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The Garifuna are a diasporic community that positions Yurumein (St. Vincent) at the center of its collective memory, and whose populations primarily reside in Belize, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, and, more recently, in urban centers in the United States. This multi-sited, historio-ethnographic study traces the group's socio-political struggles over time and space against cultural dislocation, ethnic oppression, and culturally destructive forces. It highlights how this population's core principles and forms, Garifunadúaü ("Garifunaness," or the "Garifuna way"), and particularly its central tenet of reciprocity "Ai bu, Amürü Nu" (roughly translated as "me for you and you for me"), functions on multiple levels within the contemporary context of transnational circulation and global power. Garifunadúaü is expressed in rituals, performing arts, and grassroots organizing, where external hegemonic beliefs meet counter-hegemonic practices, and become reconfigured by Garifuna social agents at the local level. Garifuna also participate in formal and informal information-sharing networks that span the full extent of their ethnoscape. Methodologically, the study draws from the work of James Scott, Clifford Geertz, Victor Turner, Stephen Duncombe, Hollander and Einwohner to suggest that Garifuna resistance, though present in everyday practice and discourse, is only subtly observable through a positioned ethnographic lens, which in this case offers unique vantagepoints given the author's own self-identification as a active member of this diasporic community.
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CHAPTER 1:
INTRODUCTION

In the past few years there has been growing awareness of a little known group of immigrants to the United States from Central America who identify themselves as Garifuna (also known as Garinagu, and formerly referred to as the "Black Caribs"). They come from a variety of sending nations that include Belize, Honduras, and Guatemala. Their efforts to maintain their cultural connectivity to Garifuna identity within the American context have not gone completely unnoticed in both national and local publications. For example, they have been framed as struggling ethnic and racial group in a full color story appearing in National Geographic (2001), in a Cultural Survival Quarterly segment (1998) about teaching Garifuna heritage in Boston Schools, and in a Los Angeles Times article on Garifuna efforts at cultural retention (1998). On a smaller, local level, they have been presented as a colorful local culture in stories found in El Diario: La Prensa (New York), which featured Garifuna food and culture in their "comida" section (2002), in a New York Newsday article that glossed the Garifuna of Roatan, Honduras while discussing family travel in its Travel Journal section (2003), and in brief discussion in Urban Latino (2001). They also have occasionally surfaced from relative obscurity through involvement in a national event, as was the case in coverage of the 1995 Happyland tragedy in the South Bronx (Bromley 1997; O' Shaughnessy 2007).

I have found a variety of issues taken up by Garifuna communities that indicate that such media awareness is not incidental, and it provides glimpses of Garifuna agency and practice. The culture has, whether consciously or not, actively preserved something of their past in the present that some authors have found worthy of documentation. As a
whole, my ethnographic fieldwork in the Garifuna communities of Dangriga, Belize, and Orinoco, Nicaragua, elucidated (what I had always understood as) a connectedness in the movement to preserve their Garifuna ways. I now recognize this as Garifunaduáü—Garifuna cultural knowledge and practices.

In the diaspora, central to Garifunaduáü is the support offered across national boundaries, both to and from Garifuna communities. This is shown, for example, by transnational coalitions bringing together local, non-governmental organizations representing Belize, Honduras, Guatemala, and Nicaragua in support of Garifuna language instruction in schools. Jessie Castillo has taught Garifuna language in Dangriga schools, Linda Castillo has provided instruction in the Garifuna language to youths in her Dangriga hometown, in Orinoco, Nicaragua (2000), and in St. Vincent, Yurumein (2007). Another example of transnational efforts includes Belizean Garinagu participation at the Garifuna Heritage Foundation's Carib Conference in St. Vincent, West Indies, in February 2002, which brought together Kalinagu and Garinagu descendants from various Eastern Caribbean islands and from Central America. The establishment of the World Garifuna Organization (WGO) and the Buyei (spiritual leader) Juan Lambey Institute are additional examples from Belize. Community forums have also brought together educators, community leaders and Garinagu from all over the U.S. to discuss empowerment and Garifunaduáü regardless of their country of origin. Garifuna Community Forums organized by the Los Angeles-based Garifuna American Heritage Foundation (GAFU Inc.) were held in Los Angeles in 2004 and 2005, and most recently in New York City (2007 and 2008). The 2009 and 2010 forums returned to California. At
present, GAFU streams live Garifuna language and drumming classes over the internet weekly.

When taken collectively, all of the above represent participations, formations, and affiliations that signify actions, practices, and agency that the Garifuna in diaspora orchestrate to preserve and advance Garifuna knowledge and culture. Garifunaduaü in diaspora provides a way forward, as well as a forum and cultural space for the culture, language, and spirituality to be cultivated.¹ The perseverance of the Garifuna to date against large odds is testament to their sustained drive towards cultural survival and their participation in globalization as Garifuna. Yet this participation is complex, and constantly raises questions, for both the Garifuna and those interested in their struggles, about the volition of cultural loss and levels of complicity with domains of power.

Why does the previously mentioned media attention document only the tip of the proverbial iceberg? Much more exists below the waterline. The Garifuna have been actively involved in the preservation of their verbal and material culture for centuries. During the full historical extent in diaspora, their efforts have taken many forms, and occurred simultaneously within a variety of local, national, international and more recently internet-based contexts. But on the whole scholarship on the Garifuna has underestimated, skirted, or overlooked the possibility of (conscious or unconscious) resistance. A goal of this dissertation is develop an understanding of Garifunaduaü as a multilayered, multivocal form of resistive practice that counters powerful pressures

¹ This has not been without complications and/ or challenges; see also "Regional differences hold up creation of Garifuna alphabet," *Honduras this Week*, Monday, March 28, 1998 Online Edition 99. http://www.marrder.com/htw/mar98/cultural.htm.
towards Western conformity that come packaged in with globalization and in the context of transnational processes and flows. To this end, this dissertation is a multi-sited ethnographic study of the cultural survival, resistance, and resurgence of the Garifuna as an important diasporic community contending with contemporary forces of dislocation and opportunity. My goal in part is to reconstruct the Garifuna story of struggle, survival, and their responses in diaspora to globalizing processes in terms of Garifunaduáü (also glossed in this work as Garifunaness or the Garifuna way).

My research establishes that the Garifuna, as disempowered citizens of Belize, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua, engaged in a socio-political struggle against the ethnic oppression and cultural destruction they face. They respond by asserting their Garifunaness through rituals, performing arts groups and grassroots organizing. In this process, external hegemonic beliefs meet counter-hegemonic ideologies, and become reconfigured by social agents at the local level, yet also participating in formal and informal information sharing networks that exchange information along the ethnoscape that links the local villages on the Central American Atlantic coast, and extend to Garifuna communities in the poorest of neighborhoods in major cities that span the United States.

In particular, this study highlights how principles and forms of Garifunaduáü, such as its central tenet of reciprocity (roughly translated as "me for you and you for me") function on multiple levels within the contemporary context of transnational circulation and global power, and how Garifunaduáü, easily missed in everyday practice and discourse, is only subtly observable through a positioned ethnographic lens. Through this
lens, Garifunaduáü functions as the Garinagu’s bridge and resource for resistance, cultural survival, cultural continuity, and community expression.

1.1. Background

The Garifuna, a hybrid group, are descendants of Carib-Arawak Indigenes who migrated from South America to the Antilles, later merged with Africans, and subsequently incorporated escaped Africans among their ranks. Yurumein, their capital in the Lesser Antilles, is what Europeans later named St. Vincent. There the Black Caribs carried out a long history of armed resistance to European encroachments on their islands (Marshall 1973; Adams 1996; Beckles 1992; Atanda 1993).

After many skirmishes, British colonial forces laid claim to Yurumein, resulting in wars between the two nations. The Garifuna successfully defended their island territory in the first Carib War, but were routed in the second. In 1797, the British exiled the Garifuna from their native island home, a precaution taken to ensure no further rebellion. Some 5,000 Garifuna were displaced, forcibly transported in seven ships to Roatan, one of the Bay Islands off the coast of Honduras. The British hoped that a Garifuna presence on Roatan would thwart Spanish attacks on British settlements in the area (Gonzalez 1990:30-33). Fewer than 3,000 of the 5,000 Garifuna arrived on the twelfth day of April, 1797. Nearly half had perished from disease, starvation and harsh conditions en route. However, many of the surviving Garifuna quickly made their way from Roatan to the Central American mainland. There they established communities along the Caribbean coasts of present-day Honduras, Guatemala, Belize, and Nicaragua.
In each of these diasporic migrations to Central America, the Garifuna endured oppression and marginalization. They became merely sources of cheap labor for national interests in the expanding global economy (Moberg 1992).

Though their work in temporary waged-employment in forestry, soldiering, and agricultural labor earned them a reputation as hard workers, they remained exiles, excluded from participating centrally in society (J. Palacio 1992). Government denials of their rights to land titles in the nineteenth century ultimately forced the Garifuna from virtual independence to subjugation and repression. As a racialized minority group, they were denied socio-political access, inclusion, and economic self-determination. Religious persecution and an assimilationist colonial education have also contributed to the peripheralization and despair that characterize much of the Garifuna experience in Central America. As demand for their labor held steady, economic crises, tensions from competing Mikito labor, and racist segmentation provided an impetus for further migration, significantly, to the U.S. The migration paths of the Garifuna diaspora are shown here:

In time, the Garifuna would migrate to major urban centers in the U.S., including New York, New Orleans, Houston, and Los Angeles. Garifuna emigration to the U.S. began as early as 1940s (Straughan 2007). Many more left Central America in the 1950s and 1960s. These early migrants entered as merchant marines, others as shipboard stowaways to the United States (M. Palacio 2002, England 2006). Women arrived in the US for employment opportunities as nannies and home attendants (England 2006). Emigration for the Garifuna has further intensified during the last two decades, changing from temporary settlement for employment (Lisurnia) to permanent settlements (M. Palacio 2002).

---

Today, not holding titles to lands they have occupied for more than 200 years has made the Garifuna easy prey for international conglomerates that seek Caribbean shores for a burgeoning tourist hotel and resort industry. Increasingly, Garifuna lives and livelihoods have been lost in this continuing struggle (Cal 1991; Bolland 1988; Wilk & Chapin 1989; Hadel 1972; Gonzalez 1990; Kirtsoglou and Theodossopoulous 2004; Ryan 2008).

Self Positioning in the Analysis

I am myself Garifuna, and so this work represents my own attempt at a non-innocent self-positioning within the Garinagu (plural of Garifuna). It is not a matter of happenstance that the Garifuna endure. My marginal positioning within and within the Garifuna culture—as a Garifuna in diaspora, as a son of a Garifuna spiritual leader, and as a trained anthropologist—has had important implications for an ability to develop a theory of Garifuna resistance and for my involvement in Garifuna struggles.

I name a vision and comprehension of cultural resistance accessible from an outsider status within the diaspora positional resistance. It is both a lens and a vehicle of cultural resistance, collectively countering those features of global capitalism deemed harmful or destructive to the very groundings of a people, revealed by multilevel comparative interpretations of symbolic behavior inextricably linked to a position in the Garifuna diaspora. Positional resistance stems from a symbolic interpretive approach of combining the theory and methodology of Turner's positional analysis of symbolic action with Geertz's thick description. I combine with these my recognition that resistance to globalization's westernizing, hegemonic and oppressive features is not always outwardly
articulated or demonstrated, and rightfully so. From my vantage point, positional resistance speaks to observed practices that counter domination, which I as researcher interpret. It can yield alternatives to socio-economic status quo through interpretations of that which is embedded in those cultural understandings, actions or performances that serve as texts for interpretation. These often go unnoticed by the targets of resistance, operate below the consciousness of the actors themselves, and additionally are not always recognized by researchers (Hollander and Einwohner 2004, 543).

Anthropologists from the margins are uniquely positioned to recognize such layers of relevance. As such they can "enrich – as well as complicate – anthropological analysis" (Harrison and Harrison 1999, 1). In doing so, they contribute to the liberating or decolonizing of the field (Rosaldo 1993, 189; Jones 1995, 68; Gordon 1997, 155; Albera 1998, 449; Benavides 2004, 173; Knauf 1996 and 2006, 409; Harrison 2008, 17-18 and 39; Jacobs-Huey 2002; Hollander and Einwohner 2004, 543; and Ribeiro 2006).

