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*Introduction*

While visiting my parents for Christmas in 2007 I read *Via Magazine*, a publication of the California Automobile Association. Reading it when I am home is a kind of ritual. I always read it with a bit of nostalgia for California, the place I left behind. This issue of the magazine, for September/October 2007, was of particular interest. An article entitled “Downieville: A Former Mining Town in the Sierra Reveals Its Golden Years,” chronicled the heyday of this community of 325 people in the Tahoe National Forest. The article describes how the town maintains some of its vintage charm, including “19th century clapboard and brick buildings, narrow lanes and creaky wooden sidewalks, [where] the past feels closer than it does anywhere else in California.” As he interviewed locals for the article, some of them in their nineties, the author, Christopher Hall, discovered that “it doesn’t take long to realize that folks in Downieville love stories.” This love of stories in Downieville, the seat of Sierra County, was born with the influx of up to sixteen thousand prospectors who rushed to the area after gold was discovered in the Downie River in 1848–49. There are still rumors that someone unwittingly found a gold nugget in a pot used to cook river trout. Downieville is a town whose very genesis was tied to a fiercely competitive economic market, where in the mid-nineteenth century people were willing to do anything to strike it rich panning for gold. To this day, tourists can do as the article recommends and visit the Sierra Hardware store, located at 305 Main Street, where they can purchase gear to pan for gold. Yet hidden or buried in this article is the not-so-golden shadow history of Downieville. In a few short sentences Hall makes a cursory allusion to its almost unspeakable past: “You might be nursing a cold one under the watchful gaze of a stuffed bear head at the St. Charles Place Saloon where you overhear two locals debating whether Juanita deserved to get lynched. It may take you a while to figure out... the events in question took place more than 150 years ago, not last week... Next to the county courthouse, in a grove of trees you’ll come across a restored 1885 gallows. It hasn’t
been used since the year it was built, and then only once. And well, that’s another story.\footnote{4}

A reader of this passage might think it comes from a historical document rather than a magazine designed to promote tourism in California. The gallows erected in 1885 to hang convicted people for the crimes they committed in this gold rush community are “another story,” as is the lynching of Juanita in 1851 (she is variously referred to in sources as Josefa). These two details are the foundation for basic questions raised in this book. There is something exceedingly disturbing about Josefa/Juanita appearing in a tourist magazine. The banality of evil, the cursory reference to her lynching in the magazine juxtapose death and tourism as the picturesque that renders it minor, grotesque, and yet traumatic. The outrage I experienced at seeing this woman held up as an article of touristic interest is indescribable. Over the past ten years I have collected countless one-sentence references to Downieville and Juanita’s lynching because they make me angry. And there is great reason to be angry: through these references the juxtaposition of death, tourism, and lynching becomes quotidian and yet spectacular. These fragments, these utterances seem almost unspeakable; that is, people allude to the event but rarely, if ever, flesh out the details. I call these references utterances because they do something, they posit something, and thus they imply action.\footnote{3} Strangely, these utterances are about the flesh, about violence that culminated in the brutal destruction of a woman’s body at a time when California’s statehood was new and precarious in the 1850s, but they suspend further investigation, preventing the reader from engaging with these narratives of violence on a deeper level.

Such rarely noteworthy references to Juanita’s lynching can be skipped over, forgotten, or seen as local color, as they typically are; or the lack of detail in their strategic repetition may be understood as a way of instructing us to forget. Precisely because these cursory references say nothing and say everything, I wanted to know why Juanita (Josefa?), a Mexican woman living in the mining town on the banks of the Yuba and Downie rivers, met her brutal, torturous death over their waters. These few lines from an article written for tourists are typical of the way Juanita’s lynching has been reported over time.

And space. There is something grotesque about the fact that the lynching of a woman appears in a tourism article. The grotesqueness of lynching as tourism in these cursory lines evokes the ways in which violence occurred situationally and further how U.S. Mexicanas (female subjects) were and continue to be conceived of in relationship to national history, citizenship, and racialized, sexualized violence.\footnote{Josefa/Juanita’s story, or lack thereof, said something to me through these shadow utterances that populated the texts I read about California, about the gold rush, about Chicana/o historiography. Josefa/Juanita as a historical subject disappears in these one-line utterances, and all we are left with is fragments of what her life was like. We don’t know why she was lynched, how much she suffered when she was hanged, what happened to her body, how she understood her citizenship, how many people were involved in the lynching, or what it meant to be the first Mexican woman lynched in California after statehood. While some might argue that lynching was a common form of punishment in the wild West,\footnote{7} what is different and crucial about this one is that women were rarely lynched, and those who were usually were women of color.\footnote{4} Given my academic training, I was most concerned with how Josefa/Juanita’s racial, gender, and sexual identities played a role in how and why she was lynched and in how the event is narrated.}

In this book I investigate the history behind moments such as this one, by arguing that violence is an ongoing social process of differentiation for racialized, sexualized, gendered subjects in the U.S. borderslands in the nineteenth century and early twentieth. I explore the stories of four distinct episodes of borders violence: Josefa/Juanita’s lynching in 1851, the Camp Grant Indian massacre of 1871, anthropological erasures of racialized and sexualized violence in South Texas in the nineteenth century and early twentieth, and the Yaqui Indian wars of 1880–1900. These diverse events in the U.S.–Mexico borderslands (California, Arizona, Texas, Sonora, and Chihuahua) reveal how regionally situated Arauipa, Pinal, and Lipan Apache, Anglo emigrants, Chicana/os, Comanche, Mexicans, Papago, Yaqui, U.S. Mexicanas/os (that is, Mexicans in the nineteenth century who were geographically relocated to the United States as a result of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo), and their varied relationships to colonialism provide a narrative of systematic patterns of violence as social transformation. Not all Mexicans, Indians, and Anglos are considered equal in this text. Regional identities, government policies, and economic conditions, understood as both U.S. and Mexican colonial residues, drastically affected how one’s citizenship, or lack thereof and racial positioning as Anglo, Mexican, or Indian were perceived. Racial positioning, gender, and class alliances were fragile and shifted according to need and economic conditions. Some categories of identity seem to have been more fixed than others.

This book is not a narrative of resistance. The story I tell is not a happy one, yet there is a graciousness to the intervention I’m trying to make. I take up my case studies because they have been or easily could be part of a resistance narrative, the very thing I cautiously try not to reproduce. Hence, I make three basic arguments that unseat and question resistance narratives: first, there is a
it is "wielded in the idiom of a society's distinctive history" and therefore produces a logic of disclosure or repression.12 Methodologically speaking, as Coronil attests, the borderlands communities I analyze have their own specific social context in the production of violence as social practice and must be considered within a transnational framework. Each incident reveals the whole history of violence embedded in the context of the borderlands, most notably through the utterance of that which is almost unspeakable. Both Joseph Roach in Cities of the Dead and Diana Taylor in The Archive and the Repertoire have argued that selective memory requires public acts of forgetting in order to blur obvious discontinuities, misalignances, and ruptures or to exaggerate them, which mystifies the past in expressive behavior and transmits cultural identity and memory.13 I tweak their readings of the utterance a bit, arguing that if we read the utterance as the unspeakable, then we are presented with fragments of the very things selective memory bans from individual and national consciousness, the historical traces that are clearly there but not allowed to be heard, seen, or experienced. Roach further argues that the unspeakable may be officially forgotten but that memory retains its consequences: "The unspeakable cannot be forever rendered inexpressible: the most persistent mode of forgetting is memory imperfectly deferred."14 So it is this sense of deferral that is a series of actions—more precisely defined as memories—that activate the unspeakable. The utterance is reference to that which cannot be spoken fully. Even as the unspeakable nature of violence denies a particular set of histories, it must acknowledge them in order to banish them from memory. My book weaves together the profound meaning found in the unspeakable and the utterance, reminding us that violence forms the foundations of national histories and subjectivity that are often elided:

