowed into the academy, and known as Tito Tumba in our hometown Santa Clara and surrounding towns of what was then Las Villas province.

When I was an adolescent and bent on study, Tito and Miguel did all they could to teach me to play the tumba or sing those 1950s boleros that working-class bohemians, sober or drunk, sang with their souls. I did learn some of the really kitsch lines to come out of phonographs of those times, like the song Y en las Tinieblas (And in the Darkness) by Alfredo Gil, made popular in the late 1950s by José Tejedor and the inseparable Luis Oviedo: “you left me in the darkness of the night ... and you left me losing my way.”

But when it came to dancing, from an early age I was out on the dance floor at parties wherever I could. How could I forget the famous matinee dances of the Las Villas societies for people of color of those days? I danced to Beny More (I write it Cuban-style with one “n”). The most memorable was back in 1951 at the dance hall in Caibarién, on a hill overlooking the pretty coastal town. I danced to Aragón at Santa Clara’s Bella Unión Society – my parents were members, which gave me rights as their son. That was the club for Blacks, while mulattos had their club El Gran Maceo, named after Cuba’s famous nineteenth-century Liberation Army general. I danced at the societies in Quemado de Güines, Ranchuelo, Esperanza, Placetas, Remedios ....

And so, after meticulously enjoying all 600 pages of Cuba and its Music, subtitled From the First Drums to the Mambo, I recommend this book with immense pleasure. Ned Sublette knows what he is saying and how to say it, to the beat of the drum, ratifying the African in Cuban music, on and off the island. I, for one, await that second volume Ned confessed is in the making, perhaps to be subtitled “from cha-cha-cha to timba,” or hip-hop a lo cubano, as performed by the group Orishas.
In the postnationalist anthology *Puerto Rican Jam* (1997), Frances Negrón-Muntaner asked why the majority of Puerto Ricans have historically favored a closer relationship with the United States in spite of fundamental injustices in the arrangement. Neither free nor equal in the U.S. political system, the island remains in perpetual limbo, a “shameful” situation for diehard nationalists and statehood-ers alike. Moreover, against the backdrop of the Iraq war, the island grapples anew with what it means to be “culturally autonomous” but vulnerable to U.S. military conscription without voting representation in the U.S. Congress.

In *Boricua Pop*, Negrón-Muntaner does not so much answer the question as interrogate the lack of a broad consensus toward national independence, a position that she provocatively states as “queer” (p. 13) – out of the norm, a political oddity that does not conform to the norms of national status, cultural identity, or the linear narratives of progress from colony to nation-state. Her premise is that any study of Puerto Rican popular culture must address the idiosyncrasies of this political context. Colonialism, as large-scale social domination, is bound to be fundamentally humiliating and shameful for its subjects. She boldly asserts, however, that Puerto Ricans have largely wallowed in this shame in myriad ways, not all of them for material ends, much to the dismay of nationalist leaders who exhort the public to “wake up!”... *despierta boricua!* She describes a form of Stockholm Syndrome on a massive scale – a case of the captive (coded feminine) falling in love with the captor (coded masculine). In this view, the name of Puerto Rico itself is written upon a legacy of shameful colonial behavior, imposed on the pre-conquest homeland that Taino-Arawaks called Borikén.

Part I presents key narratives that shape public perceptions of island identity, including the 1961 film *West Side Story*, and the 1983 *Seva* hoax – a short story about the lone survivor of a Yankee massacre of a town of Boricua rebels that was taken as fact by many readers of the *Claridad* weekly newspaper where it first appeared – which was fueled by the shame nationalists confront over the lack of military struggle against U.S. imperialism.
following the 1898 Guánica invasion. Latin Leftists came to see Puerto Rico as a queerly docile colonial “mistress” while Cuba became vigorously and stubbornly independent, leading developing nations in health care, medicine, adult education, athletics, and anti-imperial bellicosity.

Part II shows Puerto Ricans going beyond actively feeding U.S. national and foreign policy aims and subtly spearheading the Latinization of American culture, directly under the stuffy nose of Anglo hegemony. This influence on American culture is pervasive, but also largely invisible, often because of American bipolar racial categories that tend to erase Puerto Rican ethnonationality, as in the cases of Jean-Michel Basquiat and Harold Santiago Danhakl (aka “Holly Woodlawn” of the Warhol film Trash). This erasure helps American popstars like Madonna appropriate, with impunity, aspects of Puerto Rican aesthetics and cultural creativity, such as “vogue” dancing. Negrón-Muntaner, however, lets Madonna off the hook and glosses over how Puerto Ricans, such as the late Angel Segarra, aka “Angie Xtravaganza,” from the film Paris is Burning (Cunningham 1998), developed “vogue” from la figura, the ensemble of percussive gestures that constitute Afro-Puerto Rican bomba dancing.