Global regimes attempt daily to snuff out Garifunaduáü. In response, traditional elders encourage the activation of Garifunaduáü as the very tool necessary to survive as Garinagu, and as the compass for thriving as self-determined contributing participants in the forging of a more democratic global community. What results is my anthropological attempt to understand globalization as not only a process of change and domination, but also one in which African and indigenous peoples can be culturally motivated to define their resistance; this is necessary if the world is to attain a more inclusive social system. As such, I believe my work offers a new perspective on the anthropological discourse on globalization.
Relevant Works in Garifuna Studies

Anthropological research on the Garifuna of Nicaragua is extremely limited. Of significance here is cultural geographer William Davidson's (1980) ethnohistorical account on the Garifuna of Nicaragua which establishes the community as a possible example of language death. Barrett (1992) offers a medical anthropological approach to the herbal and spiritual contributions of the walagayu, known as the dügü elsewhere in the diaspora, to Garifuna health and wellness as part of a larger study of wellness, illness and healing practices and pharmacopeia on the Atlantic coast. By way of ethnomusicology, Suco Campos (1987) examines music of the walagayu, while Idiaquez's (1997) study of the Walagayu rite focuses on the Garifuna cosmology of which it is part. These studies are additionally interpretive approaches to the ritual and the Nicaraguan enclave itself. Obando et al. (1999) provide historical and ethnographic data on the Orinoco community and include contributions from local Garinagu themselves. While each establishes the ritual's importance and acknowledges a significant decline in its practice, only the latter addresses efforts to rescue the rite and reverse the decline of the culture.

Relevant studies on the Garifuna of southern Belize are more numerous. They include Douglas Taylor's (1967) interpretive study of Garifuna song genres and texts; England's (2001) and Anderson's (2000) studies on race, identity and diaspora; and Greene's (1999) and Flores' (2001) work on Garifuna spirituality in Belize. The latter in particular evidences the dialectical tension that exists between the dominant culture's Western theology and values and the ideologies and values elevated in the Garifuna dügü healing rite. Johnson's (2005 and 2007) multi-sited research investigates Garifuna religion across
what he refers to as *diasporic horizons* and its intersections with other indigenous
religions, particularly Brazilian Candomble. Palacio's (2005) publication is an important
compilation of essays that provides historical and contemporary insights into Garifuna
oral histories, inter-ethnic and colonial relations, spirituality, gender, and the historical
social actions that gave rise to UNESCO's 2001 proclamation of the Garifuna language,
music, and dance as masterpieces of the oral and intangible heritage of humanity. It
declared the Garifuna to be a "nation," a people, transgressing national boundaries.

Wilcox's study on Garifuna identity and self representation in Dangriga demonstrates
how cultural symbols, institutions, and activities like the Garifuna flag, local monuments,
the local museum, community beautification programs, and the November Settlement
Day celebrations⁴ offer counter narratives to colonial histories and interests by
embedding identity into the landscape. As such, these spaces can be understood as
performances and sites of the Garifuna cultural resurgence and resistance (2006, 27-29:
85-86). Ruiz (2008) has conducted research in Corozal, Honduras on endangered
language and Garifuna cultural practices that contribute to preservation efforts by way of
their extended family social structure. This research demonstrates a turn in the attitudes
and practices of adolescents toward speaking the heritage language as their primary

---

⁴ At 36 years of age, Thomas Vincent Ramos, originally of Honduras, founded the Carib Development
Society (CDS) in Dangriga, Belize in 1924, and organized the first November 19th celebrations in 1941 as
"Disembarkation Day Celebrations" (A. Ramos 2000, 15). T.V. Ramos is described as one of the earliest
Garifuna supporters of Marcus Garvey's Universal Negro Improvement Association (UNIA) that was
widespread throughout South and Central America, the Caribbean and the US during the 1920s and 1930s
(A. Ramos 2000, 3). Ramos' vision for Garinagu socio-cultural uplift may have been informed by UNIA
practices and methods opposed to colonial conditions of Africans in diaspora. UNIA Chapters that
promoted unity, organization, beauty of and pride in Blackness, Black nationalism, and self-sufficiency
language, as well as an accompanying self pride and esteem towards identity and cultural survival.


Gonzalez writes that their roots were destroyed by the forces that drive an increasingly global economy. For Gonzalez, this makes the Garifuna African-American as opposed to Afro-Amerindian. In her opinion, the revitalization movement she observed among the Garifuna in New York City represented imminent Garifuna acculturation. Such movements are, as she puts it, the stamp of a culture's demise (Gonzalez 1979). This study of Garifuna resistance will only briefly treat the Garifuna in the US; they both inform and are informed by their Garifuna cousins in the Central American contexts under investigation in this dissertation. I see revitalization as a form of cultural resistance; I theorize it as such in this dissertation, under the concept of positional resistance.

The research of Sr. Dr. Barbara Flores (2001), a Garifuna and a Catholic nun with the Sisters of Charity, brings out the existence of dialectical tensions in the ritual between Garifunas' Catholic Christian faith and their indigenous spirituality, recognizing that dügü
offers a site of, a space for, resistance to the dominating worldview of the former. Flores (2002,168) writes that dügü serves as "an essential element of the Garinagu historical resistance to colonization, from the original homeland of St. Vincent to the present day, has been the safeguarding of the dügü as a space of Garifuna freedom, subverting their oppressors… as the Garinagu ward off the evils of oppression and potential erasure."

Flores opens the dialogue of agency, empowerment, and resistance that influences my own research. I argue that her position as a practicing Garifuna, nun, and researcher allows for her interpretation here of the dügü as not only preserved and enacted for appeasing malevolent ancestral spirits but also as a culturally-based resistive form for warding off oppressive societal forces. My study will demonstrate that the Garifuna are social actors, insisting on social equality and inclusion while resisting the oppression, marginalization, and potential cultural annihilation effect characteristic of the very global system in which they seek participation.

1.2. Theoretical and Methodological Underpinnings of the Work

I employ a symbolicist-interpretivist approach, combining theories offered by Geertz and Turner that recognize the public nature of culture and the Garifuna symbolic systems that articulate Garifuna "world" knowledge and social action. The concepts of globalization and diaspora are central to my approach, as each recognizes local change as partly a manifestation of participations in and responses to international processes occurring through time and across space. Additionally, each concept aids in articulating

---

5 In her study of Belizean Garifuna, Stanford (1974) posed a similar consideration suggesting that revitalization movements evidence a social groupings completed acculturation.
the socio-cultural and economic opportunities and challenges the Garifuna must navigate as marginalized ethnic minorities living in the marginal environs of each of the nation-states they now call "home." These include both the Atlantic Coast ethnoscape of Belize, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua, with their African descended coastal peoples (Appadurai 2006), and the inner-city neighborhoods of Los Angeles, Chicago, New York and Boston.

**Historical Analysis**

Previous studies of Garifuna history and culture have been defined in varying Western categories of analysis, within the fields of archeology, biology, medicine, linguistics, geography, music, dance, religion, folklore, and ethnicity. Consequently, Garifuna resistance to globalization, which fits none of these categories well, has not been adequately considered.

One goal of this work is an historical reconstruction of periods in the Garifuna trajectory to elucidate the longstanding presence of Garifunaduái. Palacio (2005) offers three periods to chart the Garifuna historical trajectory. The first period spans migration to the Eastern Caribbean from South America and includes their settlements and eventual displacement by the British. The second period begins with their arrival at Roatan Island, and extends through their subsequent settlement along the Caribbean coastline of Central America from the late 1800s until the 1960s. Palacio's third period extends from the 1960s to the present.
Participant Observation

Participant observation was my primary method for obtaining data during my ethnographic fieldwork. My participant observations were organized around two classifications: occasions where I was a "participating observer," and others where I was an "observing participant." The emphasis in each category is placed on the second word in each phrase, thereby identifying my role as an observer, as in the first example, or as a participant as in the second. Each category, but more so the latter, provided the most viable opportunities for me to get at the many texts and transcripts necessary for thick description and the profound understanding it affords (Denzin and Lincoln 2007). By way of the relationships developed via these observant participations, I was able to organize and conduct informal interviews with Garifuna spiritualists, teachers, performers and influential grassroots and NGO leaders. Informal interviews were used to supplement this method because as an interpretivist I am in search of original texts that reveal categories that are defined by the people themselves; strictly formal interviews or surveys may have undermined such categories.

Given the theoretical issues I have defined above, my methodology also includes Geertz's thick description and Turner's exegetical, operational, and positional categories with which to analyze symbols and symbolic action (Geertz 1973, Turner 1967, 1968).

Comparative Data Analysis

An additional methodology I am employing is the application of a comparative framework to my data. I have obtained evidence on the subject of Garifunaduái from ethnographical sketches of ritual, folk groups, performing groups, and their NGOs in the diasporic locations of Nicaragua, Belize, and the US. The Garifuna are a nation of people
extending across international borders; they share historical traditions of Arawakan based language, ancestral veneration and rituals, and the emergence of folk performance groups and grassroots organizations based upon a shared culture, history of oppression, and desire to alleviate marginalization. In each site, I have accessed ideologies of participation in an oppressive system, and contesting of it, both through interpretations of Garifuna symbolic action and through living and preserving old and new local manifestations of Garifunaduää at these peripheral sites. This dissertation thereby expounds Garifuna meaning-making and intra-ethnic variance with regard to socio-cultural change (adaptation) and contestation within the context of the micro-histories of diasporic communities managing under powerful national interests.

1.3. Field Work

Fieldwork in this multisided study was conducted at several sites as summarized below. For ethnographic detail that supplements that incorporated in the main body of this work, see Appendix A: Ethnographic Supplement – Garinagu Diaspora in Nicaragua, Appendix B: Ethnographic Supplement – Garinagu Diaspora in Belize, and Appendix C: Ethnographic Supplement – Garinagu Diaspora in the United States.

Nicaragua

I have conducted ethnographic fieldwork in the Southern Autonomous Region on the Atlantic Coast of Nicaragua. My research was centered on the Garifuna village of Orinoco (pop. 1, 500) and the city of Bluefields (pop. 45,000) where approximately fifty Garifuna families reside. My field work extended from January to June 1999, and also
included two-week stays in November 2000, December 2002, and June 2007 and a three-
week stay in October 2008.

**Belize**

I have also conducted ethnographic fieldwork in Dangriga Town during the following
1995, and Jun to Aug 1999. I resided in Dangriga, Belize from September 2001 to August
2003. I returned in June 2008 to complete my research regarding Garifunaduää.

**United States**

In the USA Garifuna live in urban inner-city environments that often lack sufficient
socio-economic investment, as crime, drugs and urban blight are common. But it is here
that the Garifuna seek the promise of a better socio-economic future (Gonzalez 1979;
Palacio 1992; Mattei and Smith 1998). Grassroots organizations such as The United
Garifuna Association (UGA) and the Garifuna Coalition U.S.A , Inc. in New York City
and the Garifuna American Heritage Foundation United (GAFHU) in Los Angeles, and
folk-performance groups including the Afro-Garifuna Ensemble (NYC) or Wagucha
Garifuna (Boston), also serve as sources of ethnographic data on the diaspora and inform
the *positional resistance* analysis that forms the thesis of this dissertation.

**A Personal and Professional Path in the Garinagu Diaspora**

My rationale in selecting my primary and secondary sites stems from my family's
migration from Dangriga, Belize, to the Bronx, New York. This history has powerfully
impacted my worldview. I have seen efforts to promote traditional cultural values while
seeking America's promise in its inner city environs. Yet ignorance regarding the
Garifuna diaspora and struggle has made the promotion of cultural values difficult. I vividly recall the confusion among my teachers in primary school in the Bronx when I arrived at school dressed in national attire instead of my primary school uniform to commemorate Garifuna Settlement Day on November 19th. The school tried of foster cultural pride by allowing, for example, Puerto Ricans, Dominicans, and Hondurans to celebrate their heritage independence days by substituting cultural attire for school uniforms, but, dutifully following my parent's instructions, I dressed in a manner that merely turned heads, given that so few, teachers included, were familiar with Belize and Garinagu culture. Classmates, friends, and teachers knew nothing about the history, the culture, and resistance struggles. While these were stressed in my home, they were dismissed by omission from my schooling.