VIOLENCE, NATIONALISM, AND CITIZENSHIP

Utterances materialize, hail, and deny violence all at once. It is the unspeakable qualities of material and representational violence that are posited in the utterance. I further propose that the utterance and representational violence echo each other as material and historical cognates. Representational violence in fictional texts and journalistic accounts, as in the case of Josefa/Juanita's lynching, echo material violence by repeating the details of an event by efficaciously her as a subject. At the same time, historical texts echo representational violence in the sense that they also have their own mediated nature in how narratives of violence are told. As the various readings of Josefa/Juanita's lynching unfold, we see the layers of mediation and bias in texts that are read as factual history. Much larger state-sponsored histories of violence in the
U.S.-Mexico borderlands provide the perfect case-study for contemplating, within a transnational context, the movement of goods, people, ideas, capital, and policies between and among nations. I use such terms as racialized, sexualized, and gendered subjects throughout the book to indicate how social processes and social constructions of race, sexuality, and gender inform the citizenship of individuals and communities in the U.S.-Mexico borderlands. As racialized, sexualized, and gendered individuals were and are deprived of control of their bodies through acts of violence, they are also denied access to land, resources, and civil rights. At the same time, those whom we now call people of color in the U.S.-Mexico borderlands were not exclusively victims but often enacted violence upon other racialized, gendered subjects in the name of the state. This is where I make a critical intervention into celebratory discourses about mestizaje, hybridity, and nationalism within the context of Chicano, Latino, and American studies, by teasing out the nuances of how and why multiethnic communities enacted violence against each other. Few scholars are willing to talk about these questions because they pose a direct challenge to nationalist ideologies that celebrate the cultural heritage of Mexico and, in particular, of its indigenous roots. Examining how far people will go to obey national authority, even to the point of inflicting death on another, is part of my project. I also trace how seeing (visual representation) and hearing (discursive representation) challenge claims of not knowing and claims to ignorance, claims on which the success of nationalism depends. In some ways my work is about correcting historiographies, nationalist tracts, and popular lore that have left us with a series of obscured and shortened narratives in which minor descriptions of violated bodies are proof of an unspeakable act. In other words, my book theorizes how and why these unspeakable acts might announce their own disappearance and how those unspeakable acts utter the project of nation formation.

What I have been describing thus far, in regard to Josefa/Juana’s narrative of lynching and other enactments of physical violence in the borderlands, is the erasure of the physical pain these historical subjects felt firsthand, posited in an abbreviated utterance or in complete silence, which leads to a secondary effect of violence as social practice. Elaine Scarry argues that there is an "inacessible reality of physical pain . . . to anyone not immediately experiencing it." What is lost is the ability to fully understand the physical and psychic pain violence causes individuals and communities. While there is something irretrievable about the experiences of the people who emerge as subjects in the historical record strictly because they are somehow implicated in acts of violence, a kind of social residue polices the behaviors of those who come into contact with that violence through hearing about it, witnessing it, experiencing it, or reading about it. This process highlights the disciplined body in relationship to the nation-state because law, confinement, and punishment inform citizenship. I argue that tracking these processes as they are represented in the historical record and in Chicana/o, Mexican, and U.S. national imaginaries requires that citizen-subjects be theorized in relation to power, pain, and domination.

Then there is another effect, one in which violence manifests itself in the social residues that are sedimented as trauma. Trauma manifests itself in people’s behavior, in both the physical body and the psyche. Some who have experienced oppressive treatment do not live to tell their stories. For those who do, the ways violence leaves its traces have been most clearly documented in the numerous accounts of Holocaust survivors, memoirs of sexual abuse survivors, and blues songs that testify to the African American experience of lynching. Violence in any context remains as a social trace in our histories; it affects how we behave, and this is why it is so often an unspoken, underlying social current. Judith Herman argues, "Psychological trauma is an affliction of powerlessness." Writing about trauma is both a formalistic narrative practice and a way to mourn for past violence in order to counteract the sense of powerlessness that histories of colonization evoke. Rereading this archive is a means of responding to atrocities that are often unspeakable. Images of violence against the gendered and racialized body—whether in the form of rape, physical torture, or political disenfranchisement—demonstrate that these forces are normalized, enraged, and extraordinary all at the same time. In attempting to imagine "real" violence and how it was and is experienced by a collective of individuals who are explicit products of histories of colonization, my readings theorize that the pain and suffering that result from violence against the body and the subject are integral to the production of subjectivities. To illuminate the prevailing ideas of domination, violence must be read as both a subject of representation and a historical factor.

All of the histories I recount raise issues about how subjects in these spaces have attempted to enact their citizenship and maintain a sense of bodily and psychic integrity by contesting violations of their person. Citizenship plays a crucial role in the perpetration of violence precisely because national membership, rights, birthrights, and state and local practices were often determined situationally. Following Evelyn Nakano Glenn, I argue that citizenship is based on both universal and exclusionary notions of belonging to the nation-state, conditioning gendered, sexualized, and racialized subjects to police themselves and to understand that their existence is subject to policing.
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by the state.20 As Akhil Gupta argues, "Citizenship ought to be theorized as one of the multiple subject positions occupied by people as members of diversely spatialized, partially overlapping or non-overlapping collectivities."21 While Gupta's caveat on split and multiple affinities is an important one, one must remember that racialized, sexualized, and gendered subjects often are not viewed as full members of their respective communities or as full citizens of nations with rights and are more likely to be targets of physical, psychological, or discursive violence. Reconstructing various violent episodes, utilizing a transnational feminist methodology to account for the hegemonic rationales that make these atrocities unspeakable, I theorize the role of the nation-state (a legal and political entity) in forming national imaginaries (discursive formations) that perpetuate dominant narratives of national amnesia. Certainly, I am not alone in this endeavor, as such recent scholars as Leigh Payne, Ned Blackhawk, and Saidya Hartman, among others, have contemplated the role of violence and its repression in historical memory in the formation of nation-states. My project is unique, however, in that I consider how competing understandings of racial projects and models of exchange worked in tandem to produce proper subjects in the borderlands. Chicano nationalist and Chicana feminist scholarship have primarily and to a degree understandably posited Mexican racial and even gendered identification as a refuge from Anglo-American nationalist violence. My historical research demonstrates that this was not always the case, and accordingly I examine how nationalism and individuals collude in sanctioning forgotten violence in the borderlands.

Drawing on archival sources from the United States and Mexico, I further argue that the subjectivities of peoples are re-fashioned as their connection to space and their civil rights are denied. Mary Pat Brady has argued that space "is a highly social process that has an effect on the formation of subjectivity, identity, socality, and physicality in myriad ways."22 Subjugated identities are produced through spatial configurations of power that literally turn a landscape against its inhabitants. The case of American Indians—and, I would add, that of Mexican Indians, the Yaqui population of Sonora in particular—illustrates space as a way of organizing power relations which, according to Ned Blackhawk, "have countered policies aimed at denying Indians access to land and resources."23

Through an analysis of space and violent processes of social differentiation, I attempt to gain access to the cultural politics of violence that developed through overlapping colonial systems of the U.S.—Mexico borderlands. When violence leaves its ineradicable mark, it does not create merely a self—other relationship between violator and violated: rather everyone involved, specta-

tors, enactors of violence, and the recipients of violence, is differentiated through her or his role in these processes.24 Violence is an underlying social process of differentiation for all involved. The experiencing and enacting of violence are processes that differentiate, and the ultimate form of differentiation is abduction. Julia Kristeva argues that "abduction of self would be the culminating form of that experience of the subject to which it is revealed that all its objects are based merely upon the inaugural loss that laid the foundations of its own being."25 It is this primary sense of loss, the aftereffects of violence, that creates a sentiment of abduction. The social process of extreme differentiation becomes the foundation for collective residues of violence. The loss is registered in the utterances that refer to differentiation, violence, and abduction. According to the American studies scholars David Eng and David Kazanjian, the utterances are what remain, melancholically materialized in the social, political, and cultural realms, perhaps creating a productive space for reinvigorated histories and politics embodied in loss.26 While undoubtedly violence is a social process that distances the individual body from the sense of self, individual experiences are irretrievable and this only produces a greater sense of loss. However, a distinction must be made between individual abduction and collective responses to that abduction. I argue two points in relation to abduction, perhaps changing Kristeva's definition. First, for dissident subjects in the borderlands, abduction is a normal state of being in terms of their individual relationship to the state. The moment of recognition of loss is perhaps most vividly articulated in acts of physical violence against the individual. If we examine violence on a case by case basis, the inability to control what is done to one's body shows how state actors vigorously police individuals and represents the moment of differentiation in which violence is the marker of noncitizenship. The abduction is the shadow figure that lingers in multiple national imaginaries, signaling an absence of citizenship formed through social processes of differentiation registered upon the bodies and in the psyches of the violated. In other words, in the nineteenth-century history of the U.S.—Mexico borderlands U.S., Mexican, and Chicanos nationalism have uncannily relied on the abduction of certain specter bodies—from Josefina Juárez's body to the Yaqui Indian nation—for the consolidation of their narratives of loss and triumph, of national risk and consolidation.