In Part III, Negrón-Muntaner draws out contrasts between Boricua pop icons and real-life events that result in shame, humiliation, and exploitation for countless Puerto Ricans. She exposes how Boricua experience has been reduced to a litany of synecdoches: the forked tongue of Ferré, the curly locks of Puerto Rican Barbie, the sashay of J. Lo’s butt, and the wiggle of Ricky’s hips. All of it, “queer as folk,” she argues, producing highly visible, desirable, and consumable icons.

The book’s few shortcomings, besides the “vogue” oversight, include its heavy emphasis on the shame trope and its neglect of abundant scholarship on the ethnology of honor/shame dialectics (e.g., Péristiany 1966, Bourdieu 1977). It also does not substantiate the assertion about Boricuas’ perverse desire for colonial torment and thus downplays the effect of cold war tactics on suppressing the independence movement. Negrón-Muntaner, moreover, ignores issues of cultural creativity and decolonization altogether, apparently assuming a laissez-faire world of mindless consumers.

Nevertheless, Boricua Pop makes a quantum leap over previous studies of Puerto Rican identity. By starting, however tentatively, with an ethnology of shame informed by queer theory Negrón-Muntaner can explore the oddities of this crypto-colonial relationship without blinking. She disagrees (p. 26) with Quintero-Rivera’s position that Puerto Ricans have “nothing to be ashamed of,” arguing instead that under current conditions, colonial shame is endemic, immune to consciousness-raising, neither reducible to the individual, nor to an “inferiority complex” that can be psychologized and cured through progressive therapy. Shame is a byproduct of “conflict within asymmetrical power relations, not privatized pathologies” (p. xiii). Without the “shame of being
Puerto Rican, there would be no *boricua* identity, at least not as we know it” (p. xiii). Her salty description of the queerness of Puerto Rican ethnonational identity involves a heightened awareness of the sexualized, erotic dimensions of asymmetrical power relations, including violence – the paradox of people perpetuating the terms and conditions of their abuse and settling for less than what is possible. Flag-waving displays of pride are common to patriots across the political spectrum, but the flipside condition of collective self-doubt, the “*ay, bendito*” expression of mutual self-pity, is equally common. She also parts with Juan Flores and his barrio-centric response to colonial shame, showing less interest in down-home authenticity than in the doubleness of commodification from the standpoint of racialized minorities, in which questions of visibility and worthiness of consumption are burning issues, implying visceral “spit or swallow” value judgments about whether a person or a product of one’s labor may be tasteful and/or assimilable.

Having worked in the Puerto Rican community for most of the past twenty years, and performed (shaking a bon-bon and a tambourine) on stage with Ricky Martin, I can vouch for Negrón-Muntaner’s claims about the underlying pride/shame dialectic, as well as the abundance of odd pleasures to be found in the practices of Boricua pop. Overall, she has written a ground-breaking piece of work on the persistence of colonialism – irreverent, tragi-comical, and bittersweet. Though a delightful read, the book’s reliance on lit-crit jargon may make it too dense for most undergraduates. Highly motivated students and fellow researchers interested in the intersections between popular culture, queer theory, colonialism, and Caribbean mass media will find it most rewarding.
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In 1990 Gordon Rohlehr published Calypso & Society in Pre-Independence Trinidad, a wide-ranging exploration of the literary and social dimensions of calypso from the nineteenth century to 1962. Since then, calypso researchers have been questioning him about a sequel to this definitive work. In the preface to his new book, Rohlehr notes that the essays contained are “the beginnings of an answer to that question” (p. i). Though the essays have appeared in other publications, readers will find this book to be a very convenient collection and will be treated to the erudition and wit that are characteristic of Rohlehr’s several decades of writing on the wealth of verbal expression in the Caribbean.