Nicaragua was selected as the primary part of this study because we in New York and Belize knew that Garifuna lived in Nicaragua, but knew little about them. Even as an academic I find few sources on the Garifuna of Nicaragua. This led to my personal and academic inquiry regarding their linguistic, socio-economic, and political condition in diaspora in the wake of ever penetrating global process that present opportunities as well as challenges. Because Dr. Robert Carmack conducted an Anthropology field methods course in Masaya, Nicaragua, and because Baba, my father, who was an internationally known Buyei, was able to connect me to our extended community on the Atlantic Coast, this site was both personally desirable and logistically feasible. The data obtained during my time in the field, across these diasporic sites, take the material form of 165 digital field recordings, 42 audio cassette field recordings, 22 microcassettes containing field recordings, approximately 110 hours of video recordings, and 27 field notebooks.
My initial goal in Nicaragua was to record as much as possible from the recognized knowledge holders of Garifuna traditions. Examples include ritual activity, folk song, music and dance, political structure, economic activity, religion or cosmology, education, and whatever the community dwellers themselves brought to my attention by way of their words and practices. I gave all informants my word that their views would be relayed with complete anonymity to protect the identity of the living and to insure their comfort in speaking freely without fear of later public attack or criticisms for their views. In this dissertation, I will use the names of those who are now deceased to honor them and their contribution to this work, as well as the names of those who allowed it. I will use pseudonyms for those who must remain clandestine. While my word was sufficient to obtain their participation, I must contextualize it as part of my field methodology which itself stems from Garifunaduaü. Santiago Ruiz (2008, 63), himself Garifuna and a cultural anthropologist, correctly states in his study of language preservation strategies among the Garifuna of Honduras:

In the Garifuna cultural framework, people are assured that their rights are protected in a particular research, for instance, if they know the parents or grandparents of the researchers, or if they at least know the family and personal background of the researcher's primary contact person in the village.

My father's renown as a spiritualist strengthened the community's trust in me. My primary contact person in the village was Kensy Sambola, a direct descendent of a Garifuna chief and founding father of the village of Orinoco, Laguna de Perlas, Nicaragua. As the leader of the Garifuna community in Nicaragua, Sambola requested that I share my knowledge of Garifuna culture with the community, as they were engaged in cultural rescue. My father confirmed that I was capable of assisting in this manner. In
return, community members agreed to assist me with room, board, and information for my study. In the following years, my father visited Nicaragua twice to assist in the Cultural Rescue process. Representatives from the Nicaraguan Garifuna community visited Belize to continue the rescue process and to participate in conferences and encounters hosted there. These visits strengthened the networks of the known and familiar that gave credence to me as a community member and therefore a person to be trusted. "Welcome home" was common upon my return visits; it was followed by questions about members, mutual friends, and acquaintances, and with stories of their most recent contacts and experiences.

As I stated earlier, I used loosely structured or informal interviews to allow consultants an opportunity to take the conversation where they chose. This produced a general overlap in the insights and ideas obtained from consultant to consultant and from community to community, which helped to insure accuracy in accounts. Often different persons in differing Garifuna communities in Nicaragua told different stories. Their collective insights and experiences offer different aspects of their life. Once they became comfortable, they provided the oral history of this Garifuna community that they wanted to share and to have included in this project.

My experiences in Dangriga, Belize, and among Garinagu in New York allowed me to discuss with some elders in Nicaragua topics that local Garifuna could, or would not, participate in. This occurred because I was able to converse in Garifuna, and I had participated in dügü or walagayu rituals. I also had an understanding of gubida and other spirits in the Garifuna pantheon and could discuss this topic as well.
In addition, and most significant for my case and methodology, was my ability to share and perform Garifuna songs and drum styles. I took my \textit{primero (garawon)} (Garifuna first drum) everywhere I went while in the field.\footnote{I had constructed the drum with my father in Dangriga circa 1992. We cut the trunk of a mango tree from our yard at \textit{Promised Land}. Simon "Yau Sei" Arana was involved in helping to cut down and mark the trunk. Austin Rodriguez, drum maker, was helpful in making the holes at the base of the drum used to lace the strings used to hold down the drum's head and for tuning. My father sent me to him after he and \textit{Yau Sei} had taken me as far as they could with the drum's construction.} It allowed me to further develop my skills in Garifuna drumming, which I had casually practiced for some time in Belize and in the U.S. In addition, drumming helped to bring back local memories of \textit{walagallo} that had been dormant for years in some of my consultants. My drumming opened doors for me to seek answers, while sharing cultural experiences with elders who recalled the rite as increasingly a thing of the past. Strict questioning would not have produced the personal story exchanges that resulted, whether about facts or about creative fiction based upon stories told and retold for a century. The meta-narrative of the visual and physical responses of consultants to the drum when I played it, or in some cases when they played it themselves, told a story that was an important layer in the phenomena I was trying to reveal.\footnote{Reminiscent of the experiences of the return migrant from the US, a musician, to his home village in the Garifuna novel \textit{Tumba Le} (1977) by Garifuna author Don Justo (1918-1994).}

For example, my primary consultant on our earliest encounters would shift our conversation away from the topic of \textit{walagayu}, telling me to come back another day for that. Other times, he would instruct me to sing and play my drum. Sometimes he would translate these songs aloud, sometimes even calling other people over to hear me sing and...
drum: "come hear this boy from Honduras, man, fella know he thing." But when he was satisfied, he started to share songs of his own that he learned from his old people. He shared, "them learn me this songs... my old people them." He, and subsequently a brother and sister of his, would supply the bulk of the Garifuna ritual song texts I collected in Nicaragua. My father notwithstanding, I had to demonstrate, that is to earn, my own access to aspects of Garifunadúaü to create a safe space in which we could together stimulate interest in examining cultural elements that had attracted persecution from outsiders in years past. My primary consultant recommended me to others as "coming from a good family" before he ever met my father. He knew my father's reputation, and would later meet him, but my knowledge and experiences helped to validate me and the legitimacy of my quest. My primary consultant became a surrogate grandfather to me. Upon returning home I learned from my father of the blood ties that made my consultant and his family our relatives. The walagayu drumming and song memories that my Nicaraguan family were steeped in enabled me to ask questions about the role of Western religions and governmental practices in the time of the stories, with them and with others.

While my interviews were generally loosely structured, in the city of Bluefields I structured when and where they occurred. I followed a set line of questioning here because city dwellers have a faster lifestyle with more options outside of their home than cuenca residents. City interviews were more often scheduled and time was more limited than the "stop in anytime" interviews of the lagoon area. Fewer persons here told

_______________________________

8 I was oftentimes referred to as a Honduran in those early days because of the infrequency with which locals had interaction with Belizeans. I additionally believe that their history of having migrated from Honduras where their direct forebears came from and the Garifuna are plentiful aided in this early misconception.
Garifuna tales or sang Garifuna songs, although Bluefields was the headquarters of the Garifuna "movement." This was led by the Organización Afro-Garifuna Nicaragüense (OAGANIC), for which Sambola would eventually become the leading figure. The Garifuna headquarters was in Bluefields because Orinoco lacked access to phone or fax, and had limited electricity. The relatively formally educated and economically successful Garinagu lived here, having left their villages to gain employment, but still sending money home and returning to the home village intermittently. The data collected here about childhood experiences in the cuenca gave me a view of what the Garifuna sending communities were like, including cultural change and continuity, insights on their treatment by ethnic neighbors, and the rise and work of the Garifuna organization itself.

In all, I have collected texts from the diasporic communities outlined above provided by a spiritual leader, traditional knowledge-bearers, master craftspersons, local elders, and the membership of grassroots/non-governmental organizations, such as the NGC, AAGANIC, and GAHFU. I have additionally consulted with Garifuna politicians including a former Minister of Education, a Chief Education Officer in the government of Belize; Garifunas seeking political office in the NY State Assembly; and another who ran for the post of Vice Alcalde in Bluefields, Nicaragua. I include data obtained from musicians and performing artists across each of the diasporic contexts under study. Lastly, school teachers who recently served as Garifuna language instructors in Los Angeles, Belize and St. Vincent, and the primary school of Orinoco, Nicaragua, have also

______________________________

9 Electricity was available in the evenings from 4:30PM to 9PM when the village generator was
served as field consultants with valuable contributions to the interpretations offered in this work. The interactions and the explorations with each not only assisted me with interpretive data for this dissertation but also aided my own personal development both as an anthropologist and as a Garifuna and Belizean in diaspora, as I learned about community challenges, opportunities, and the accompanying responsibilities. Therein lies another thread that connects me to the Nicaragua community. In many ways, I am them and they are me, facing parallel and yet divergent challenges in the Garifuna diaspora. Through this process we learned a lot about ourselves and each other.

My time among them, whether physically, emotionally, intellectually, spiritually, reflectively, or via cyberspace, has aided in my personal and intellectual growth and development and help to solidify my personal and professional roles and goals. Foremost is that success need not mean cultural abandonment. An important outcome resulting from my differing but mutually informative approaches is that even with my western education, modest material accumulation and access to travel, Garifunaduáü is not an obstacle, but a key component of my academic research and success. Garifunaduáü is reconfigured as valuable in academia, as is the work for socio-economic uplift based upon knowledge they have protected and guarded so that the community could reach to the present. Together, as a community, we moved drumming to the heart of the classrooms, bringing the drums and songs to the primary school of Orinoco and into participations and presentations at the Bluefields Indian and Caribbean University (BICU) and the University of the Autonomous Regions of the Caribbean Coast of working and there was sufficient diesel to fuel it. Many many nights we went without.
Nicaragua (URACCAN). More could be done, but considering the *rescate* work that preceded my fieldwork, and that which followed, coupled with the context of intercultural and bilingual education that has developed on the coast up to the present, I cannot overstate the influence that my participation as a Garifuna had on a community seeking to "rescue" their culture. Perhaps my modest success in this process helps to make their effort both possible and plausible. Even modest success paves the way for the greater success of subsequent generations.

1.4. Organization of this Dissertation

**Chapter One** (this chapter) introduces the primary argument of the work, describes its theoretical and methodological approaches, and summarizes the field work undertaken.

**Chapter Two** develops the particular understandings of diaspora, transnationalism, and globalization as part of my theoretical framework, presenting contemporary philosophies on the study of diasporas and global processes, and my own adaptation and application to the Garinagu.

**Chapter Three** is a consideration of resistance theory. Here, I present an in-depth global survey of cultural resistance, which is the main theoretical thrust of this dissertation, and further elaborate on what I introduced above as *positional resistance*.

---

10 Acronym taken from the Spanish.
Chapter Four briefly treats the Garifuna ethnogenesis in the Eastern Caribbean by examining the intersection of Black Carib and Garifuna autonomy, their open resistance to European for-profit globalization, and the aftermath of their exile to Central America.

Chapter Five offers the micro-history of migration, social and economic marginalization, and ethnic resurgence of the Garifuna on the Atlantic coast of Nicaragua. The categories of analysis here have been determined from the data extracted from the complex cultural systems and symbols of this Garifuna enclave. Personal memories and histories, rituals, song texts and ethnic activity are presented here as the earliest manifestations of potential mobilization for political action.

Chapter Six elucidates confluence and divergence within the Garifuna Diaspora through a global view of Garifuna resistive actions beyond Nicaragua. Belizean Garifuna case studies and Garifuna symbolic, economic and political behavior in the USA serve as supplemental texts, demonstrating resistive practices to manifestations of global processes that are implicitly or explicitly deemed harmful to Garifunaduáü.

Chapter Seven serves as the final and concluding chapter. This chapter will reassert the thesis of this dissertation: the resurgence and utilization of Garifunaduáü as socio-political and economic resistive strategy.
CHAPTER 2:
CONCEPTUALIZING THE GARINAGU DIASPORA WITHIN THE SCOPE OF
CONTEMPORARY TRANSNATIONALISM AND GLOBALIZATION

2.1. Introduction

The unique placement of Garifuna within contemporary theories of diaspora, transnationalism, and globalization has yet to be substantially investigated. This chapter briefly surveys relevant theories and comparatively highlights contributions to these highly topical theories by making reference to Garinagu struggles for cultural survival, continuity, and expression. This genealogy provides a basis for considering in greater detail the topic of resistance in the following chapter.