At the collective level, how this abduction is or is not narrated shows that a great deal of national history is about selective memory and the prioritizing of particular information and events over others. I am not arguing that all the communities involved in these case studies of violence are organized around a collective abduction, but rather that reading these incidents as a collective
whole posits abjection as a precondition for registering the impact of violence. Herein lies the reason Josefina/Juanita's lynching gets only one sentence in the mass-market media article instead of a detailed treatment. The inability to articulate subjection, abjection, and the distinct types of violence (physical, psychic, discursive, and epistemic) is located at individual, communal, national, and transnational levels, evading the real reasons why violence "pushes the limits of the permissible."28

In the context of Chicano studies, violence in the U.S.-Mexico borderlands in the nineteenth-century has been characterized as a conflict between Anglo and Mexican males over land and citizenship. While this perspective makes important contributions and revisionist corrections to the ways race and class are talked about in the Southwest, generations of scholars have been influenced by how such narratives track a singular idea of Mexican resistance to Anglo hegemony, as if that were the only kind of power struggle that existed.29 It reflects the narrative emerging from the Chicano power movements of the 1960s, which articulates the Mexican and Mexican American subject fighting the voracious northern neighbor who is attempting to steal Mexican lands (although some scholars have argued that the cession of the Southwest to the United States was a reflection of the administrative disorder of the Mexican nation after independence).30 Rather than ask the same questions again, I ask, Does the paradigm of resistance to Anglo hegemony always situate an oppositional relationship or is there a more productive way to ask research questions that uncover the field's strengths? I think there is.

**Transnational Feminist Frameworks**

Even as I critique the limitations of certain paradigms such as Chicano nationalism, which cast Chicano identity as indigenous and masculinist, I strive to retain the insights these paradigms have yielded in the past, specifically the worthwhile political project of conceiving of Chicana/o studies in a transnational framework. An early attempt at a transnational feminist turn is exemplified by the Mexicana/Chicana Women's History International Symposium held in Santa Monica, California, in March 1982, at which scholars and activists shared research and teaching expertise on the history of Mexican women. Their goal was to enact a "collaboration that underscores the benefits of international exchanges in Chicano studies and in the history of Mexican women on both sides of the border."31 Eight years later a Chicana graduate student from UCLA, Adelaida R. Del Castillo, a feminist organizer, edited and published an expanded version of the conference proceedings in the transnationally minded anthology *Between Borders: Essays on Mexicana/Chicana History.*32 Del Castillo argues that the theoretical and conceptual framework of the book derives from the idea that "Chicana history is the history of Chicano and Mexican people representative of a transnational labor force in the context of global capital accumulation," and the scholarship it contains focuses on Mexicans on both sides of the U.S.-Mexico border.33 Del Castillo's anthology not only argues for the consideration of the movement of bodies and peoples through circuits of exchange and labor, but also foregrounds how gender and women's studies have caused epistemological shifts in the study of Mexicana/0s. The essays span the period from colonial California under Spanish rule to current debates in Chicana/Mexicana studies (as of 1990). But the distinguishing feature of the work is its publication of essays in Spanish and its focus on the history of the Partido Liberal Mexicano (PLM) during the Mexican Revolution, its exile communities, and the gendering of the revolution's history, from which women have been written out. Del Castillo argues lucidly that "the proximity of the border and the adepness with which a transborder traffic negotiates movement between the United States and Mexico has historically made possible a cross fertilization of political ideas and organizational activism."34 While the evidence Del Castillo relies upon comes from the early twentieth century, she nonetheless rejects a Chicano nationalist discourse in favor of a focus on the geographical, political, social, and racial convergences and divergences that PLM historiographies often missed by failing to analyze class and gender oppression. Del Castillo sought to represent a "broad topical diversity, scope, and consciousness on Mexican women's history comprised of an unprecedented collection of interpretive essays and original research on the theory, method, and content of Chicana history," written by an interesting cast of intellectual leaders in the field, including Juan Gómez-Quiñónez, Antonia Castañeda, Raquel Rubio-Goldsmith, Dennis Monroy, and Rosauro Sánchez. The contributors to the anthology pursue not a nationalist agenda but an explicitly transnationalist one.35 Sánchez's essay in the anthology, "The History of Chicanas: A Proposal for a Materialist Perspective," critically outlines the kinds of transnational historiographic projects needed to expand the field:

Works tracing Chicana roots in Mexican history need not postulate direct links between us and La Malinche or Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz. References to Aztec goddesses similarly prove absolutely nothing and in fact have been used to idealize the status of Aztec women in pre-Columbian society, both in creative and historical projects, despite documentation which points to the subordinate status of women in pre-Columbian society. In short, Chi-
cana historians need fewer myths and more historical analysis. In all cases, whatever the focus, references to women included in these histories should be accompanied by information on the class status of the historized figures, for we are often provided information which pertains only to the ruling classes of Mexico.26

Shunning the imaginary world and revisionist histories that make Chicanas/os the direct descendents of La Malinche or Coyolxauhqui, Sánchez provides a refreshing materialist model for writing transnational history, because her analytical focus rests not on the compulsory working-class subject, but on social class in general.27 In her vision of transnationalized Chicana/o and Latina/o studies, Sánchez urges readers toward a Marxist feminism that acknowledges that sometimes the only extant historical records in both Mexico and the United States are those of upper-class Mexicans, and they say a great deal about power struggles through their discursive absences and presences. Sánchez sees this as an opening to move away from narrow nationalist methodologies toward an analysis of class struggle between and among those who make history.

In a nearly unprecedented move for its time, Between Borders consciously includes Mexicana and Chicana historical scholarship by Mex. J. Jorge Klor de Alva and Gómez-Quíñónez, as Latin Americanists turned Chicana/o studies scholars, demonstrate that it is possible to be a Chicano man and take seriously gender analysis beyond the United States and beyond women. The conclusions in Klor de Alva’s essay “Chicana History and Historical Significance: Some Theoretical Considerations” point in a transnational direction. “With regard to Mexican women in the United States,” he argues, “not only must they be studied with class and gender categories in mind, but with attention to critical historical variables of ethnicity, race, and international context. Therefore, no single conceptual framework will be able to fully capture the complexity of the Chicana past.”28 He calls for a multilayered, mixed methodology that takes into account international factors as well as issues of race, class, and gender as being central to any study of Mexican women in the United States (and, I would add, Mexican women in the borderlands). Gómez-Quíñónez’s “Questions within Women’s Historiography” relies on nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Mexico as the basis for his arguments about Mexicana, Chicana, and, more generally, women’s history. “In Mexico as elsewhere, male chauvinism and sexism have existed in correspondence to the level of social, economic, and political development,” he points out.29 In discussing the social and gender stratification that affected the lives of all participants in the Spanish conquest, Gómez-Quíñónez notes that “male domination has meant unequal distribution and exploitation along gender lines and the propagation of values and interpretations which sustain this disadvantage among Mexicans.”30 Both Klor de Alva and Gómez-Quíñónez rearticulate the problem of masculinist constructs of history as a field, and both go beyond the United States to view Mexico as a central place from which to theorize problems in epistemology.