In the book’s title essay, Rohlehr notes that by “scuffling” he means both the economic struggle of Caribbean peoples and the insular conflicts that have challenged attempts at regional political and cultural integration. This chapter gives particular attention to the perspectives of calypsonians and other writers on the promise and collapse of the Federation of the West Indies of 1958-1962. But scuffling runs through all the chapters in the sense of class, ethnic, gender, and artistic contestations in Trinidad, which calypsonians have, in various ways, chronicled, intensified, and criticized. Among the many topics discussed in the book are the administrations and cultural politics of Dr. Eric Williams, chief/prime minister of Trinidad and Tobago from 1956 to 1981; the role of calypsonians as prophets in a society believed to be in the process of deterioration; calypsonians’ constant demand for freedom of speech against all forms of suppression; constructions of masculinity, diverse dynamics of male-female interaction, and an escalation in violence against women; and the ongoing re-creation of calypso music over the past several decades in response to changing perceptions of social identities and commercial markets. A final essay is a meditation on Kitchener, the consummate calypso master who died in 2000, after more than sixty years of public performance.

Together, the essays highlight a number of themes in the development of calypso since Trinidad’s independence. Clearly, this has been a period of tremendous musical creativity. Rohlehr notes that calypso has always been an eclectic form that, in earlier years, easily borrowed from Latin American genres, jazz, vaudeville, and other traditions. Such hybridity became more pronounced in the 1970s with the development of soca. Though Lord Shorty’s
innovations with East Indian music and soul were crucial in this regard, Rohlehr emphasizes that soca was “diverse, multi-layered and many-ancestred” (p. 415). Shadow, Calypso Rose, Blue Boy, Penguin, and others also played key roles. Since the 1980s, chutney soca has become an important style, one that has reflected shifting African-Indian relations in Trinidad.

Another major trend has been the increasing number of female calypsonians, which, in turn, has sparked new debates about gender issues in calypso. Calypso Rose, for example, began performing in the 1960s and, by the 1970s, was a prominent figure who countered the chauvinism of the likes of Sparrow with assertions of female concerns and desires. During the 1970s, Singing Francine, Calypso Princess, and other female artists also established independent voices. In one essay, Rohlehr focuses on Singing Sandra’s “The Equalizer,” written for her in 1998 by Christophe Grant. In the context of a growing number of rapes and murders of women during the 1990s, the song offered violent reprisals as a solution. Rohlehr suggests that a sense of social chaos and a lack of confidence in the law have contributed to harsher forms of rhetoric and humor in calypso.

Widespread perceptions of social decline and catastrophe are, in fact, another salient theme in calypso in recent decades. Following the rise of Williams and the People’s National Movement in 1956, many calypsos by Sparrow and other calypsonians articulated public optimism about an independent Trinidad. Since the emergence of Chalkdust in the late 1960s, however, calypsonians as a whole have become increasingly skeptical about the nation’s political system. Rohlehr argues that they often serve as prophets who exhort the community and offer visions of hope. He asserts that David Rudder has become calypso’s “most articulate and intuitive prophet,” an artist who combines “transcendent optimism and pessimistic realism” (p. 358) in compositions such as “Another Day in Paradise” (1995).

Several major strengths of Rohlehr’s calypso scholarship are evident in these essays. First is his detailed knowledge of seemingly thousands of calypsos. He frequently demonstrates that calypsonians offer a wide range of opinion on any topic and that even a single singer’s oeuvre often includes various perspectives. Rather than rush to generalizations, Rohlehr always examines a variety of examples and counterexamples. Also notable is his deep understanding of diverse forms of verbal and musical expression. He often comments on calypso’s ongoing connections with oral traditions, such as kalinda songs, Orisha music, Spiritual Baptist hymns, and Carnival Jab Jab rhythms. At the same time, he discusses the poetics of calypsonians in relation to the work of such writers as Louise Bennett, Martin Carter, and Derek Walcott. A final strength of Rohlehr’s approach is his insightful analysis of the social and political contexts of specific calypsos. He carefully explains the relevant issues and players, and maintains a keen sense of the moral vision of calypsonians in their commitment to creating a more just society.
In the course of his career, Rohlehr has consistently written for and engaged a broad audience. Just as parts of *Calypso & Society* originally appeared in the journal *Tapia* and in radio programs during the 1970s, several articles in *A Scuffling of Islands* were first published in the *Trinidad and Tobago Review*. This latest collection of Rohlehr’s thoughts on calypso will be of great interest to scholars, students, and anyone who cares about art and politics in the Caribbean.
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This compact handbook is good for students who want to begin the arcane journey into Trinidadian Carnival music. I intend to use it the next time I teach “Music of the Caribbean.” It is packed with useful features: a CD with eighteen selections (some of which are brief excerpts) keyed to the text with rhythmic and/or melodic notations, illustrative lyrical transcriptions, photographs of performers and record album covers, and end matter (glossary, index, and an annotated list of resources for “reading,” “viewing,” or “listening,” most of which are readily available in print, on CD or DVD, or over the internet). The book is not extensively footnoted (probably the policy for the “Global Music Series,” which includes many similar studies of contemporary world music). This is appropriate for an introductory text but it makes it difficult to trace specific sources of information.