By way of introduction it is useful to consider how the Garinagu might fit with broad rubrics of diaspora. For example,

**Table 2.1 Classic Rubrics for Diaspora**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Classical Diaspora</strong></th>
<th>Example provided centers on the Jews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Victim Diaspora</strong></td>
<td>Examples provided include Africans and Armenians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Labor and Imperial Diaspora</strong></td>
<td>Examples provided include indentured servitude through the whole of the British Empire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trade and Business Diaspora</strong></td>
<td>Examples provided include the Chinese and Lebanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deterritorialized Diaspora</strong></td>
<td>Examples provided include the Black Atlantic, but on inspection it appears that the groupings under which the Garifuna might be classified within his schemata include <em>victim diaspora</em> and <em>deterritorialized diaspora</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Cohen, 2008
2.2. Diasporas in Relation to the Homeland

Any consideration of the Garifuna in relation to diaspora must consider the conceptualization of a homeland, which appears very frequently as a theme in Garifuna expressive and political culture. William Safran (1991) has addressed the importance of the homeland myth, the ending of a diasporic state; and the socio-political-economic effects that diasporic groups can have on their homelands and their host communities. Though the term diaspora is used to refer to that segment of a people living outside of their original homeland, Safran advocates broadening this definition. He suggests the term be reserved for expatriate minority communities whose members share several of the following characteristics:

They or their ancestors have been dispersed from a central location to two or more peripheral or foreign regions. They maintain a collective vision, myth, or memory about their original homeland. They believe that they are not and cannot be fully accepted by their host community, and are insulted by this non-acceptance. They regard their ancestral homeland as their true home and their descendants should eventually return there when conditions are appropriate. They believe that they should collectively be committed to the maintenance, restoration, and prosperity of their original homeland. They continue to relate personally or vicariously to that homeland; this relationship defines their ethnocommunal consciousness. (Safran 1991, 84)

The historical trajectory of the Garifuna people meets Safran's criteria for diasporic identification. Their history of having been forcibly exiled by the British in 1796 by removal from Yurumein St. Vincent, West Indies, to Roatan in the bay of Honduras, Central America, as a result of the Carib resistance to European colonization and slavery
has rendered the Garifuna a landless Nation, dispersed along the isthmus' Atlantic Coast (Marshal 1973; Davidson 1976; Gullick 1976; Beckles 1992).

**Collective Vision About the Homeland**

On November 10, 2005, at a Cumbre Garifuna gathering organized by the Nicaraguan government on Corn Island (Taylor 2005), Garifuna community representatives from Nicaragua and Honduras joined the participants in singing the *Yurumein*, which serves as a Garifuna national anthem. In another context, Celso Alvarez, president of Honduras-based ONECA, opened his panel discussion on African Diaspora at the New York Public Library's Shomburg Center in Harlem by singing the opening verse of this song for participants before delivering his address. Within the context of the contemporary Central American Atlantic coast, Palacio characterized the Garifuna as "A Nation Across Borders" (J. Palacio 2003). The Garifuna concept of shared identity, culture, and history, of oneness and peoplehood, is expressed in the text of the *Yurumein*, known and sung across the full extent of the diaspora (Griffin 1997). Key phrases in the anthem's text below reflect the homeland myth of which Safran speaks:

*Yurumein Gierunege Wayuna*
Our ancestors are from St. Vincent

*Yurumein guiedibo wabo waruetei*
Our chief is from St. Vincent

[...]

*Yurumein negebunga wageirabei*
St. Vincent was (supposed to be) our homeland

*Bugáriigü hamutiwa harutian*
Whites forced us from there
Folk knowledge and ritual texts are oral and intangible scrolls of encyclopedic data as they relate to cultural resistance via Garifunaduáü in diaspora. The gloss translation from Garifuna to English evidences the importance of the re-telling of the Garifuna trajectory.

Rethinking Conceptions of the Homeland as Static Cultural Survival

The shift in such research requires description of traditions, local networks of power/knowledge in which diasporic experience is employed, and the kinds of identities these traditions make or shape. For example, one corrective states: "It is within an Americanization process that continues to define immigrant labor in racializing terms that unemployed workers living on remittances in Haiti and "boat people" who have been able to settle in the United States welcome the current efforts of Haitian political leaders to reconstruct Haiti as a transnational nation-state" (Schiller 1999, 30). Political leaders of labor--sending states like Haiti have begun to look to their diasporas for economic and political support. It is worth noting here that in 1991, Haitians in the United States were declared the Tenth Department of the Haitian state, which is quite indicative of the
significance of the diaspora's importance to Haiti as it formalizes the diasporan's' responsibilities to their Haitian homeland / Haitian State (Braziel and Munnur 2006, 10).

David Scott (1991) works to establish another approach to studying Africans in diaspora. He proceeds by measuring the "scale of intensity" of Africanisms in the American diaspora by reexamining noted works on the Saramakas (Bush Negroes) of Surinam during two differing periods of research. The scale was originally presented by Melville Herskovits as a reconstruction of elements from varying aspects of their culture, evidencing what the New World Negroes had retained. At one end of the intensity scale is situated the "old" cultures in the Americas that have a wealth of old world or African connections. This site is best characterized by the aforementioned Saramakas. Situated at the other extreme of the scale is the site of the "new" cultures, with the fewest connections to their old world or African past. North American African-Americans are best characterized, according to this scheme, by the latter site.

In charting the history of the study of African descended peoples as an anthropological problematic, Scott recalls that American Blacks, from the earliest undertakings by anthropologists, had been constituted by a dominant and racist nineteenth- century discourse as a people without a definable past or its correlate, a unique culture (1991, 277). In the mid 1920's, radical identity politics gave rise to counter-discourses that claimed an active African heritage. This had the effect of moving anthropologists like Herskovits to illustrate that African descended people were a people with history and corresponding culture. His early work among the Saramakas was published in 1934 and featured corroborated survivals from their African past with cultural traits in the present.
In examining Richard Price's (1983a, 1983b, 1990) more contemporary works on the Saramakas, Scott notes that Price's anthropological path is not concerned with retentions or survivals as demonstrative of an authentic African past. Rather, Price works instead to present an authentic memory, a consciousness, of a "Negro" past, in which slavery plays a critical role. Thus, the general thrust seeks to move the field away from a "preoccupation" with corroboration and verification of authentic pasts. To this end, Scott discusses the significance of questions that affirm how peoples of African descent in the New World do make Africa and slavery a profound presence in their cultural worlds. The shift in such research requires description of their traditions, the local networks of power and knowledge in which they are employed, and the kinds of identities these traditions make or shape. Scott (1991, 278) explores how diasporic traditions can help identify specifically:

connections among a past, a present, and a future by addressing what are the varying ways in which Africa and slavery are employed by New World peoples of African descent in the narrative construction of relations among pasts, presents, and futures. What in each case, are the salient features with which these figures are inscribed? What is the rhetorical or, if you like, ideological, work that they are made to perform in varied instances and occasions in which they are brought into play?

Traditions can be used to identify a community of adherents through specific kinds of appeals, to particular contemporary constituencies, and through culturally-specific modes of address and styles of the diasporic identity:

What space do Africa and slavery occupy in the political economy of local discourse? To what kinds of authority do they make their appeal? From what kinds of audience do they seek their support? What are the conditions—discursive and non-discursive—of reception that facilitate their persuasiveness? How are the figures of Africa and Slavery employed in the fashioning of specific virtues, in the cultivation of specific dispositions, specific modes of address, specific styles – of dress, of speech, of song, of the
body's movements; how do these figures participate in those techniques by means of which the construction of appropriate bodies and selves are effected? (1991, 279)

Moving even further from the concept of a primary scale fixed in a return to an authentic homeland, Clifford (1994) questions if the concept of homeland and homeland return is even necessary for a group to constitute a diaspora. Among other factors, he considers a group's de-centered efforts at resistance as a sufficient qualifier to substitute for homeland. Thus, it is important to recognize that diasporans may identify with multiple identities, as opposed to a singular identification with the host nation or the home country. The diasporan will highlight particular aspects and identities and downplay others in differing situational circumstances. Therefore, the identity disclosed at any given time is based on informed summation. It is negotiated, and mediated in context by context.

2.3. Describing Diaspora in Community Visions and Across Sites

Another set of critiques point to the value of "thick" ethnographic description to capture the ways diasporas like that of the Garinagu re-translate visions of the homeland and tradition.

In a review of different formulations of the African diaspora, Gordon and Anderson (1999) note that studies of Pan-Africanism can best be understood as a political project given Pan-Africanism's focus on racism and colonialism. Subsequently, a phase of diasporic scholarship with influences from Herskovits, Boas, Zora Neale-Hurston, Carter G. Woodson, and W.E.B. DuBois envisioned a community of displaced African descendants constructed by way of similar and/or shared cultural survivals. More
recently, postmodern critiques have identified essentialist conceptualizations of race and culture, and have warned of their collusion with disadvantageous Western ideals. Gordon and Anderson (1999, 286) explain:

They [of the Postmodern perspective] claim, with much bias, that the "Afrocentric" aspiration to construct an "authentic, natural, and stable rooted" African identity (Gilroy 1993a:30) and that "racial" self results in an ethnic absolutism that reifies the very categories of racial oppression. They also assert that these notions valorize a male, patriarchal subject and thus exclude many who identify as Black but do not fit the essentialist criteria (such as women, homosexuals, people of mixed descent). For their part, they offer alternative means of opening up our understanding of the African Diaspora as an intellectual project.

Here the concern has been with hybridity, syncretization, and creolization to bypass such problems of essentialism. Yet these too fall short for overlooking the role that class and racial power play in identity formation.

Subsequent to the review, Gordon and Anderson devote much space to discussing Gilroy's conceptualization of the African Diaspora or what he himself refers to as the Black Atlantic. They see this Black Atlantic as a "…middle ground between the ontological essentialism of Afrocentrism and the anti-essentialism of diaspora as hybridity" (1999, 287). While they approve of Gilroy's formulations that recognize the centrality of shared or similar experiences of violent uprootings, bondage, dispersion, and racial oppression, as opposed to shared origins, cultural essences, and /or cultural continuities, they do offer the following critique:

In his polemic against Afrocentrism, Gilroy fails to explore the power that imaginings of Africa hold within various constructions of diasporic

\[\text{12} \] The Black Atlantic as a contact and exchange zone for both colonizer and the colonized is advanced by Gilroy, who classifies such realities a counterculture of modernity (Gilroy 2003, 49-80).
identity… such oversights suggest that the study of diaspora necessitates ethnographic investigations of identification processes among diverse Black peoples, investigations of how individuals and groups conceive and participate in a diasporic community or identity (1999, 289).

This ethnography, as called for by the authors, does far more than create a mere collection of community studies comprised of African-descended people. It must consider their diasporic identification, politics, and the influences these have upon their struggles at the local, nation, and or transnational levels, guided by the following three questions:

1. How do particular individuals and groups imagine themselves as members of the black community beyond the confines of national or regional communities?

2. With what peoples, regions, movements do these individuals or groups most closely identify or align themselves?

3. What are the local conditions that help shape diasporic identifications as racial and cultural politics? (1999, 289)

Salience here is found in the approach's capacity to ascertain processes of identity formation and identity mobilization which will reveal varying levels of acquiescence and resistance to local, national, transnational, and global pressures upon people looking to define and situate their communities within time, place and space.

Consider Gordon and Anderson's case study of the Garifuna of Honduras. We learn that Garifuna use the word Negra in their grassroots Organización Fraternal Negra de Honduras (OFRANEH). That young people adorn themselves in backwards baseball caps, baggy Hilfiger jeans, NBA basketball jerseys, and Nike sneakers, and are fond of U.S. hip-hop culture, Caribbean reggae and dance hall music, urban "ghetto" films, and use words such as "chillin" and "Nigga" should not be viewed as acculturation and
culture loss, as it would be if one adopted the primordialist understandings of Garifunaduáü. Their ethnography reveals that in a Mestizo-dominated third world country like Honduras, such associations and use of commercialized goods distinguish the Garifuna as a modern community. Modernity affords Garifuna youth feelings of higher social status. As such, "These practices do not negate Garifuna identity but perform it as part of a larger black identity associated with resistance to 'white norms' (Gordon and Anderson 1999, 292; see also Anderson 2000)."