But the most overtly transnationalist move of Between Borders comes with the publication of several essays in Spanish by Mexican scholars who focus on Mexican women’s history in Mexico. The refusal to translate, as well as Carmen Castañeda-García’s “Puentes para la historia de la mujer en los archivos de Guadalajara” the transnationalized study of Mexican women that Del Castillo proposes in the introduction. Castañeda-García invites readers to pursue historical research on Mexican women in Mexico as part of transnationalizing Chicana/o studies. Beginning her catalogue of archival sources in the eighteenth century and continuing through the mid-twentieth century, she illustrates the breadth and scope of the collection, which includes letters, notary records, and government documents. One of the most interesting and compelling portions of Castañeda-García’s essay is her presentation of a source from 1856 about Jalisco’s women’s relationship to religion. The source elucidated that working-class women’s lack of citizenship rights was so complete that the Mexican Congress passed legislation to further delimit the lower-class’s heathen, irreligious ways and focus on civilizing the most “ignorant portion of Mexican society” and their rights, who, it was assumed, did not respect moral principles.31 Most important, Castañeda-García reminds scholars how important it is to examine what the upper class was doing in the period immediately after the signing of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo because they informed social norms about gender, religion, and propriety for the working classes. Her scholarly preoccupation is not simply with whether class divisions make certain women somehow less or more important to the national project, but rather with how these sources from Guadalajara can contribute to a transnational dialogue on Mexican women’s history.

Between Borders shows that transnationalism has been a viable methodology in Chicana/o studies for quite some time and that Chicana feminism is at the forefront of this movement in the field. Chicana feminist scholarship, as the anthology demonstrates, incorporates postcolonial theories of identity that deconstruct and challenge dominant racist, sexist, classist, and heterosexist paradigms to analyze how the effects of colonialism continue to thrive within U.S. borders in new and more complicated forms. Nevertheless, Be-
between Borders relies on a discourse of mestizaje even as it promotes transnational methodologies.

Angie Chabram-Dernersesian similarly argues in "Chicana/o Rican? No, 'Chicana, Riqueña!': Refashioning the Transnational Connection" that Chicano/a studies scholarship needs to make good on the claim of transnationality not just in theory but in practice. She marks how rigid nationalist frameworks police her everyday identity struggles as a Chicana-Riqueña. Chabram-Dernersesian chides the belief in authentic Chicana/o identities as she refuses to "engage in the business of putting on a ready-made identity the way nationalists did when they celebrated a glorious Aztec past with questionable relations to the present but neglected to map vital relations to contemporary indigenas or other local underrepresented ethnic groups." She goes on to argue that today's mestizaje is "the age-old political embodiment of the Mexican national who has traditionally occupied this central space and is the subject of contention by many indigenas for whom mestizaje means inequality, a concerted dilution of Indianness and partnership with the Mexican state." Chabram-Dernersesian suggests that evocations of the border and of mestizaje circulate an essentialist discourse, offering a native multiculturalism that is exclusive because of its ethnic absolutism. It seems that the terms border, borderlands, and mestizaje come to stand in for or masquerade as a transnational methodology in Chicana/o studies. We should not dismantle these concepts, but rather consider a different set of questions and methodologies with which to answer them. Stepping out of a U.S. Chicano-based intellectual paradigm with its master narratives of mestizaje, the borderlands, and lo indio/the Indian would demonstrate that colonial aggressions are enacted by Chicana/os, Mexicanos/as, and U.S. Mexicans as well. Chabram-Dernersesian writes, "Although we live in a period that prizes the multiplicity of identities and charts border crossings with borderless critics, it is ironic that] there should be such a marked silence around the kinds of divergent ethnic pluralities that cross gender and classed subjects within the semantic orbit of Chicana/o." For Chabram-Dernersesian, the evocation of mestizaje and the border masks inequalities and is essentialist, identifying a single Chicana/o identity that equates with "the" indigenous (Aztec) to the exclusion of all else.

If one maps this transnational alternative theoretical and practical genealogy of the field, the book that most closely exemplifies the happy marriage of feminist critique and transnationalism is María Josefa Saldana-Portillo's *The Revolutionary Imagination in the Americas and the Age of Development*. In both content and scope, Saldana-Portillo shows why transnational meth-
tique of the vanguard politics that were originally aimed at helping the peasants, who should be the legitimate subjects of revolution. These small peasant producers later became counterrevolutionaries because their concerns were dismissed by the Sandinista party leadership and conflated their concerns with those of national identity that "necessitated commitment to the revolution, to a particular vision of modernization" and that read peasants and their consciousness as prerevolutionary.51 In the case of Nicaragua even the most well-intended discourse of revolution could and did primitivize the peasant majority of the country, an utterance nobody wants to hear as a critique of insurgent struggles in the Americas.

Saldana-Portillo's engagement with the Zapatista movement in Mexico is equally honest in that she shows the movement's democratic and respectful politics without falling into the trap of treating the Zapatistas as unavailable or romanticizing the Central American revolutions of the 1970s and 1980s. What I appreciate about Saldana-Portillo's methodology is that it leaves no stone unturned; it reminds us "about the many tensions that exist among indigenous peasant groups in and around the Zapatista liberated zones and the Mexican army camps."52 Admitting that there are tensions among indigenous groups because of language barriers not only saves one from constructing a romanticized, monolithic, universal Indian subject of revolution, but also provides an opportunity to understand the racial and ethnic differences that continue to be reformulated by postcolonial regimes of subjection and that a romanticized discourse of mestizaje ultimately masks. An honest appraisal of the Zapatista movement as a solidarity-based indigenous front built on a foundation of respect for difference makes the romance of mestizaje impossible to sustain.

Finally, and most important for the argument of my book, Saldana-Portillo suggests that uncritical Chicano nationalism produces romanticized images of a single Indian tribe that later became Chicanos, a system of representation that erases historically accurate indigenous subjectivities. Such nationalistic narratives, grounded in biologically based terms of mestizaje and a national romance of a unified indigenous past, do not recognize Indians other than Aztecs as inhabitants of this continent, so that in such narratives, mestizo and therefore Chicano means Indian.53 Saldana-Portillo points out that in Chicano studies and Chicano nationalist histories of violence and capitalism, the only venerated Indians are the Aztecs of the past. I build on this argument but take it in a different direction in my examination of the historical record. Late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century archival materials in Mexico and the United States show the complex social and power relationships regarding indigenous communities in the U.S.-Mexico borderlands and proposing an alternative model to that which Chicano studies offers, one that is more relevant to its rich historical context.

THE RESISTANCE TO TRANSNATIONAL FEMINIST METHODOLOGIES WITHIN CHICANO STUDIES

Even though Chicana feminist critical projects have "underscored the 'back and forth' movements of people and ideas within spaces that challenged our notions of discrete domains," these calls in the field most often still go half answered.54 Norma Alarcón, Sonia Saikly-Hull, and Chabram-Dernersesian all sounded this transnational call in the late 1990s, but the transformation still seems to be on the verge of happening, not yet quite complete.55

Some recent scholarship is highly problematic in that it gives a cursory nod to the transnational, once again using an invocation of the border and mestizaje to stand in for a concrete engagement with transnationalism. One of the main discourses used in studies of the Americas to articulate oppression and resistance is that of mestizaje, which was made famous by Gloria Anzaldua's now-canonical text Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza (1987). Whereas Anzaldua's theory was specific to Chicana identity formation within the context of the geopolitics of the U.S.-Mexico borderlands, the new mestiza consciousness she proposes is often taken out of this context and applied to everything and anything that references racial and cultural mixture or borders. In "Miségenation Now!," a review of recent scholarship on mestizaje, Rafael Pérez-Torres argues that one of the problems with this concept is that scholars focus exclusively on how mestizaje "embodies possibility" and "the emancipatory potential of racial mixture.' What is often occluded or oversimplified is the "reality of race in the face of its constructed nature." When racial mixture is evoked as the future, as the harmonizing of disparate identities, it ignores "the more pernicious and hierarchical impulses behind mestizaje in the Americas" and does not complicate the legacy of colonial violence or implicate Chicana/os in the production of racism.56

In Chicano studies this discourse privileges indigenousness, or the Indian heritage of Mexicans and Chicanos, as part of a common identity that unites all Chicanos politically.57 The recent string of books and articles celebrating the literal embodiment of mestizaje in the figure of the native or, more directly, the paradigm of Chicana/as as Indians, "run[s] the risk of representing the [mestizo] body as the realm of 'the real,'" according to Pérez-Torres, superimposing a physical essence on ethnicity.58 By privileging that "Indian essence," mestizaje fetishizes a residual, abstract, dehistoricized Indian iden-
tity that obscures Mexican, Mexican Indian, and American Indian participation in genocide and violence against other American Indians and Mexicans in the U.S.–Mexico borderlands. When we situate these moments of violence in their complex historical matrices, we begin to understand the sexual and gendered dimensions of genocide, which rather than being subsumed under the celebratory gaze of mestizaje deserve to be theorized as transnational moments of violent cultural practices based in fundamental ideas about racial and gender inequality in multiple national contexts.