The author is a panman and professor of ethnomusicology and so the volume, while containing a sketch of the history of Carnival, is weighted
toward the current scene, especially the sound of the steel orchestra. Dudley relies partly on the vast Carnival scholarship to frame his study, but the real strength of this work is his continuing field experiences and his musical sensibility. For Dudley the words, the masquerades, the parties, and the parading all point toward the massive sound of the modern Carnival. The Carnival music that interests him most is calypso (e.g., lyrically oriented songs for contemplation performed in “tents” or arenas), “pan” (which is both the singular name of an instrument and the name for a group of such instruments, the steelband), and soca (party or “soul calypso”).

His approach is to understand Carnival music in terms of tradition, social identity, and performance context and function. Traditions are not static, but constantly changing. Social identities in Trinidad are affirmed and reinvented during Carnival performance. Carnival performance is understood by documenting the setting of the performance and its purpose. In Chapter 1, “Carnival and Society,” Dudley puts Trinidad’s Carnival in time and place. Chapter 2, “The Man of Words,” traces the development of reflective calypso (calypso in the “tents” for listening) and profiles five contemporary singers: the Mighty Sparrow (“Slinger Francisco,” usually considered the greatest calypsonian of all time), the Mighty Chalkdust (Hollis Liverpool, heir to Atilla the Hun and the greatest calypsonian-intellectual), Lord Kitchener (Alwyn Roberts, now deceased, the most “musical” calypsonian ever and author of many tunes favored for steelband performance), David Rudder (one of the few singers who makes a year-round income singing), and Singing Sandra (Sandra Des Vignes, who, along with Denise Plummer and Calypso Rose, is one of the most important female calypsonians in this male-dominated field). Chapter 3, “The Tent and the Road,” begins by making the contrast between calypso appropriate for the tents and the music that is played to move the masquerade bands through the streets, concentrating on the latter. Chapter 4, “The National Instrument,” focuses on the history and musicality of pan, and Chapter 5, “Steelband Repertoire,” illustrates the contexts in which pan is key. The final chapter, “Bacchanal Time,” briefly reviews contemporary Carnival musical styles (soca, rapso, raga soca, and chutney soca) and offers a conclusion.

Shannon Dudley clearly grasps an essential point of calypso and Carnival in this fine little book, and that is that through tradition the people of Trinidad – at least Carnival devotees – are continuously asserting and reformulating their individual and social identities by singing, playing, and acting out masquerades. I see certain folkways constantly asserting and reasserting themselves through time and through different media in Carnival over the years and over the decades. The dynamic of Caribbean culture is always there: the concerns of race and ethnicity, class, gender, and the issues of the day. As Ruth Benedict might have put it had she lived in today’s hi-tech world, Carnival is culture, played out on a giant screen, the making of the people’s blockbuster cinematographic extravaganza, a whole greater than the sum of its parts.
Before ending, there are two minor corrections I’d like to put on record. It is clear that Dudley used (on p. 24) a rendering of the lyrics to “Iron Duke in the Land” made by Dick Spotswood and me.\(^1\) Since then John Cowley (1996:194-95) has updated the lyrics with a better transcription:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{At my appearance upon the scene} \\
\text{Julian come down with blazing sword} \\
\text{And see him shouting the order} \\
\text{Calling, screaming to all agony} \\
\text{And see his magnetizing mantle} \\
\text{See its glinting, gleaming, and swaying} \\
\text{Jumping this way, bawling, “Clear de way, Whiterose joli”} \\
\text{Djab rere-o.}
\end{align*}
\]

It was a modern manifestation
Of that elder civilization
That in the Carnival celebration
Of the Social organization
Which causes the minds and extension
Of all the population
I Julian singing a Social recording
With White Rose Union
\textit{Sans humanité}

This correction is important. Julian Whiterose, one of the greatest chantwells (a singer who leads a masquerade band) of his day, understood that his legacy would be assured by making a record. On this record (recorded in Trinidad in 1914), he is telling us about his role in developing what turned out to be the origin of the modern masquerade band movement in the 1890s (especially pointed out in a verse not transcribed in Dudley). We need to do our best in transcribing these lyrics. The errors, like so many other errors one makes these days, become immortalized on the internet, and wherever calypso freaks google the information, they come up with the wrong transcription. You cannot completely get rid of cockroaches and you cannot entirely wipe out misinformation in a digital age. The truth is obliterated by the sheer volume of a replicated error. This is my small attempt to feed the corrected version into the digital whirlpool.