Paul C. Johnson (2005; 2007) similarly placed importance upon ethnography within diasporic communities in his calling for multi-sited ethnography. In his case study of Brazilian Candomble, he finds that the circulation of symbol and meaning brings "new bodies" or new participants to the fold. The multi-sited approach was necessary for Johnson to situate the people and the symbols across migrations and returns within the context of diasporas. He refers to diasporas as extensions, and uses them as a means to focus, not on community boundedness, but on processes that illuminate how "lines are drawn, crossed and redrawn" (2005, 39). In so doing, he finds that place and the social meaning of place become reworked to meet new historical challenges. The supporting ethnographic evidence he presents demonstrates the effects of migrations and return migrations.

In the case of the Garifuna Dugu religion of Central America, circulations of bodies, that is to say emigrants who return back to the homeland, bring new meanings to symbols back at home. In any direction, boundaries and extensions – migrating bodies and circulating bodies – of imagined communities privilege, to name a key element of diasporic consciousness, religious cultural phenomena and its associated territorial status
as fundamental. Multi-sited ethnography has demonstrated the increasing significance and usefulness of such culturally rooted practices rather than the decline some might anticipate due to assimilation and/or dominant cultural stigmas and unfavorable attitudes which undermine such practices (Johnson 2005, 38, and 48-49).

**Relations Between Host Nations, Diasporic Populations, and Homeland**

Safran also states that host nations sometimes find it useful for political and economic ends to support diaspora sentiments within their borders. For example, during the 1960's the U.S. encouraged Cubans to immigrate for the purpose of recruiting them in the fight against Cuba. While homelands may be to some extent grateful for the support of diaspora communities, some may regard such support with contempt or suspicion, pointing to the potential for capitalist enchantment to ultimately result in a limited, subordinated version of the culture. Such suspicion is not surprising considering the political and economic conditions in which many Garifuna find themselves. While some diasporas no longer have a "homeland" to return to, others have homelands that are not welcoming environments where they could identify politically, ideologically, or socially. Additionally, it could be too inconvenient, disruptive, or traumatic to leave the diaspora, making return unfeasible or even impossible (Safran 1991, 91).

What, then, is the most viable option for many immigrants in such dilemmas? It may well be to become model citizens in their new host country. Glick-Schiller (1999), as part of a larger discussion of what she identifies as a new theory of nation-states, the "transnational nation-state," provides a case study of Haiti.

In the late 1980's, Haitian U.S. immigrants began invoking the term *Haitian diaspora* to refer to their state of being. Here, diaspora reflected their belief that: "they were a
community of people who had been forced to leave Haiti because of the difficult political and economic conditions of their homeland but that in some sense Haiti was still their home" (Schiller 1999, 30). Therefore, being Haitian is an ascribed status that gives a person of Haitian descent a Haitian identity, regardless of status, precisely because many Haitian immigrants and their children have learned to look to Haiti as a home base within a hostile world. This understanding of the continuity of Haitian identity is also shared by impoverished Haitians who never left the country. Therefore, Haitian identity transcends legal citizenship and is characterized by blood ties in the diaspora or the receiving of remittances from family abroad who live in the diaspora.

James Clifford, too, takes up the challenge of providing a framework with which to comprehend diasporic communities within changing relations between host and diasporans. In Further Inflections: Toward Ethnographies of the Future he criticizes Safran in particular for not adhering firmly to his own criteria, and warns students of diasporas that, while diasporic practices may be defined and constrained by nation-states and global capitalism, they also exceed and critique them (1994, 306). Two quotes help illustrate the logic of Clifford's contention, his warning to be cautious of adhering to strict conceptualizations of "ideal-types" in regard to diasporas:

For better or worst, diaspora discourse is being widely appropriated. It is loose in the world, for reasons having to do with decolonization, increased immigration, global communications, transport – a whole range of phenomena that encourage multi-locale attachments, dwelling, and traveling within and across nations. A more polythetic definition (Needham 1975) than Safran's might retain his six features along with others. I have already stressed, for example, that the transnational connections linking diasporas need not be articulated primarily through a real or symbolic homeland – at least not to the degree that Safran implies. Decentered, lateral connections may be as important as those formed around a teleology of origin and/ return. And shared, ongoing history of displacement, suffering, adaptation, or
resistance may be as important as the projection of specific origins (1994, 306).

He goes on to describe further limitations:

Whether the national narrative is one of common origins or gathered populations, it cannot assimilate groups that maintain important allegiances and practical connections to a homeland or a dispersed community located elsewhere. Peoples whose sense of identity is centrally defined by collective histories of displacement and violent loss cannot be "cured" by merging into a new national community. This is especially true when they are victims of ongoing, structural prejudice. Positive articulations of diaspora identity reach outside the normative territory (myth and history) of the nation state (1994, 307).

Thus the host national narrative's ability to subsume a diasporic community is often constrained by prejudice and oppression integrally present in the host nation-state itself.

III. Diasporas and Transnationalism

An understanding of the Garinagu in terms of transnationalism requires a consideration of processes of displacement, exile, and settlement that can take place at psychological, cultural, and social levels. These occur both in the context of home communities and those abroad in the transnational or diasporic state.

Goldin's (1999) edited volume *Identities on the Move: Transnational Processes in North America and the Caribbean Basin* features specific studies on displacement, incorporation, and the reformulation of the self in various transnational community experiences. Transnational processes are here "characterized by cultural and social fields in which actors take action, make decisions and develop subjectivities and identities embedded in networks of relationships that connect them to two or more nation states" (1999, 4). It is perhaps best to think of the Garifuna diaspora, as it relates to transnationalism, in terms of adaptive strategies. Cohen (2008, 155) explains
The form of adaptive behavior that meets the needs of a complex world is for a group simultaneously to hold to its ethnicity or religion, and also establish transnational and intercultural ties, first with groups sharing similar origins and characteristics, and then more widely. This strategy, this game of life, can be deployed to mobilize diasporic ties and sentiments and bend them to more cosmopolitan outcomes and purposes.

Diasporic self identification, then, is a practice, and moreso a strategy that, when enacted, mediates and mobilizes.

**Accommodation and the Power of Diasporans Within Transnationalism**

The fluidity associated with transnationalism must not be misinterpreted as indicating processes that are arbitrary or random in nature. Transnational processes follow discernible patterns: they yield essentialized views, they play themselves out within pre-fabricated labels and categories along racial and national lines, they produce new versions of patriotic zeal from abroad, and they are expressed through various cultural forms such as art and language use.

Multi-local attachments and being a good citizen in one's host country, or new home, in the diaspora does not nullify the diaspora's espousal of liberatory ideologies, cultural retention initiatives, and/or participation in varying levels and forms of resistance to complete cultural assimilation. As Clifford (1994, 307-308) explains:

Whatever their ideologies of purity, diasporic cultural forms can never, in practice, be exclusively nationalist. They are deployed in transnational networks built from multiple attachments, and they encode practices of accommodation with, as well as resistance to, host countries and their norms…and the black diaspora culture currently being articulated in postcolonial Britain is concerned to struggle for different ways to be "British" – ways to stay and be different, to be British and something else complexly related to Africa and the Americas, to shared histories of enslavement, racist subordination, cultural survival, hybridization, resistance, and political rebellion. Thus the term diaspora is a signifier, not simply of transnationality
of movement, but of political struggles to define the local, as distinctive community, in historical contexts of displacement.

He correctly recognizes that diasporans participate locally in a multidimensional fashion, as both this and that, simultaneously. Diasporans work with and within, and counter to, host ideologies, thereby resisting them.

2.4. Diasporas and Globalization

A Critical Theory of Globalization

As Goldin has noted, globalization can be considered to be a factor underlying transnational processes:

Transnational processes arise in part from the globalization of the world economy, the internationalization of production and the consequent construction of intricate webs of new social relations. As capital moves around the world in search of adequate sources of labor so does labor move around the world in search of better working conditions and new sources of potentially more profitable conditions. Such developments are characterized by complex political, social, and psychological features, as individuals reevaluate their positions from within and consider their place in new and extended social networks (Goldin 1999, 2).

As the rate of globalization rapidly increases, we find ourselves challenged to find answers to a host of questions surrounding the effects of its spread on democratic causes in general, and diasporic populations like the Garinagu in particular. Will globalization broaden the divide between the rich and the poor? Will there be an increase in worldwide economic opportunities that provide benefits for all? What impact will these "opportunities" have on the environment and local cultures? Will globalization homogenize the values of peoples the world over and in doing so eradicate traditional communities and cultures? (UNESCO 2004, 31)
According to Braziel and Mannur (2003, 10), diasporas and diasporic movements must be examined and understood within the context of the global capitalism that was exacerbated by the emergence of international processes and intercontinental agreements such as the European Union, NAFTA, GATT, and the WTO. Collectively, these arrangements, as well as others, provide for the exporting employment opportunities to overseas markets, widening the gap between those who have and those who have not. At the same time, they undermine First and Second World economic zones in favor of first world zones situated in what we formerly recognized as the Third World. As such, the authors suggest that diasporic zones need to be understood as situated, to greater or lesser extents, within the realm of such internationalizing forces.

But this need not be understood monolithically. Globalization is met locally by varying parties and interests who offer resistance to its expansion. Braziel and Mannur (2003, 11) explain:

As the World Trade Organization negotiates financial treaties globally, environmental, labor, and anarchist protests in the US (Seattle, Washington DC, New York), Italy, Switzerland, and elsewhere resist such globalization and global capitalism locally.

Yet diasporic communities have not only been excluded from acting as active architects of global processes, they have often been excluded from the public face assumed by the "backlash" against it. In 1996 participants in the Annual World Economic Forum in Davos, Switzerland, were strongly advised, if not warned, to "start taking the backlash against globalization seriously," such that the 1999 convention focused on globalization and the world's poor (Kellner 2002). However, the voices of indigenous communities and the poor continue to be excluded from the dialogue.
In *The Other Davos: Globalization of Resistance to the World Economic System* (2001), Houtart and Polet hone in on this exclusion as problematic and establish the importance of alternatives, which are identified as resistances to the ideals and practices surrounding Western globalization. One alternative to the Davos forums was a meeting in Porto Alegre, Brazil, which represented a worldwide recognition of the importance of formulating and organizing a global posture for resistance to Western globalization as a means to creating a world system truly rooted in participation, inclusion, solidarity and justice for all; that is to say, globalization from below. Cohen (2008, 147) suggests:

> that globalism at the cultural level has solidified localism through the fragmentation and multiplication of identities. How do we understand this apparent paradox of particularism in the midst of globalization? In effect, what is being suggested is the witnessing of counter global movements, which operate locally and globally while drawing their inspiration (normally unconsciously) from a felt need to confront and oppose the anonymous, rational, bewildering, progressive and universal elements of globalization. This requires a special kind of return to the local and the familiar.

Note that Cohen validates both the conscious and unconscious contributions of diasporans and their resisting adverse features of globalization.

Yet directing one's attention solely toward local units of analysis renders incomplete understandings of the local without an appreciation of how local processes participate in cultural flows (again, a path that leads to consideration of transnational exchanges). Arjun Appadurai calls attention to cultural flows using terminology such as ethnoscapes, ideoscapes, financescapes, technoscapes and mediascapes. Additions include sacriscapes and leisurescapes (2003, 31; 1996, 206). These *scapes* indicate a blurring of boundaries of local units, and so they do not map evenly within nation states or even onto one
another. However, technical flows, media, finances, and people of varying ethnicities do interconnect at these sites and produce hybrid cultural forms that are not being fully changed, assimilated, or exterminated within global processes. As Ian Condry (2006) has written in his discussion of *genba* globalization and the Japanese embrace of African-American Hip Hop culture in Japan, people are not merely passive recipients of outside influences---even the influences they themselves deem beneficial. Within these *scapes*, actors are taking the cultural intrusions from above and modifying them in particularly local ways.