Ralph Rodriguez, Monika Kaup, José Aranda, and others have argued that we are in a postnationalist moment in Chicana/o studies. Now, Alicia Gaspar de Alba says, “Chicana/o authors can explore the Chicano/a subject in... a historically specific ontological space in which Chicana/o identity has been attempting to redefine itself outside of the cultural logic of ‘el Movimiento’ and its rhetoric of nationalism, essentialism, and carnivalismo... but now is also estranged from the cultural, linguistic, political, and sexual discourses that structured Chicano and Chicana identity at the time of the Chicano Civil Rights Movement.” Yet the excessively regressive figure of “lo Indio/la India” manifests itself in other forms, signaling not a cultural retention but a Chicana/o indigenous reinvention that is not an uninterrupted historical formation.

Kaup argues that “Chicana feminists have achieved this [postnationalist] decentered reconfiguration of their community by rewriting the two major Chicano plots found in male Chicano writing: the indigenous and the immigrant stories. In some cases—the exemplary text here is Anzaldúa’s Borderlands—the dismantling effect results from playing out these two plots against each other.” Even if the combining of indigenous and immigrant stories as one narrative thread in Chicana feminism manages to decenter hegemonic ideas of community, then neonationalism, much like violence, becomes that unspeakable thing that gets remapped as resistance. Neonationalism then becomes the structure of power in the field, shaping the intellectual production and maintaining a particular kind of control over what is venerated as authentically Chicano and what is ignored. Neonationalism is culturally understood as an unspoken ideology or idiom of resistance that most often is articulated as “mestizo equals Indian.” So even while scholars like Rodriguez, Kaup, Gaspar de Alba, and Aranda argue that el Movimiento has forged an estrangement from Chicana/o identities, they are talking about representations of the postnational rather than about how both systems of thought (that is, Anzaldúa’s mestizaje interpreted as Indian only and neonationalism) are based on resistive agency, a structure that represses and restricts what gets talked about and valued. In the 1970s and 1980s it was gender that was rationalized away by cultural nationalism. Today, gender, for the most part, is included in the analytical framework, but what gets rationalized away now is any sort of critique of indigenismo that does not fit the cultural nationalist script of vindication of “the” Indian subject who is Chicana/o.

This new reading of Indio, detailed in Borderlands/La Frontera, reappropriates (mireads?) Vasconcelos’s la raza cósmtica from the 1920s: Anzaldúa theorized a Chicana/o ideological claim to self-determination, dignity, and civil rights through mestizaje instead of reading Vasconcelos for the eugenicist that he was. This move is a response to an agrieved sense of being wronged. Yet the reclamation of the mestiza/o sharpens the focus on the revolutionary content of any political project that uncritically celebrates this mestiza/o heritage, with a particular focus on an essentialized, dehistoricized indigenous past, most closely paralleled by a “neonationalist” discourse. The common reading of Anzaldúa as taking up the mantle of mestizaje as a theory of Chicana/o liberation in some ways denies the violence, both physical and epistemic, that occurs when the essentialized Indian—who cannot pass for mestizo or cannot celebrate a mestiza/o cultural heritage and is in fact Indian in the eyes of the U.S. and Mexican nations—is eliminated from the conversation. Further, Afro-mestizos and blacks in general form another silent part of that thought and politics of exclusion in Chicana/o, Mexicana/o, and U.S. national imaginaries. Even though Anzaldúa’s Borderlands/La Frontera makes a concerted effort to discuss blackness as part of the mestizaje paradigm, we will see these multiple imaginaries gain force by obviating people of African descent. The tremendous feminist influence of Borderlands/La Frontera cannot be denied; however, my point is to demonstrate that the politics that center around celebrating or reclaiming mestizaje are highly problematic because of what they elide from the colonial past and nationalist present, especially when Anzaldúa’s strategic invocation of the mestiza is unequivocally read as Indian only. One reason mestizaje is so appealing as a discourse is that it deconstructs the totalizing nature of things, cultures, and bodies, liberating Mexicans and Chicanos from the shameful past that has figured them as second-class citizens, a position articulated today as indigenous. Thus, even in this presumably postnationalist Chicana/o culture we have entered, a chain of equivalence still persists: if Chicano, then Mexican; if Mexican, then mestizo; if mestizo, then indigenous; if indigenous, then resistant. So by celebrating mestizaje as a kind of neo-Chicano/a nationalism—an analysis that includes gender constructs but focuses mostly on indigenismo—Chicano cultural studies too often systematically forgets the history of violence embedded in its
uncritical narratives of so-called resistance based on ho mophobic, essentialist, indigenous neonationalisms in an Anglo/Mexican binary. Thus decontextualized evocations of mestizaje, indigenismo, and nationalism eclipse historical moments of violence, meaning, and specificity, just as their complexity is denied because they exclusively address a quasi-proletarian subject.

Further, I examine Mexican ideas about citizenship, nation, and Indians in the late nineteenth century and early twentieth as the selective acknowledgments of mestizaje as a strength of the Mexican character. The Mexican documents represent their own kind of selective memory. Mestizaje and positive representations of Indians in Mexico are convenient arguments for nationalism and rarely anything more. One need look only at the daily protests of Oaxacan indigenous communities at El Monumento de la Madre in Mexico City from 2008–2010 to find evidence of the disparity between the convenient Indian of the Mexican national past and the living Indians who must protest in order to be recognized as citizens of their nation. Local, state, and national policy must often disavows Indians and their relationship to Mexico.

For example, Mexican Indian policy dissolved the slightest possibilities of political alliances between Indians and Mexicans in Chihuahua, where the Indian policy of 1849 was still in effect in 1886, demonstrating that the state’s position on Indian exclusion did not change for almost half a century and remained exceedingly violent. Félix Francisco Maceya, the governor of Chihuahua, wrote to Porfirio Díaz in 1886, “You will see that it is a matter of accord in the United States Senate as a decree made in the year 1849 which provides prizes for every Indian killed in action or [made a] prisoner of war. This decree has not been abolished and it has been made to wage the war with some advantage on Indian savages.” Díaz responded, “I accept the decree of 1849 as a necessary evil, unless we can find another type of compensation with the same results.” The fact that Indian policy had not changed in Chihuahua in thirty years suggests that vigilant violence was standard practice when dealing with supposed savages who broke the law. Maceya’s and Díaz’s acceptance of the bounty killing of Indians as a necessary evil tells us two things. First, beheading, torture, and maltreatment of alleged Indian offenders were rewarded with monetary compensation, and cadavers served as the proof of captured criminals. Second, both the U.S. and Mexican states had contracted their labor of killing Indians for monetary compensation to private parties, thus further deregulating Indian policy and making it a matter handled on a case by case basis, outside of the law. People must have literally made a living by bringing in Indian cadavers (which had its own problems because “Mexican” and “Indian” cadavers were not always easily distinguishable) to the Chihuahuan government, thereby conveying a message much like that contained in Andrew Jackson’s policy that the only good Indian is a dead Indian—a dead Indian that is clearly not a Mexican or a Mexican citizen. Rather, each Indian cadaver represented what needed to be eradicated to transform Mexico into a modern nation and especially to make its borders safe for capitalism and foreign investment in relationship to U.S. Indian policy.

Furthermore, the same Indian policy can be linked to early twentieth-century, state-sponsored counterinsurgency practice against the Yaquis in the borderlands that is part and parcel of a larger history of empire. Thomas A. Bass has argued that the tactics of counterinsurgency involve “a dominant power forcing its will on a subject people [and] . . . involves a mix of offensive, defensive, and stability operations.” Bass refers to the current U.S. intervention in Iraq and offers a way of thinking about the treatment of rebels through a kind of historical continuity. Bass’s words on counterinsurgency are directly reflected in Mexican governmental documents from the late nineteenth century and the early twentieth because counterinsurgency was a necessary part of the project of nationhood and the project of Mexico imagining itself as an empire. Mexican governmental documents on the Yaqui Indian wars demonstrate a range of offensive, defensive, and stabilizing operations but in the service of nations imagining themselves, however directly and indirectly, as empires.