My second correction is also important, especially for historically minded scholars. On page 23 Dudley identifies the two foreign record companies active in Trinidad as Decca and Sony. (The era is not identified, but it was in the late 1930s.) Decca did record in Trinidad then (and they recorded calypsos in New York a few years earlier), but Sony did not. It would have been strange for Sony to own an American company in a British colony.

when Japan and the United States would soon be at war. RCA Victor, using its Bluebird label, recorded in Trinidad. Decades later Sony bought a more recent incarnation of RCA Victor. No doubt Dudley knows this, but the students who read this book should be taught a sense of history as they learn about Carnival music in Trinidad.

These criticisms are small considering the overall merit of this book.
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I don’t know whether to feel thankful or frustrated by this book. *La ronde des derniers maîtres* is an oral history of some of the elders (“les anciens”) of traditional Martinican music, especially the music of the north-east of the island, in the communities of Bezaudin and Pérou near the town of Sainte-Marie. There is still an important role in today’s world for oral history, particularly in a place like Martinique, where modernity arrived fast and carried away so much in its wake, and where traditional music has been heavily stigmatized. At the same time, most of the elders interviewed come across as crotchety old cusses, full of nostalgia for a bygone world. Nostalgia is a familiar theme in Martinique and is likely to appeal to the local intellectuals who read this book.

About half of the book presents the words of drummer Félix Casérus, now in his seventies, a member of a large family that has, like several others, given Martinique many singers, dancers, and percussionists over the past half-century. Monsieur Félix is a masterful musician indeed. He could, if he desired, tell us a great deal about his art. But time and time again, he
refuses – because we moderns are disrespectful, because he is sad. In fact there is a growing segment of young Martinicans who are interested in exploring their musical traditions, and who have created several grassroots organizations (associations) devoted to learning, maintaining, and spreading these arts. M. Félix dismisses most of these because they are changing the music. He opens up to this book’s author in part only because Terrine is related to one of Bezaudin’s great departed drummers, Galféte.

Not to pick on M. Félix. His sentiments are widespread among the rural elders with whom I have worked. Some of their suspicions are warranted. Terrine’s book recounts a few well-known incidents in which city folk have exploited country musicians. For example, rural artists reacted to the first commercial recording of their music, in 1958, by accusing the young people who made it of stealing their work. A chapter late in this book gives the man behind that recording project, Franck Hubert, the chance to tell his side of the story. (Terrine is obviously sympathetic with both sides.) Nonetheless, my feeling is that the elders’ suspiciousness and, in particular, their frequent reference to artistic “secrets” that they alone know and could share (but won’t), is due less to such incidents than to cultural capital. Most of them have not been to school, they have seen their art disrespected most of their lives, they have struggled to maintain it, sometimes they have been able to make a little money from it, and in their old age they are unwilling to see others (especially people outside their families) take custody of it. Superior aesthetic knowledge is the about the only thing they can lay claim to, and if they can cloak that knowledge in an aura of mystery, so much the better.¹ When M. Félix gets around to giving artistic criticism, as he does periodically throughout the book, the mystery vanishes and he is direct, lucid, and detailed.

Do not read this book for full descriptions of the Martinican musical traditions bèlè, danmyè, kalenda, or lalin klè. You will find some information on these, but nothing comprehensive. Occasionally there are minor errors in the elders’ accounts that a more ethnomusicologically minded editor might have corrected. Terrine’s purpose is rather to paint verbal portraits of some very interesting people. In addition to Félix Casérus and Franck Hubert, we hear from Vincent Chevignac, a koumandè or dance caller (a role that has since disappeared); Jean “Mico” Terrine, son of Galféte; Vava Grivalliers (now deceased), a superb dancer; Marie-Victoire Persani, another great dancer (how nice to find one woman, at least, represented in this book!); and D’Artagnan Laport père et fils, drummakers. This is by no means a complete picture of the world of Martinican musical tradition, but it is a start. Far too little writing on that world is generally available.