Returning to the concern for the effects of globalization, how does one maintain a critical concern and stance in relation to globalization given such complex local assertions, interconnections, and unpredictable flows? According to Kellner, "A critical theory of globalization does not buy into ideological valorizations and affirms difference, hybridity, resistance, and democratic self determination against forms of global domination and subordination" (Kellner 2002, 301). In keeping with Kellner (2002, 301), and by way of my interpretivist approach, I employ a critical theory of globalization where I am interested in a discourse that, "affirms difference, hybridity, resistance, and democratic self determination," specifically against globalization as Western invasion of the periphery. This critique reveals that capitalism, by way of its free market economy, actually undermines the global democracy promoted by Western society (Bodley 1999; Tomlinson 1991; Mander and Goldsmith 1996; Eisenstein 1998; Best and Kellner 2001, Held and McGrew 2002).

---

13 Waters (1995) defines *sacriscape* as the dispersion of religion and characterizes *leisurescape* as the
For indigenous, minority, and subaltern communities, then, globalization introduces a host of impositions from above that further marginalize them. The evidence suggests that these are not received passively, however, as global influences, whether ideological or material, are subject to refusal, rejection and adoption in local ways that suit local interests. Their locations, these scapes (or borderlands), are spaces or zones of contact and friction where the interplay of power, meaning, and identity gives rise to transformations and resistances via processes of meaning-making (Ortner 1999, 8). That is to say, that people at the margins can and do utilize aspects of globalization to navigate forces of the world system. By merging, invoking, manipulating and solidifying global phenomena into their culture, they advance and insure their human worth and progress toward rights to justice. Their culture becomes the (or a) primary means by which to gain the positive recognition needed to secure a valuable space in the emerging global economy (Markowitz 2004, Muehlebach 2003, Cepek 2008). Therefore, culture takes on new levels of significance as culturally organized response to power and dominance create spaces for struggle, political conflict and varying forms of resistance (whether overt or clandestine in nature) from below (Polanyi 1944; Hardt and Negri 2000; Brecher, Costello and Smith 2000; Best and Kellner 2001; Barrios et al 2003).

2.5. Conclusion

In this chapter, we see how the concept of diaspora creates a location for critical perspectives in an expanding global culture that brings to many a host of impositions from above. Within this expanding globalization of culture, we recognize too that diffusion of cultural phenomenon.
"imperial" influences will not all be received passively by the have-nots; global influences whether ideological or material can face refusal and rejection or be "accepted" but used in local ways. Therefore, regional or culturally organized response to power and dominance create spaces for struggles, political conflict and varying forms of resistance. They become sites of individuals acting as agents in the contexts of globally defined possibilities. Whether their actions be overt or clandestine, conscious or unconscious, they manifest themselves from below (Hardt and Negri 2000; Brecher, Costello and Smith 2000; Best and Kellner 2001; Appadurai 2003; Barrios et al 2003).

The next chapter surveys applicable theories for unpacking the complex terrain of diasporan resistance to the marginalizing impact of transnationalism and globalization just reviewed.
CHAPTER 3:
POSITIONING EVERYDAY GARIFUNA DIASPORIC RESISTANCE WITHIN CURRENT FIELDS OF POWER

3.1. Introduction

This chapter formulates a working theory of resistance in order to ground and expand an understanding of what constitutes forms of resistances shared by, or unique to, the Garifuna. This theory of resistance applies through time and space, locally and transnationally, at home and abroad, and in the diasporic sites and scapes reviewed in the last chapter. I provide examples of resistance, primarily, thought not exclusively, from the African diaspora, and further offer a discussion of current theories of resistance.

I demonstrate that resistance is not always organized, planned, or undertaken violently on a large scale. To the contrary, resistance can be protracted by unnamed groups of individual actors who may only coalesce in the short term and disband. Whatever the case, the ultimate goal of cultural resistance is political – to create more equitable circumstances in the de facto (and de jure) state of affairs as perceived by those peripheralized in the context of what we have previously established as globally informed local networks of capitalist interest and exchanges.

I have dialectically juxtaposed Scott's position with that of other resistance theorists (such as Duncombe, Gal, Ortner, Gupta, Turner, Ferguson) to offer a road map for my own work. I am examining resistance as an ongoing process to be expected in unequal power relations that define success in differing parameters with special attention to forms and relations of global power.
3.2. Adapting Duncombe's Measures of Cultural Resistance

Duncombe uses the term *cultural resistance* to refer to sites and situations where "culture is used, consciously or unconsciously, effectively or not to resist and/or change the dominant political, economic and/or social structure. But cultural resistance, too, can mean many things and take on many forms" (2002, 5). Duncombe usefully offers us a "means of resistance" and "scales of resistance" rubric with which to make sense of varying types of resistance.

Duncombe's *Means of Resistance* contains four points referencing how culture conveys politics in its recognizing that messages travel via the *content* of culture. Politics is also transmitted by the very *forms* culture takes. His analysis of content reminds us to recognize written forms as well as forms sung with "emotion or laid over a danceable beat." Additionally, content can take on different messages if captured, for example, on a local recording, internationally distributed compact disc, via live concert or at an underground party. As written or vocalized mediums, these carry messages that lie slumbering until received and subsequently *interpreted* and made sense of by audience members. Lastly, because the powerless are generally limited to consuming that which has been produced for them, the very *activity* of producing culture has political meaning precisely because "The first act of politics is simply to act" (2002, 6-7).

Duncombe also offers a working typology of the scope of resistance, which he plots out into three scales. The first scale measures *political self-consciousness*, while the second scale is an assessment of the *social unit* engaged in resistance. The third scale measures the *results* of cultural resistance, denoting a continuum of possible outcomes that range from survival to rebellion or revolution. I have summarized these scales as follows:
Table 3.1 Three Scales of Cultural Resistance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCOPE OF CULTURAL RESISTANCE*</th>
<th>SCALE 1 Political Self-Consciousness</th>
<th>SCALE 2 Social Unit Engaged in Resistance</th>
<th>SCALE 3 Results of Cultural Resistance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unconsciously Political</td>
<td>Appropriation</td>
<td>Self consciously Political</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture may serve as resistance but is not necessarily created with resistance in mind. Participants do not perceive or recognize it as resistance.</td>
<td>Culture used in ways not intended. Culture is not created to be rebellious or used for political ends. Alternatively, culture originally created for rebellious ends used for non-rebellious purposes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual level</td>
<td>Level of Subculture</td>
<td>Level of Society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating/ living out culture that challenges the dominant system. Largely worked out in the mind of individual. Individual shares resistance with no one.</td>
<td>Group cuts itself off from dominant society to create shared/inclusive cultural values and norms.</td>
<td>Dominant culture and power are expected to decline in the short term or cultural resistance has become so pervasive throughout society that engaging in it is politically unsuccessful and fruitless.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survival</td>
<td>Rebellion</td>
<td>Revolution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural resistance is a means of coping with daily injustices while maintaining a modicum of dignity.</td>
<td>Cultural resistance leads to political activity against power. Action within the framework of power results in repression on one extreme to forced reform at another extreme.</td>
<td>Complete overthrow of power. Here, culture of resistance becomes just the culture (normative).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Duncombe, 2002
These scales, while very useful, still fall short of conveying the fullness of understanding necessary for accurately depicting schematically that which would be recognized as diaspora. Duncombe's first scale, in particular, sets the stage for the discussion as it recognizes that actors may or may not conceive of their actions as resistance. But the targets of resistance also may or may not recognize the actions under discussion as resistance.

In "Conceptualizing Resistance," Hollander and Einwohner (2004) offer terminology that addresses these concerns. A few of the terms they introduce are worth reviewing and affixing into our scales of resistance model. For example, they define covert resistance as intentional resistive actions that go unnoticed by the targets of resistance but are recognized by observers. This is similar to Scott's concept of hidden transcripts. The concept of unwitting resistance describes actions that are not intended as resistance, but that are seen as threatening by "self-defined targets" (545). In cases where actors or targets neither intend nor recognize resistance, but third parties may, the term externally-defined resistance is used.

Proposing a Positional Resistance

I have identified what I call positional resistance to assert this very point regarding the plausibility of externally-defined resistance. I depart from Scott's analysis as Scott (1985, 290) suggests that intent (as opposed to outcome) be the marker for qualifying an act as resistance. In keeping with Clifford Geertz, we cannot possibly get into people's heads to access "truth" (Geertz 1973). It is for this reason Turner utilizes three levels of
symbolic interpretation in which the positional is worked out by the anthropologist (Turner 1967).

In her study of hair styles as a form of resistance, Weitz (2001) notes that, because of the dangers associated with vocalizing oppression and its resistance, field consultants can and do obscure the truth, leaving the researcher to ascertain the meaning of the action in the act itself. Grove and Chang's (1999) work evidences that researchers can interpret the same phenomena differently. Where Grove saw childlike behavior and immaturity, Chang, of Asian descent, saw resistance because, according to their final analysis, relations of power in the field setting itself can influence and determine who can and cannot see resistance. That is to say the external observer's position can either aid or obscure the perception of cultural resistance. I have affixed these additional types to my scales of resistance as scale 4.

14 Leblanc (1999, 18 in Hollander and Einwohner 2004) states, "... the person engaging in resistant acts must do so consciously and be able to relate that consciousness and intent."
Table 3.2 Scale for the Recognition of Cultural Resistance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECOGNITION OF RESISTANCE*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCALE 4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recognition of Cultural</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resistance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actor(s)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Observer</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual or group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recognizes their action(s) as resistance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual or group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does not recognize their actions as resistance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unwitting resistance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>is not intentional but is perceived as threatening by self determined target.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Covert resistance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>is intentional but goes unnoticed by target.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Missed resistance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>is intentional and is recognized by target.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attempted resistance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>is intentional but goes unnoticed by target.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Externally Defined Resistance or Positional Resistance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>is not intended or noticed by actors and target, but is identified by a third party.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Missed Resistance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>is intentional but not seen by observers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attempted resistance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>is intentional but goes unnoticed by observer.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Hollander and Einwohner, 2004

With properly calibrated lenses for resistance's varying manifestations that extend beyond rebellions and revolutions, we find that, where there is dominance, oppression, and injustice, there is also resistance. That is to say that resistance of varying forms takes place at many differing socio-economic and political levels, scapes and/or spaces. When considered alongside our discussion in chapter 2 on diasporas and globalization, we see this is particularly so for diasporas. Resistance can be recognized, or not, by any combination of a tripartite group of players including actors, targets, and observers, and be as thoroughly immersed and dispersed throughout the global socio-cultural and political landscape as is the hegemonic ideology of core sites over marginal areas or scapes. Gramsci informs us that hegemony is always a works in progress; it is not an absolute given, and it additionally always instigates opposition and resistance.
Hegemony, then, must be "sustained and reproduced", and as such, we are justified for not only questioning its completeness (Williams 1977:108ff in Comaroff 1985, 119; Hall 1977) but analyzing the human agency, a variety of which we have discussed here as resistance, that stands in response to it.

3.3. Revisiting Everyday Forms of Resistance

Scholar-activist in the reparations movement for the descendants of enslaved Africans, Ray Winbush (2001) opens his text *The Warrior Method: A Parent's Guide to Rearing Healthy Black Boys* with a foreword by the great-grandson of Sengbeh Pieh (Joseph Cinque). On the high seas aboard a slave ship named *Amistad*, Sengbeh led a significant resistance movement of captured Africans who were en route to slavery in the Americas. Depictions of such uprisings, war, revolts, and flights from bondage as forms of resistance abound (Beckles 1992; Boland 2003, 70 – 72; Corzo 2003; Baralt 2008).

Enslaved Africans in the Americas would later add to the forms of resistance by using the legal system as yet another means by which to resist bondage, fight for freedom and petition for justice (Brana-Shunte R 1990, Brana-Shunte G, 1990; England 2000, 49; Winbush 2009). All of these represent significant contributions to the development of our present conceptualizations of resistance research. These types of resistance fall along a continuum of types that range from violent revolt to clandestine and covert acts couched in a dialectical relationship with accommodation. Since its earliest conceptualizations, the lens with which to identify resistance has broadened significantly, but not without contentions as to what actually constitutes resistance and belongs as a true resistance type.
James Scott's work provides an important starting point for considering the case of Garifuna resistance. Scott's approach to power and resistance in his *Moral Economy of the Peasant* (1976) was influenced by E.P. Thompson's previous work as progenitor of the "Moral Economy" view of power and popular resistance studies. Both authors establish the efforts taken by peasants to preserve and maintain traditional forms of exchange based in reciprocity (of gifts and services) during the advancement of individualistic capitalist ideology and power within their midst. These works are demonstrative of the peasant's agency in resisting power (Scott 1976; Thompson 1963 and 1971; Mitchell 1990).