The desire to stabilize economic productivity in northern Mexican states like Sonora in the late nineteenth century shows how Díaz’s vision of Mexico was one of an empire that dominated its indigenous populations. The vision of Mexico as empire is articulated most concretely in the speeches and biographies of Mexican army generals who directed the counterinsurgency campaigns against the Yaqui in 1880–1910. But even those messages were mixed. Lo indio was invoked as Lo Azteca, the precocolonial Mexican indigenous, not the contemporary one present within the context of the Yaqui Indian wars. After a decisive victory over Yaqui scouts and the killing of the Yaqui chief Tetaibate at Bacatete in 1901, the government declared the wars over. Gen. Bernardo Reyes, the governor of Nuevo Leon in 1885–1900 and secretary of war in 1901–3, wrote the following treatise in his autobiography evoking the Aztec past as part of Mexican national military glory. Reyes calls on the imperial Aztec past to illuminate the Mexican national present and domination over Yaquis at the battle at Bacatete: This race is the Aztec race, and one sees it written down in the Anahuac, on a space covered with lakes and trees; one sees it fighting with the towns-
people and organized in an amazing army: but extraordinary men, and covered with iron, invulnerable to the weapons of the aborigines, and that have the fire of the ray (the harquebus and the cannon), they appear in the East, allied with their countless and already vanquished enemies, and they drown their guerrillas in their blood, and they hold the town subjugated, in a lengthy captivity. . . . How Much Blood and what vitality [they need] to bear the terrible, constant disasters! What an Epoch that of our wars is! The battalions that fight and the remainder that is conquered, or that triumphs, the squadrons impassioned by the vertigo of their office, that fall destroyed; the cannon that thunder and are illuminated sinisterly; the banners floating, running while calling for torches, the fields of friends and enemies, troops spouting blood, that look at each other amidst the fire and the smoke; the shine of weapons, the noise of brass, sounds of bugles, and drums, to burn the conquered or conquering flags, such was the apocalyptic picture of our internal fights.\(^6\)

The pomp and circumstance of an imperialist nostalgia for the destroyed Aztec empire of the past informed Reyes's military present; he strategically evokes the dead Indian past and not the living Yaqui one on purpose. Reyes uses the heroes of Aztec battle, albeit anachronistically, as a way to talk about those fighting for the Mexican nation against the Yaqui. In his time, evoking dead Indians as the symbols and future of the Mexican nation would have completely legitimated the Mexican imperial project in the north that required stamping out the Yaqui in their fight for autonomy. Reyes evokes a more or less strategic kind of mestizaje that included obliterating Yaqui dissent. In other words, the dead Aztec as the foundation of the Mexican nation and ideas about military warriors are used by Reyes to create a complete distinction from the savage Yaqui present. He evokes an uninterrupted continuum of empire as Mexican national history by yoking the "men covered in iron" (the Spanish conquistadores) and "the Aztec race." The two clashing empires are the national narrative and locate the victory of Reyes's troops over the Yaqui at Bacatete within a much larger tradition. Aztec history becomes Mexican history and is defined in the erasure of Yaquis from that story.

Yet this empire has its own narratives of haunting, most closely examined by Claudio Lomnitz in his detailed study of death and nationalism in Death and the Idea of Mexico, State, church, local, and cultural practices from the colonial period to the present have made death Mexico's national totem. But relevant to the argument of my book and its critique of national history is Lomnitz's claim that "Mexico is haunted by an entire pantheon of caudillos, who often died at each other's hand."\(^7\) This is crucial to understanding why the Revolution, the Reforma, Independence, the Caste Wars in Yucatán, the French Imperial period, and the end of the Mexican-American war in 1848 are the touchstones of Mexican national imaginaries, whereas Yaqui genocide is actively willed out of the national discourse and history. Focused on such iconic figures as Diaz, Emiliano Zapata, Benito Juárez, Pancho Villa, José María Mordo, Miguel Hidalgo y Costilla, and pre-Columbian heroes like Cuauhtémoc, the national pantheon leaves little room for common Indians like the Yaqui, who existed on the northern periphery of the nation. Yaqui inclusion in the pantheon is not the point; rather, the symbolic power of the pantheon overpowers everything else, like a sponge soaking up the history of violence in the north so completely that it is never seen or heard of again, especially in light of the fact that Yaqui resistance against the Mexican military and government was its own distinct project for national autonomy.

Lomnitz further argues that the national projects around death in Mexico have followed a particular trajectory in the contemporary period, a "syncrasyism in which the pre-Columbian religion is obsessively tracked in the horizon of tradition," minimizing the significance of the archaic or outmoded in traditional practices in favor of an exalted affirmation of the historical depth, and in particular, indigenous roots.\(^8\) Because the pantheon of dead heroes leaves little room for critique or recognition of histories of violence, using mestizaje and indigenous roots as the authenticating discourses of national identity lacks historical credence. The current Mexican national infatuation with pre-Columbian religion as the horizon of truth, argues Lomnitz, "is even more exaggerated among Mexicans in the United States."\(^9\) Although some might read this critique of Mexicans in the United States as one more example of calling Mexicans in America pochos, or imitation Mexicans, Lomnitz cites the resurgence of the pre-Columbian (lo indio/mestizaje) as a new phase of nationalism that gains strength and fervor from a particular imagined past.

Much as Lomnitz criticizes the discourses of historiography and cultural theories about mestizaje, I question the fixed paradigm of resistance as the only mode of life worthy of study, one often linked to the romanticized Indian and mestizo identities of Mexicans and Mexican Americans. How do researchers account for what is rendered unspeakable when resistance is the primary thing talked about in ethnic studies? If resistance is the only legitimate paradigm, how can we possibly understand what compelled Native Americans, Anglos, and Mexicans to participate in violence against others of their own race in the making of borderlands cultures? What is lost when we relegate intraracial, intracultural, and sexual violence to the periphery of
mapping transnational feminist methodologies

Rather than setting nationalism up as a proverbial straw man or suggesting that we live in a uniform, postnationalist moment in Chicana/o studies, I propose that a transnational feminist theoretical approach forces us to pay special attention to the moments when the excessive recursiveness of indigeneismo, mestizaje, and nationalism crop up in an institutionalized fashion. The accounts that follow demonstrate that scholars of Chicano studies (myself included) need to be cognizant of how they are mediating voices, often actively forgetting the ethnic, racial, sexual, and gender-specific histories of those individuals whom they are uncritically reclaiming as foremothers, pioneers, and perceived Indians, assigning these groups a privileged identity position in contemporary discourse (even though the subjects did not imagine themselves in that way), and actually displacing or erasing the history of anyone who does not neatly fit the narrative of resistance to Anglo hegemony. Scholars need to be able to discuss critically and respectfully how and why Mexican and indigenous communities collided in perpetuating violence against each other. I want to account for the long history of racism and elision based on resistance narratives. The four episodes of violence I discuss do not embody the ubiquitous "culture of resistance" that ethnic studies focuses on because the agents in these episodes did not emerge from a place of powerlessness. In fact, I suggest these acts of violence demonstrate moments of complete empowerment. The episodes represented are well-trodden ground for Chicana/o studies scholars for the most part, but those previous accounts celebrate resistance by ignoring key facets of the violence. I describe these misreadings as epistemic violence, a production of knowledge that selectively forgets and remembers some details while forgetting others.