¹. For a fuller account of relationships between rural elders and urban music revivalists, see Gerstin 1998.
The recent history of Martinique’s musical traditions – the complex phenomenon of revitalization that has emerged over the past quarter-century – deserves a more complete, well-rounded hearing than this book gives it. Overall I am more impressed by how well elders and revivalists have worked together than by any tensions between them. But a mood of decline and loss in the face of modernity is a familiar theme in Martinique. This mood may well be the aspect of Les derniers maîtres that most resonates with local readers, whose response to the book could be as interesting as the book itself. I hope that this is not the case. Martinican traditional music deserves to be known (not least to Martinicans). But it deserves to be known in its fullness, as a living art, not only as something passing away with its eldest practitioners.
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Race in Mind is a succinct, clearly written critique of European and American authors who have argued, during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, for the inequality of races based on biological, evolutionary, and genetic principles. Alland begins his analysis of scientific racism in the United States with a series of excerpts from advertisements for slave auctions and a medical school solicitation to purchase slaves for use as specimens. Referring to these advertisements, he asserts that “one can well understand the development of the abolitionist movement” (p. 3). However, he cautions against assuming
that most abolitionists viewed Whites and Blacks as intellectually equal. He quotes a British biologist, reacting to abolition in the United States, who endorsed “the ultimate superiority of the whites” so that “whatever the position of stable equilibrium into which the laws of social gravitation may bring the negro, all responsibility for the result will henceforward lie between nature and him. The white man may wash his hands of it, and the Caucasian conscience be void of reproach for evermore” (p. 3). Alland links scientific racism to the justification of White privilege through a proclaimed belief in social mobility via merit that seeks to make all social inequity a matter of “nature.” He shows how attempts by scholars to demonstrate a genetic explanation for disparity between social groups employ the authority of science and their position as scholars to influence social and educational policies, viewing class status as a product of “social selection” (which is compared to natural selection) (p. 81). Alland often quotes contemporary praise and criticism within academic and popular publications, thus demonstrating the circulation of racist ideas among “a society in which too many are too ready to accept any biological argument concerning race and IQ providing that they fall into the superior group” (p. 136).

The introductory chapter is followed by an overview of theoretical premises behind studies of evolution and human variation as well as key terminology. Alland builds on this background in the third chapter by explaining why “race” is “a flawed category” for understanding human biological variation while continually stressing the importance of race as a sociological reality. He refers to Chapters 2 and 3 throughout the remainder of the book when demonstrating inappropriate applications of terms and concepts. Chapters 4 through 9 critique theories and data that have been employed to support arguments for a racial hierarchy. Chapter 4 shows how the theories published by Carlton Coon in the 1960s cannot be understood apart from his political and ideological perspective. “Coon stands as an example of a man whose interpretations of the then-available evidence for human evolution were driven by ... the notion that blacks are inferior to whites in intelligence [which] colored his interpretations of both fossil and living hominid forms and led him to speculations that were far from justified by the data” (p. 57).

Along with a brief history of the problematic development of intelligence testing, the “IQ argument” as developed by Arthur Jensen and Cyril Burt is more fully explored and dismantled in Chapter 5. Alland traces genealogies of ideas as he demonstrates problems within each study and the misapplication of flawed data in Jensen’s (and subsequent authors’) analyses. Robert Ardrey (a playwright and the only non-academic discussed) and Konrad Lorenz (the “father of ethology”) are the focus of Chapter 6, “Biological Determinism and Racism.” Both are well known outside academia, as Alland points out, and three of Ardrey’s publications were bestsellers. Lorenz and Ardrey, he writes, “attempt to explain differences among human cultural
groups on the basis of genetics” (p. 106) which are used to establish “notions of inferiority and the consequent necessity for racial purity” (p. 105). Chapter 7 discusses the theories of William Shockley (a physicist), Leonard Jeffries (a political scientist), and Michael Levin (a philosopher), with the first criticism being that these individuals are “amateurs, professors all.” Shockley “was a true believer in the IQ superiority of whites over blacks (and of Asians over whites)” (p. 121) – a viewpoint endorsed by Levin as well. In contrast, Jeffries argued for the superiority of Blacks in IQ, culture, and emotion (p. 122). The respective views of Levin and Jeffries are critiqued for content, but Alland also demonstrates how racism influenced public opinion on their views and the controversy surrounding Jeffries’s removal from his position as head of the Black Studies Department at City College, City University of New York. For Alland, all three men abused their positions to promote flawed and ill-informed arguments. Chapter 8 examines Richard Herrnstein and Charles Murray, concluding that their “key error” is “a replay of Jensen’s systematic misuse of heritability as a concept” (p. 149) and showing how they purposefully present their data in a manner that misleads readers in order to bolster their political position against social programs including affirmative action. Chapter 9 examines the studies of two psychologists, J.P. Rushton and H.J. Eysenck, the key tenets of sociobiology, and the countering arguments of cultural determinism. Alland extols the unique ability of a four-field anthropological approach as “the only social science capable of dealing in a professional way with racist arguments that reflect pseudoscientific reasoning and ‘research’” (p. 171). The book’s epilogue offers a series of discussions on racism encountered by Alland during fieldwork within and outside the United States.