In a subsequent text, *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday forms of Peasant Resistance* (1986), Scott advances the idea that what one might consider trivial everyday actions can actually be undertaken for, or be imbued with, political activism. This study of the peasants of Kerala, India, sets out to "determine to what degree, and in what ways peasants actually accept the social order propagated by elites" (1986, 41). He reveals the disguised nature of peasants' efforts to both undermine and to resist continued usurpation of their possessions, their labor, and their production by those associated with power.

Scott finds that overt actions such as revolutions and rebellions are most often acknowledged and accepted as resistance. They are, however, uncommon. They generally result in even more coercive and hegemonic state structures and repression levied upon the resistors. The option of actively passive resistance that he presents in the case of Sedaka's poor was conditioned by obstacles that hindered collective forms of open resistance. These included:
1) Sudden changes that destroyed nearly all the routines of daily life and threatened the livelihood of much of the population.

2) Factions and alliances that cross cut class such as kinship, friendship, faction, patronage, and ritual ties--- all of which blur class divisions in small communities.

3) Flight by heads of households as an alternative to open conflict, which lessened active participation in local affairs that might give rise to class conflict.

4) The necessity to provide for one's daily household needs and survival where there is potential for repression (1986, 242 – 247).

As everyday actions appear to be the normal state of affairs, he reclassifies passive resistance with the terminology of normal resistance as means to describing non-rebellious and non-revolutionary acts such as non-compliance, subtle sabotage, evasion, deception, character assassination, stealing grains, ridicule, and desertion. According to Scott (1986, 29), these everyday forms of peasant resistance to power are emblematic of … the prosaic but constant struggle between the peasantry and those who seek to extract labor, food, taxes, rents, and interest from them… foot dragging, dissimulation, false compliance, pilfering, feigned ignorance, slander, arson, sabotage, and so forth. These Brechtian forms of class struggle have certain features in common. They require little or no coordination or planning; they often represent a form of individual self-help; and they typically avoid any direct symbolic confrontation with authority or with elite norms. To understand these commonplace forms of resistance is to understand what much of the peasantry does "between revolts" to defend its interests as best it can.

This conceptualization of the normalcy of passive resistance that is carried out by coalitions with no names, no organization or structure, and no leadership, is indicative of a marked change from the "false consciousness," cultural consensus, and cultural hegemony and ideologies of domination previously advanced by Anthony Giddens,
Howard Newby, John Gaventa, Pierre Bourdieu, E. P. Thompson, and Antonio Gramsci. These scholars held that in situations where people face exploitation and inequality, the subordinated populations will accept the exploitive system. This occurs as the exploited peoples themselves come to believe in the ideology of the dominant group, even though the system does not serve their best interests. The result is that the power of elites comes to be viewed as part of the natural order of things, which thereby legitimizes their dominance in the minds of the oppressed (Gal 1995).

Scott's text *Domination and the Art of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts* (1990) is another step away from the dominant ideology theories. Here he directs his attention again to hegemony and the logic of both political action and revolutions. He further elaborates on the importance of considering how language practices help create and disseminate ideology by placing emphasis on language acts as a means to understanding resistance to cultural hegemony. He writes, "the greater the disparity in power between dominant and subordinate and the more arbitrarily it is exercised, the more the public transcript of subordinates will take on a stereotyped, ritualistic cast. In other words, the more menacing the power, the thicker the mask" (1990, 3). His public transcript refers to the open communication, or interaction, that occurs between subordinates and those associated with positions of power. Scott suggests that researchers have too often missed resistance to the dominant culture by failing to recognize the "hidden transcripts" as they relate to the public ones. Scott (1990, 4) defines the hidden transcript as:

15 See also Antonio Gramsci's (1999) thoughts on hegemony and counter-hegemony, and Pierre Bourdieu's (1977) discussion of the effects of direct domination over persons by others he calls *habitus*; the internalized realities and sensibilities that operate below the surface in the mind of the subaltern or
…discourse that takes place 'offstage,' beyond the direct observation by powerholders. The hidden transcript is thus derivative in the sense that it consists of those offstage speeches, gestures, and practices that confirm, contradict, or inflect what appears in the public transcript… the hidden transcript is produced for a different audience and under different constraints of power than the public transcript. By assessing the discrepancy between the hidden transcript and the public transcript we may begin to judge the impact of domination on public discourse.

Examining everyday forms of communication by way of a sociolinguistic analysis of human social interaction, folklore, and ritual in the context of unequal power relations establishes their resistive properties, and also identifies sites of resistance. Ideology becomes one such transcript as it is made evident through dissemination and dispersal by way of language performances such as stage talk and dialect use. That these are referred to as "hidden" need not mean that resistance occurs in clandestine settings. Again, in Scott's view, public manifestations of resistance to power have been largely overlooked because of their use of subtle or disguised language, even when such resistance is effected in the presence of power. Therefore, the "infrapolitics" of the powerless requires additional consideration in order to truly understand how oral phrasing reveals their recognition of the unequal power web of relations they are caught up in, as well as their dominated classes. Rooted in historical contexts, Habitus governs and/ or limits behaviors in ways that benefits historical powers and/ or oppressors.

16 For example, Barbara Flores (2001) identifies storytelling as a form of socialization precisely because it communicates and transmits the "stored wisdom[s]" of a community's sociocultural and historical knowledge. In the case of Belize, she writes: "Storytelling is a language that has enabled Belize's people to define themselves. It has served as a form of resistance to outside domination" and continues with the inclusion of folklore (in following Katie Geneva Canon (1994)) stating "To learn from the wisdom, the genius and the strategy of resistance of the ancestors as a way to define self is an experience of liberation (2001, 172-173)."

Ohadike (2007) recognizes African cultural retention in the diaspora, particularly spiritual/ religious beliefs and both religious and secular music forms as resistance and highlights the significance of drums and drum beats to his analysis by way of rumba, samba, capoeira, steelband, reggae, blues, and rap rhythms in the African diaspora.
resistance to the dominant culture's linguistic forms and cultural values (Scott 1990: 19, 183-84, 199-201).

**Critiques of Scott**

While Scott's analysis represents a significant contribution to resistance studies, it is not without shortcomings. Critiques have been advanced based on the multiplicity of meaning in discourse, the salience of organized resistance vis a vis spontaneous resistance, and claims of an ethnographic retreat from full accounting of the agency of local subjects.

Gal (1995, 412) critiques Scott's analysis and consideration of linguistic form and ideology as falling short of basic anthropological practices in regard to studying language and social life. She suggests that Scott overlooked the possibility of multiple discourses constituted in social discourses, existing simultaneously in juxtaposition to one another. Gal invokes Abu-Lugod's (1986) discussion of counter discourses by way of ethnography, revealing resistance to elders embedded in Bedouin oral lyric poetry. This leads to a discussion that opens up an investigative terrain for examining, for example, aspects of Garifuna expressive culture through language, media, and the arts. Gal (1995, 416) states

Resistance to domination is just as likely to be produced by illegal radio stations, samizdat magazines, pirated music cassettes, patched-in cable TV. Anthropology itself has certainly not solved the problem of how to analyze such mediated linguistic practices, but it is clear that the tools of face-to-face analysis alone are inadequate to the task. Instead, we need to understand the semiotic processes and ideologies with which people imagine their identities, their subordination, and their "communities," through such media, and vis-à-vis other social entities.
In a different critique, Matthew Gutman's (1993, 75) analysis suggests that Scott's work hinders the development of conflict theories in the Latin American context. He argues that popular struggles in the region do not fit Scott's model, and that spontaneous resistive forms should not be privileged to the exclusion of organized forms.

But identification with the authority does not dispute the structures of power any more than do the ritual of rebellion which interested [Max] Gluckman. Latin Americanists should seek to understand and valorize spontaneous forms of resistance, but we must not overlook manifestations of organized resistance, among the proletariat as well as the peasantry, on the ground either that they have been overstudied or that they are inimical to the primary concerns of these classes… at least in Latin America today and historically, these forms occur together, alternate, and transform themselves into each other (75-77).

Gutman correctly contends further along in his discussion that the overt forms of resistance can and do open up spaces for those "similarly inclined but more hesitant" to become restive actors (Guttman 1993, 80). Sherry Ortner (1995) expressed a similar concern regarding resistance studies in her article "Resistance and the Problem of Ethnographic Refusal." Her critique of the genre stems from proponents sanitizing or cleaning up the local politics (1995, 184).

Reconsidering the Role of Everyday Resistance

Gupta and Ferguson (1997) constructively trace an intellectual genealogy for the recent emphasis on ambiguity and contradiction in Culture, Power, Place: Ethnography at the End of an Era, as part of their examination of recent post-structuralism:

From Foucault (1978, 1980) ethnographers have borrowed the idea that power relations permeate all levels of society, with a field of resistances that is coextensive with them. From such writers as Bourdieu (1977) and de Certeau (1984), they have taken a stress on the active practices of social agents, who never simply enact culture but reinterpret and reappropriate it in their own ways. And from Gramsci (1971) and his more recent interpreters
(Raymond Williams [1977] and Stuart Hall [1986] chief among them), they have taken a focus on the partiality, the eternally incomplete nature of hegemony, with its implication on the cultural as a tested, contingent political field, the battlefield in an ongoing 'war of position' (1997, 5).

Approaches to resistance that examine the complexities of the everyday and ritualized activities of diasporic actors like the Garinagu, seen as part of a contested "war of position," moderate critiques of Scott's view of resistance. Such approaches are also consistent with the overall theory of positioned resistance which is advocated and developed in this work.

Daniel Rosenblatt (1997) provides an important re-assessment of the political salience of everyday forms that otherwise might be seen as either acquiescent, nihilistic, self-defeating, or inconsequentially aesthetic. He examines the practices of tattooing, piercing, and scarification in the late twentieth century U.S. as indeed forms of resistance to totalizing entities such as the church, the "Judeo-Christian ethic" or "Western society" (1997, 324). Reminiscent of Gupta and Ferguson's discussion of culture as battlefield, Rosenblatt sees the corporal body as a battleground upon which these dominant ideologies, and an increasingly routinized world, can be combated. Similarly, Maori forms of resistance to the "capitalist world system" are not necessarily conceptualized solely by body art upon one's person, but are complemented by building and invigorating communities, and by communal institutions prevalent in a modern world. For Rosenblatt (1997, 326):

The skin becomes a kind of battleground on which the self and society contest each other, and the decorated body becomes an indexical icon of the self's (possible) victory (Silverstein 1981; Tambiah 1985). By these practices modern primitives have found a way to recuperate the 1960s notion that desire is a force with which the potential to undermine capitalism (e.g., Cohn-Bendit and Cohn-Bendit 1968).
In Nationalism and Resistance: The Two Faces of Everyday Activism in Palestine during the Intifada (2001), Jean-Klien, in keeping with Scott, recognizes how Western accounts of social movements credit formal organizations and undervalue acts of resistance undertaken by ordinary people. This privileges the former by directing attention to more dramatic and organized actions. In her Palestinian case study, suspension of everyday routine by putting their normal state of ambiguity or shiftiness on hold provided a means for ordinary people to regain a sense of personal and collective control within the context of disruptions and disturbances orchestrated by Israeli authorities working to unsettle local movements. She describes such practice as exhibiting *duplexity*, as it reveals both agency and the collective everyday variety of resistances. In this state of being, the hegemonic as well as the subaltern, and the everyday as well as the orchestrated, exist simultaneously in both a challenging and complementing state. *Duplexity* is described in her own words as the state of affairs when:

…subjects, through specific courses of action, address two discrete interests, problems, or projects at once… activists have no need to deny or hide the double-edged of their activities – to be duplicitous- because they do not view them as invalidating one another… Ambiguity, shiftiness – these may well be privileges and luxuries the historical peculiarity of which Western analysts have taken for granted (2001, 92).