Therby move to a transnational model that complicates the fixed ways in which race is talked about in the contemporary period. By looking to the past, I show that alliances (racial and gender categories of socialization) were and continue to be highly malleable, especially where questions of indigenous identity in the borders are concerned. Following the lead of works by James Brooks, Juliana Barr, Mary Pat Brady, MariaJoséna Saldaña-Porillo, Emma Pérez, and Ned Blackhawk and adopting an interdisciplinary approach, I suggest that women, children, American Indians, Mexican, Mexican Indians, and other migrants were often the power brokers in the conflicts detailed in this book. I thereby try to avoid projecting contemporary ideas about race, gender, and nation onto the past. At the same time, one could view these cycles of violence as a continuation of the social practices of empire that commenced with Spanish colonization of the New World. As Pekka Hamäläinen, James Brooks, and Blackhawk have shown, the Comanche, Apache, Great Basin Ute, and other Native American nations were embroiled in colonial systems of violence and exchange, including trade in captives, livestock, and other forms of property. Brooks tracks ceremonial commemorations as a metaphor for larger enactments of intertwined displays of violence, honor, and gender in systems of exchange in New Mexico. These exchanges created fertile kin networks in which captives were integrated into both Spanish and indigenous communities, often reconstructing families in the wake of violence. Hamäläinen traces similar changes in what eventually became the Comanche Plains empire, especially as it relates to the introduction of horses. Horses made trade and raiding easier and facilitated greater physical mobility. But what distinguishes the Yaqui case is that, unlike the Comanche, Apache, and Ute, they had relatively few native enemies, and horses were never a central part of their economy, except when they used them for food. Unlike the highly nomadic Comanche, Apache, and Ute peoples, the Yaqui did not migrate to the Yaqui Valley. They had remained in the same place ever since the Spaniards made contact with them. Their long-standing land base is essentially what brought them to the attention of the Spanish and later Mexican authorities. Yet the Yaqui quickly became embroiled in what can be called retaliatory cycles of violence that resembled Hamäläinen's, Blackhawk's, and Brooks's characterizations of the exchange systems of the borders and plains. In highlighting the Yaquis and their fight for autonomy, I want to make a space for this project in the larger field of borders and Plains history by showing that the subdued Indians who continued to disrupt U.S. and Mexican imperialisms that Brooks, Blackhawk, and Hamäläinen detail with great precision are not simply a phenomenon of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The Yaqui case extends well into the twentieth, up to the 1990s. These social structures of retaliatory violence found their way into the twentieth-century
cultural practices of both the Yaqui and the Mexican state. In foregrounding this history, I call into question timeless, unshifting ideas about indigenous peoples as singular and authentic that are evoked as part of romantic U.S., Mexican, and Chicano national pasts.

It is the complicity of groups we have come to call people of color in particular kinds of violence motivated by race or gender because it challenges facile deployments of the discourse of resistance/victimization. A transnational methodology allows one to track the movement of goods, individuals, and ideas in a context in which gender, class, sexuality, and race simultaneously operate to contain and command how these things circulate. Situated both discursively and spatially within the context of overlapping imperialisms—where interracial, intraracial, and intracultural violence were and continue to be the ultimate means of containing even the slightest difference—the punishments I discuss are endemic to nations (imagined and real) that are reconsolidating themselves through the acts of their citizens.

Often the destructive capacity of violence is taken out of its historical context and held up as nothing more than “evidence of minority oppression” within nationalist Chicana/o narratives of resistance. 39 We are often left with historical residues that perpetually cast racialized men and women in the role of victims. My engagement with multiple moments in the history of Mexicans, Indians, and Anglos in the U.S.—Mexico borderlands, in all of their discrete subject positions, corrects this paradigm while nevertheless exposing the inherent contradictions and difficulties in writing historiography of individuals who have been represented as political nonstakeholders and who did not always have the ability to represent themselves in the kinds of historical evidence that most scholars would consider valid. I use the tools of historiography, that is, the tracking of the meaning of how history is told; close textual analysis; and feminist and cultural theory as means of exposing not just the physical and psychic violence that individuals experienced but to also show epistemic violence at work. These interdisciplinary methods allow for the examination of the historiography of the four distinct episodes I identified earlier, namely, Josefina/Juanita’s lynching in 1851, the Camp Grant massacre of 1871, racialized violence in South Texas in 1870–1910, and the Yaqui Indian wars of 1880–1910. One might call these case studies of violence against communities in the U.S.—Mexico borderlands. The events are narrated chronologically in order to show the change and continuity in the deployment of violence between 1851 and 1910. I am trying to tell a different kind of story about nation and subjectivity, one that is as attentive to the practices of reading critically as it is to showing how contemporary ideas of the U.S.—Mexico border are divergent. The book moves back and forth between what are separate yet connected geopolitical boundaries, boundaries that are highly contested. As these events attest, the past two hundred years of relations between Mexico and the United States have been marked by violence. In particular, the transnational movement of people, capital, and ideas about difference and power demonstrates that concepts of the nation-state need to be reimagined as being mutually dependent. That is, nations like the United States and Mexico need to be defined and historicized in relation to each other. The nation-state is the “historically contingent form of organizing space in the world,” and although the United States and Mexico are two distinct nations, the historical subjects that emerge from the zones where the two nations meet experience overlapping colonaries. 40 As a result, historically extreme violence has been tolerated and in fact legitimated and reinforced by both nations precisely because of their interlocking colonial legacies.

I chose the four episodes because they represent moments in Chicana/o, U.S., Mexican, American Indian, and Latina/o history that are either extremely well known but misrepresented and deserving of reinterpretation or not known at all. On one hand, these moments of violence are not commensurate with each other, and on the other, the physical violence that occurred is incommensurate with the epistemic violence in their historical recording. The violence in all of the cases is racial and to some degree gendered; these moments were instrumental to the foundation of U.S., Mexican, and Chicano nationalism (though, again, not all of these incidents were visible in all three nationalist imaginaries); and these case studies are particularly important for Chicana/o studies because they challenge traditional methodologies and thematic narratives in the field. These moments are historical flashpoints that reflect how violence remade the borderlands for everyone who inhabited it.

I consider the standard narratives of these historical events, provide archival evidence to dispute the record, and try to articulate what has been lost or forgotten in their retelling. What one ends up with when attempting to smooth over violent histories is an empty symbol of disenfranchisement and nothing more. That is, if the history does not show the subject of inquiry resisting some hegemonic Anglo force or it is not about working-class or proletarian peoples, it is somehow rendered unimportant as a subject of study. Constructing narratives of victimization is intrinsic to the ways in which the historical subject is manipulated to reflect the desires of the critic.
and to some extent all researchers are implicated in this project. The feminist critic Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak calls such processes "a representational space that exists somewhere amid silence, nonexistence" and "a violent a prioria between subject and object status." It would be too simplistic to portray those subject to violence as a majority of racialized, sexualized women and children. The feminist critic Chandra Mohanty notes that "the writing of history (the discursive and representational) is confused with women as historical actors," and thus women as a group have been represented as being universally duped. Scholars need to recognize that there is a place for studying upper-and middle-class subjects in ethnic studies that are not uniformly proletarian and never were or that gender analysis does not equal studying women alone. A feminist reading can help us avoid such traps. Transnational feminism in particular focuses on the intersections of sexuality, sexual violence, gender, and race as processes of making subjects in multiple national contexts simultaneously. My book is also a methodological proposal in the sense that it demonstrates that transnationalism is not limited to the historical present, nor is it an anachronistic mapping of contemporary concerns onto a historical past. Rather, in the nineteenth century transnationalism was an operative concept, although not named as such, and it was visible enough to be both threatening to and yet enabling of nation-building projects.

My use of the term transnational signals a theoretical and historical interest in Spanish and U.S. colonialisms and diasporas, a series of displacements caused by extreme forms of physical and psychic violence; overlapping colonial regimes; and the various ways in which Mexican, Indian, and Anglo peoples collided in these colonial projects. Although I focus on the U.S.-Mexico border as the site where these violent acts occurred as the result of many communities interacting, the same situation may pertain to the Americas more broadly. I use the methods of transnational feminism not to water down and homogenize the different national groups, classes, and gendered identities of the groups of Apache, Karankawa, Kickapoo, Papago, Kiowa, Comanche, Chicanos/as, Anglos, or Mexicans I discuss herein, but rather to reflect how Spanish, Mexican, and U.S. colonialisms had different effects on subjects that were shaped by regional contact or lack thereof, especially as influenced by gender and sexuality. A transnational methodology enables us to see the overlapping historical contingencies that render nations on the same side of a racial divide as well as the different histories of racial ideology that lead to the privileging of different kinds of bodies in different nationalisms and the similarities and differences in the articulation of gender, race, and nation. Such a methodology identifies how we all collude in the selective forgetting of violence against some communities while memorializing and glorifying it against others.