Blackness Without Ethnicity incorporates Livio Sansone’s fieldwork over ten years in Brazil, primarily during the 1990s, to adroitly argue for a more complex analysis of the interactions between globalization, local race relations, and conceptions of race and ethnicity. Sansone contextualizes his work within the Black Atlantic, focusing on communities in the states of Bahia and Rio de Janeiro. The book is organized in an introduction, five chapters, and a conclusion.

Sansone offers a multifaceted analysis of race and ethnicity as dynamic and locally specific processes, proposing an alternative to “U.S.-centric” perspectives. He contrasts his work to that of scholars who regard “Afro-Latin ... as worse off than in more racially polarized societies, in particular the United States” and presume “that at some point race relations in the region will – or should – ‘evolve’ toward some of the traits of the North American situation” (p. 9). For Sansone, “the Brazilian situation sheds new light on the creation of racialized identities in modern cities,” providing “a truly universal picture of the construction of blackness and its alter ego whiteness in different contexts and regions” (p. 17).
While socioeconomic statistics and descriptions of color and race terms are often cited in publications on Brazil, Sansone’s contribution lies in his attention to class as contextualizing change in color terminologies and their meanings within historical and sociopolitical perspectives that include local, national, and international discourse. His second, third, and fourth chapters examine the “use and abuse” of Africa which has “resulted from the interplay and struggle between white intellectuals and black leadership, popular and elite culture, conformity and protest, and political ideas developed in the West and their reinterpretation in Latin America” (p. 59). Sansone explores the globalization process through the changing use and meaning of commodities and symbols that are viewed by Afro-Brazilians as inspired by Africa but are produced largely in English-speaking countries such as the United States, Britain, and Jamaica (p. 98). He argues that Brazilians draw from and contribute to a growing source of symbols, interpreted and expressed within specific local contexts, reflecting local race relations.

Sansone claims that a “new black identity” in Bahia “is based on ... color consciousness, black pride, the management of original presentation of the black body – rather than on identification with and participation in the more traditional aspects of black culture” such as candomblé (p. 99). However, his informants viewed “the practice of black culture as an escape ... a way to elude racism rather than as a way to fight it in organized ranks” (p. 100). The Bahian example “shows a new usage of black symbols [that] need not be associated automatically with an increase in ethnic polarization” (p. 108). Funk music in Rio and Salvador is discussed as an example of how globalizing forces “end up being instrumental in the creation of local varieties of black youth culture” (p. 140). The fifth chapter compares youth in Salvador, Brazil with Surinamese Creoles in Amsterdam, the Netherlands. Recognizing that “what is black in one context or country may be brown or even white in another,” Sansone defines “black youth” in these two cities as “people who, in some specific context, see themselves and are seen by outsiders as being of African or partly African descent” (p. 141). He provides examples of contrast and similarity in techniques employed by youth in Amsterdam and Salvador to attain social mobility despite the limitations of racism, continuing to focus on global interaction and local specificity. The concluding chapter argues for self-determination and the legitimacy of alternative models for social justice in the Black Atlantic rather than mobilization around ethnic identity as in the United States.

Sansone’s work is important in demonstrating the constant exchange occurring throughout the Black Atlantic and the hierarchical and disproportionate contribution made by the United States to this discourse. Alland and Sansone both call for greater attention to cultural context and historical perspective in studies of race. Their work encourages further analysis into the mechanisms by which, and the extent to which, racist academic publications inform perceptions of race and racism as well as varying models for social justice in the African diaspora.
As a clearly written historical case study of the interaction of religion, politics, and economics in a society in continuous contact with a variety of outside influences, this intriguing volume has much of value for professional anthropologists, historians, and missiologists, as well as sociologists and psychologists of religion. Yet the results of its solid ethnographic and historical research are also of interest for readers of NWIG who, like us, may not be adept in any of those fields; it is with such readers in mind that this review has been written. In its brief compass we have chosen to sample the book’s main themes more than to recount its main hypotheses.