The chapters in this book are unspeakable stories of nation, identity, violence, and citizenship in Mexican, Chicana/o, and U.S. national imaginaries. Because these stories are told in several genres, including historical documents, historical writing, literature, and anthropology, the study requires different modes of analysis. This reveals silences particular to specific disciplines and methods that enact discursive or epistemic violence by selectively forgetting sexual, familial, and racial alliances made through marriage, social practices, and capitalism. Scholarship on the role of violence and the production of subjectivity in a historical perspective focuses on specific types of violence. They have deeply influenced my book; yet I argue that violence is a central category of analysis in and of itself because it is a process of extreme differentiation. Systematic cycles of violence driven by economic anxieties translated into the chronic conflicts of (non)citizen subjects competing for power in overlapping colonial systems. For power, argues David Kazanjian, "...understood as subjection, is reiterative and systematic, but it also repeats itself differently or even fails to repeat, allowing the very systematicity of its system to be exposed and troubled. Reiteration, it should be remembered, necessarily exceeds its normative effects and, consequently, the historicity of the norm."

Starting with the intimate details of Josefa/Juanita's lynching in 1851, my book builds upon research on histories of violence that began with the global forces of U.S. colonization of northern Mexico in the nineteenth century. Josefa/Juanita's narrative foregrounds the ways in which economic displacement, transnational industrialization, colonization, and shifting notions of hierarchies of class, race, and gender and their ensuing violence continue to police the bodies and behaviors of racialized subjects in the borderlands. This lynching suggests that disciplining racialized, sexualized women was acceptable at that nineteenth-century historical moment. I isolate the events (her supposed crime occurred on July 4, 1851; the lynching on July 5) and the fact that she was one of fewer than twenty women in the town to make a larger, symbolic commentary about the status of U.S. Mexican (citizen-)subjects in nineteenth-century California. The contemporary accounts of the hanging express a general sense of discomfort, shock, and horror that people could lynch a woman and also question whether Canon, the man whom Josefa/Juanita stabbed, may have committed sexual violence against her. Over time the focus has shifted from Josefa/Juanita as a historical subject of her own
making to a sensationalized portrayal of the lynching. By examining how critics, historians, and participants have used her story to attain specific political ends, I bring attention to representations of racialized rage, violence, and the body in the context of this lynching and how these representations helped California settlers as liberal citizens of the United States in the nineteenth century and Chicanas/os consolidate their identities as citizens of Aztlán. Tracking how people in that historical moment and the historiography that followed understood disciplinary structures illuminates how capitalist relations of the time were structured around race, class, gender, and sexuality.

Chapter 2 builds on the notions of citizenship, silence, and discipline introduced in the first chapter to consider the joint participation of Mexicans, Papago Indians, and Anglos in the Camp Grant Indian massacre that took place on April 30, 1871, in which 108 Aravaipa and Pinal Apache who had surrendered were slaughtered. I pay special attention to how internalized racism and economic and ethnic alliances influenced subjectivity and concepts of citizenship, for those involved in the massacre. Although a huge body of scholarship in the fields of U.S. and American Indian history focuses on indigenous people’s killing of each other in the service of U.S., Mexican, and Spanish colonial powers, there has been little or no discussion of these events in the context of Chican and Latino studies. The silence surrounding the history of Mexican and Indian participation in genocide against other Indians apparently reflects the power of the resistance paradigm in ethnic studies. The truth is that Mexicans and Indians were not always resisting whites; they often allied with whites against other Indians and Mexicans. This seems to be one reason the history of Camp Grant goes unspoken in Chican studies.

Chapter 3 analyzes another barely audible history of violence in the Texas-Mexican national imaginary of Jovita González, the first Mexican American woman to earn (in 1920) a master’s degree in anthropology at the University of Texas. I theorize González’s archive as a site where power and narrative were and are negotiated because many of the materials were not circulated at all or were circulated only posthumously. González’s papers and publications grapple with corporal punishment, abjection, and racial, gendered, and sexualized violence enacted upon those who held no power in the Texas-Mexican national project—that is, North American Indians, Mexican Indians, African Americans, and Texas-Mexican women and children—yet rely on a middle-class racist perspective that enacts its own violence, only discursively. Countering a history of narratives about great men of Texas, González’s archive mobilizes discourses of gender, race, and class as analytical frameworks to replace a disjointed, skewed past with a more nuanced account of the complex web of violent relations among Anglos, Mexicans, blacks, and Indians in Texas. In the field of Chican/o studies, González’s work has restored historical voice and agency to those she interviewed and those who read her. At the same time, in order to position González as a feminist visionary in the canon, her racism is ignored particularly by feminist scholars, assuming that her racism would be non-feminist. González’s oeuvre demonstrates the limits of gender politics, in that lower-class, racialized subjects are portrayed through her own racist lens.

The second half of the book shifts to the Mexican nation-state, specifically to the Arizona–Sonora border region. Chapter 4explores another unspoken history: the transnational effects of the Yaqui Indian genocide during the Porfirato (1876–1910). Focusing on the Mexican government’s use of violence, sexual force, and deportation as ways of eliminating the alleged Yaqui problem, this chapter examines how U.S. venture capitalists and Mexicanos who had interests in Sonora actively collaborated in a genocidal project of Yaqui extinction. I use little-known archival sources from Mexico to critique how the relationship between indigenous and Mexican/a and Chicana/o peoples—who were linked through transnational political interests, modes of production, and histories of genocide—has been erased from U.S., Chican, and Mexican national histories.

Chapter 5 continues the conversation about the Yaqui genocide by contrasting and comparing official Mexican and U.S. government discourses with a literary intervention staged in Montserrat Fuentes’s novel Dreams of the Centaur. The chapter offers a nuanced, complicated vision of genocide and citizenship as twin transnational projects in the Americas during Mexico’s push for modernization in the late nineteenth century and the early twentieth. These evocations and images put Yaqui subjectivity at the center of the picture and alert historians that this violence was abnormal and pathological and needs to be read, as Laura Briggs argues, “for the way it carries traces of very specific histories of violence.” These texts collectively comment on discipline and violence enacted against tortured, imprisoned bodies because the public displays of discipline communicate how the Mexican national project of modernity was predicated on Yaqui captivity and lack of citizenship.

The postscript points to the tremendous lessons people can learn from Mexican and U.S. discourses on state and local impunities. Somewhat fittingly, the book begins and ends with discussions of lynching and public displays of violence and the impunity they represent. Although not explicitly
situated on U.S. soil, the concept of impunity helps articulate racialized, sexualized, and gendered violence in the contemporary period as part of a larger transnational continuum.

Jesúas/Juanita’s lynching, the Camp Grant massacre, and the Yaqui genocide were not anticolonial moments of solidarity among Mexicans, Anglos, and various Indian groups. Those whom we would now consider members of colonized, oppressed, and ethnically heterogeneous communities produced inequities by aligning themselves with the states and economies they were a part of. These moments afford vivid examples of temporary Anglo, Mexican, and indigenous enfranchisement through acts of violence and often of genocide. By effectively policing the citizenship of others with violence, eventual marginalized populations were temporarily or symbolically enfranchised.

There is a special grammar of violence in each specific instance, and I use it as diagnostic of the grammar of the whole (violent) set of Anglo, Mexican, and indigenous relationships on the border. Each incident reveals the whole history of violence in which it is embedded. Yet we can achieve this reading only through a critical self-reflexivity in which we implicate ourselves in the power dynamics of social and cultural practices. Creating solidarity ultimately requires admitting our mistakes, taking responsibility for them, and moving forward. This transnational turn to deconstruct subjects as being simultaneously of and not of U.S. and Mexican imperial projects of nation and to analyze how these identities are socially produced creates a more nuanced history that is accountable to politics. Such a method avoids co-opting the historical subjects in this book in the name of nationalism and allows their history to be considered in their own contexts, leading us to contemplate the unspeakable losses and the reasons they are unspeakable.