Like other “Bush Negro” or “Maroon” societies of Suriname (whose histories are sketched in an opening essay by Dirk Van der Elst, pp. 1-15), the Ndyuka society described in this book reflects both the African roots of its founding runaway slaves and subsequent historical development in the Suriname context. Even its pantheon includes deities from both the Suriname rainforest and Africa, and associations between specific deities and particular matrilineages, a feature not uncommon in West African religious systems.

Religious, economic, and political features of their changing environment over the past three centuries have continuously shaped and reshaped details of these domains of Ndyuka life. This evolution has been documented by the authors in part through archival work but especially through their personal empathetic involvement with many individual Ndyuka over a period of more than forty years. Through all the changes, some themes have persisted, though waxing and waning considerably in prominence: religious power as potentially manipulative political and economic power; practice and fear of witchcraft, and attempts to control it, arising from an atmosphere of chiefly economic envy; and openness to the adoption and adaptation of outside influences for economic gain or for deliverance from the power of one’s real and potential enemies, both human and superhuman.

Modern naturalistic readers will find it more difficult to identify with the extent of the interaction of human and supernatural forces characteristic of Ndyuka history than will modern supernaturalists or postmodern
pluralists. But for the Ndyuka, as for members of the other Maroon societies of Suriname, a range of beings from avenging spirits and demons to local and supreme gods provide a framework for making sense of the fortunes of life and for maintaining some degree of well-being in the face of competition from one’s neighbors (including military advantage, as illustrated during the civil war of the 1980s and 1990s). At the same time, the Ndyuka also pragmatically acknowledge the efficacy of human efforts (including manipulation of supernatural powers) in the struggle to survive and prosper: “Although the belief in spirit mediums and witches is just as strong now as it was a century ago, and although the protection of supernatural agencies is just as avidly sought, that does not keep Maroons from struggling for full economic participation and political rights” (p. 277).

Imagine yourself growing up in a society where resources are by definition assumed to be limited: there is only so much money, so much food, so much political power and influence. If someone has more of these than you do, it must be that they have deprived you of your due, very likely with the aid of spiritual forces. What can you do? Enlist the help of such forces yourself, both for protection and to retaliate, causing loss to others so that you can gain. Small wonder that in times of increasing visible economic inequality among the Ndyuka, as during their late nineteenth-century monopoly of river transportation for gold and rubber exploiters, development of religious institutions to deal with witchcraft became especially prominent. But not only then: in the early 1960s, when economic inequalities were less obvious, one out of every three deaths was still attributed to the deceased having engaged in witchcraft.

Manipulation of politico-religious power is illustrated clearly by the process for determining that someone has died because of being a witch. This decision has been the prerogative of Ndyuka religious leaders, through their control of oracle consultations to find out the cause of death, including interpretation of the oracle’s responses. Since the possessions of a person declared to be a witch are then distributed according to the same leaders’ interpretation of the oracle’s wishes, with many possessions going to themselves, this institution has had obvious potential for serious abuse. Periodically such excesses – both the economic impoverishment and the pervasive atmosphere of mutual suspicion encouraged by a high percentage of one’s fellows being posthumously identified as witches – have led to iconoclastic reform movements in which a prophet arises to challenge the authority of the cult dominant at the time. Often begun with apparent benevolent intentions, these movements frequently developed into a mere shift of power and a displacement of its abuse from one regime to another, as the prophet-deliverer gained more and more power and then succumbed to the temptations to abuse it in various ways. Further, when the antitwitchcraft institutions were thoroughly weakened without other control mechanisms put in their place, the atmo-
sphere of fear was replaced by a malaise arising from too few constraints on antisocial behavior – “as Da Asawooko [an important source of the authors’ understanding of Ndyuka sociopolitical history] expressed it: ‘We are like dogs without a master, and those sleep on empty bellies’” (p. 276).

In developing specific topics through time, the presentation is not strictly chronological, yet this complexity reinforces the pervasiveness of supernatural concerns in Ndyuka life. The resulting impression readers are given of this highly religious society is further enhanced by the well-chosen photographs, maps, glossary of Ndyuka terms, and a bibliography of some two hundred items.