Gal, Guttman,.and Ortner, in their critiques of Scott, constructively help to identify a need for a brand of "ethnographic thickness." Ethnography, in keeping with Geertz, is a commitment to recognizing the subject of study as part of a highly intergrated culture. He instructs ethnographers to strive for thickness and to produce understanding through richness, texture, and multi-layered detail. After considering the works of other scholars
such as George Marcus, the Comaroffs, Martha Kaplan and John Kelly, Ortner, for instance, asserts that thickness has many possible forms. Her definition of ethnographic refusal is described as "… a refusal of thickness, a failure of holism or density which itself may take various forms" (1995, 174). Ortner attributes this state of refusal within resistance studies as a manifestation of the crisis of representation within the social sciences. She explains

There are no doubt many reasons for this interpretive refusal… When Edward Said says in effect that the discourse of Orientalism renders it virtually impossible to know anything real about the Orient (1979); when Gayatri Spivak tells us that the subaltern cannot speak (1988a); when James Clifford informs us that all ethnographies are "fictions" (1986:7); and when of course in some sense all of these things are true-then the effect is a powerful inhibition on the practice of ethnography broadly defined: the effortful practice, despite all that, of seeking to understand other peoples in other times and places, especially those people who are not in dominant positions (1995, 188).

In a discussion relevant to Garifuna ritual, Michael Brown's work (1996) on "channeling" among female Americans engaged in spirit-mediumship, a form used by women the world over to counter the power of men, finds that female practitioners themselves often reject analysis of the practice as explicitly or exclusively resistance. According to practitioners, channeling is a means of expanding themselves by way of experiencing masculinity in non-confrontational ways that allows them to transcend their gender. Channeling differs from feminisms' posture of resisting male domination, a reality that is overlooked in thin description fixated solely on articulations of resistance (1996, 732). As described in a retrospective on his own work amongs the Ashanikas of Peru, and the blinding effects of his focused attention toward layers of resistance, Brown (1996, 731) explains:
…we let an inspiring story of resistance distract us from a more thorough analysis of the specific content of Ashaninka prophecy. The Ashaninkas who inserted themselves into conflict were not only responding to external challenge but also advancing their own vision of existential redefinition or transcendence. It is easy to pigeonhole these aspirations by cataloging them as the "hopes of the oppressed" or as a "bold struggle for fundamental human rights." Although accurate, such labels cannot fully address or comprehend the specificity of Ashaninka dreams of world transformation or the internal struggles that these touched off within Ashaninka society itself.

Connecting with the adaptation of Duncombe's stages of cultural resistance discussed above, what emerges is a view of resistance made visible through a "thick description" that captures and contextualizes it more broadly when emic-only insights exclude such concerns.

We now turn to the specific case of ritualized resistance, which has a special salience in the Garinagu diaspora.

3.4. The Role of Ritual and Symbol in Diasporic Resistance

Victor Turner's (1967) analysis of ritual and symbolic data contributes to a thick description of resistance in diaspora by calling attention to ritual's less recognized forms of social, political, and economic transformation.

In the study titled *Victor Turner Revisited: Ritual as Social Change*, Bobby Alexander (1991) discusses how ethnographers have used Turner's work to advance a view of ritual as antithetical to social structure. According to Turner's analysis of the conflict between ritual and social structure, ritual often acts as a form of protest against the pressures of existing social structures and such resistance contributes to social change. While others theorized ritual within structure-functionalist terms as a safety-
valve that keeps society functioning much like an organism, Turner (1977:39 in Alexander 1991, 7) writes that the conflict between ritual and social structure:

can never be tranquilly regarded as safety valve, mere catharsis, 'letting off steam,' rather it is… weighing structure, sometimes finding it wanting, and proposing in however extravagant a form new paradigms and models which invent or subvert the old. For this reason, the "powers-that-be who represent and preside over established structure" find ritual "dangerous."

In keeping with Turner's dialectical analysis, Alexander's study of poor working class Pentecostals demonstrates that Pentecostals' religious rituals include spirit possession precisely because it creates a supportive community in the protest against abusive class structures. The application of Turner's theory, writes Alexander:

suggests that, where possession fundamentally is a form of sublimation [as formulated by the structure-functionalists], these activist Pentecostals would find no use for it. Indeed, they would find it counterproductive because it would act as a safety-valve, deflecting attention away from undertaking concrete structural change and reinforcing the structural status quo (1991, 9)….communitas unmasks the arbitrary distinctions inherent to social structure (Turner 1975, 16) and allows humans to interact with one another "not as role players but as 'human totals,' integral beings who recognizantly share the same humanity" (Turner 1974, 269, 46; see also 1969, 127-128 in Alexander 1991, 130).

The communitas achieved in ritual not only delineates meaning, but also critiques social structure and offers more egalitarian forms of human interaction as alternatives to the oppressive structure embedded and perpetuated in the status quo. We would do well to recall here that Ortner (1984) discusses the restrictive features of structure or "the system" and how it undermines envisioning alternatives. "The problem is not that of the system telling lies about some extrasystemic reality, but of why the system as a whole has
a certain configuration, and of why it excludes alternative possibilities” (1984, 153). She therefore stresses the importance of presenting the dialectic that exists between the power structure and human practice or agency.  

Jean Comaroff’s (1985) study of the Tshidi Barolong, who live across the national boundaries of South Africa and Botswana, also demonstrates how social actions in general, and ritual in particular, are communicative in dialectical processes that accomplish more than just an echoing of meanings; they seek transformation and the undoing of inequalities in the social structure. According to Comaroff (1985, 125):

…such rites as healing, first fruits, or initiation were not merely expressive vehicles… they were pragmatic acts which effected the transformation of the world; from an analytic perspective, they constructed, rather than merely reflected, meaning. Thus no simple distinction between instrumental and symbolic practice makes sense here, or indeed anywhere; instrumental action is always simultaneously semantic, and vice versa (1985, 125).

Describing the Christian missionaries who facilitated western religiosity and colonial administration over the Tshidi people by way of signs and organizational structures of inequality, Comaroff states that these became "elements of a syncretic bricolage deployed to carry a message of protest and resistance, and to address the experiences of a runaway world." Because Protestantism was packaged in with bourgeois liberalism, these

---

17 Cox (1984) presents Nicaraguan religious festivals as forms of protest against the Somoza regime.

18 Also relevant to this discussion of power and resistance is Gramsci’s use of the term hegemony. For Gramsci, hegemony does not favor any specific configuration of power and as such he can assert that social movements [practice/agency] themselves are not universals fixed upon eradicating the powers that be. The reality is that the ideology of the dominant system is so diffused into the day to day affairs of the subaltern that it becomes authorized as part of their "common sense" and is therefore natural and invisible to them. The hegemony of powers ideology can and does constrain resistive practices or the subalterns' acting upon their critical or "good sense", but does not eliminate there resistance.
Black South Africans rejected Protestantism and the spirit of colonial capitalism and "introduced a mode of practice which interacted with indigenous cultural forms to yield a Christianity that stood in vivid contrast to colonial orthodoxy" (1985, 11), by way of Zionist splinter groups diffused throughout the ecclesiastical territory.

This calls to mind aspects of Scott's analysis, as it opened up a "general discourse about estrangement and reclamation, domination and resistance," that was not always readily apparent but "stretched far beyond the domain of [Zionist Christian] ritual [protest of the neoliberal order] itself, penetrating acutely into the experiential fabric of everyday life" (1985, 11), to undermine and subvert oppressive structures of domination.19

**Culture and Symbolism: The Interpretation of Resistance**

Given the above argument for everyday forms of behavior and ritual as productive ground for the development of a thick description of effective resistance, it becomes important to look more closely at how classic renderings of the thick description technique must be adapted to serve the "third person" perspective of the ethnographer participating in our notion of "positioned resistance." We begin with a brief review of thick description, followed by its specific application.

---

Hale explains, "People have not turned passive; rather their resistance takes forms that dominant actors can contain through negotiation or adjustment, leaving the structural underpinnings of their power intact" (1994, 27). Though here status quo is maintained, hegemony remains a negotiated dialectical process.

19 Karl Polanyi's (1944) conceptualization of varying forms of social movements as agents of change resonates here as well, precisely because of their interest and ability to shape institutional life and societal structures.
**Adapting Geertz' Symbolic Approach**

According to Geertz, the object of ethnography is thick description. Thick description is a multitude of complex conceptual structures, or layers of significance, that are necessary to gain an understanding of a particular event, ritual, custom, or idea.

Thick description presupposes a particular conception of culture. Geertz (1973) instructs us that culture is public, and that it is brought into being by way of systems of meaning shared by a collective of human actors. Culture is therefore symbolic public action because human behaviors are imbued with value and significance. "The thing to ask," he writes, "is what their import is: what it is, ridicule or challenge, irony or anger, snobbery or pride, that, in their occurrence and through their agency, is getting said" (1973, 10). We cannot come to comprehend their signs and systems of meaning by trying to certify what is in their heads (Sosa 1985, 108). We cannot see that, and so we "… cannot find our feet with them" (Geertz 1973,12 -13). According to Geertz, attempting to get into their heads is destructive for it is based upon a cognitive fallacy. What consultants verbalize of their conceptual world represents a valuable contribution to the thick description of interlaced systems of meaning that I am after. But, in keeping with Geertz, their words alone do not and cannot verify, validate, prove or disprove either that which they claim to think/ believe or my own interpretations of their actions.

Certainly there are those who have taken pause with Geertz's theoretical positioning for being neutral both politically and ethically, suggesting that Geertz misses the innerworkings of power differentials that occur in unequal power relations.

Further, Crapanzano (1986) indicates that Geertz's interpretations, in particular, impose external meanings in his analysis of Balinese cockfights. Mark Schneider (1987)
agrees. He, like Crapanzano, questions the value of treating non-linguistic culture
textually and providing meaning where none exists for the natives themselves. I will
revisit Schneider as he relates to language momentarily.

Certainly questions have been raised regarding the ethical/political neutrality and the
imposition of meaning (Crapanzano 1986, Schneider 1987) in Geertz' approach.
Criticism notwithstanding, Geertz's works have also been cast to contain moral and
ethical purposes that stress cross-cultural understanding. The individual chapters
provided by Sewell, Marcus and Rosaldo in *The Fate of "Culture": Geertz and Beyond*
prompted Ortner to write in her introductory chapter to the edited text that

...although Geertz's work does not address the kinds of issues that for the
most part constitute "politics" in the present moment, it nonetheless offers the
intellectual grounding for a position of considerable political importance. I
refer here to the question of the cultural construction of "agency," of human
intentionality and forms of empowerment to act (Ortner 1999, 5).

This realization weakens claims of Geertz's disengagement. We additionally see in
the quote above that she, in subsequent lines, goes on to highlight his work's relevance to
studies on "agency" in what she refers to as a "non-reductive" matter.

Geertz's approach to ritual and symbolic action can effectively be supplemented with
contributions from Gossen (1986), Turner (1967), and Da Matta (1991), placing
importance on the "auto" or self-interpretations these collective actions convey. This
complements a thick description of the Garifuna and can inform, for example,
interpretations of ritual, folk, performance groups, and NGO activity that evidence
agency and resistance for groups like the Garifuna. Symbolic action, including language,
then serves as a means to understanding the Garifuna posture towards the meta-physical
world, their physical environment, relations with neighboring ethnic groups, their view of
the nation-state, their human interests, their desire to change the reality of their socio-
economic and political marginalization, and the importance of cultural preservation to all
of these motives.

**Employing Turner's Three Level Symbolic Analysis to the Study of Resistance**

Victor W. Turner (1967, 50-52; 1968, 81-82) and his followers offer a theory with
applications for developing thick descriptions and better defining what I have proposed as
the positioned participant-observer in resistance. Turner recognizes that different classes
or levels of symbols/symbolic behavior require different types of analysis. His *exegetical*
level of analysis is concerned with a symbol's manifest properties that native subjects are
aware of and capable of articulating. Turner's *operational* level informs us that people
express culture in behavior but cannot express it. As he suggests, subjects are only
marginally aware of it. The third and final level, the *positional* level, refers to the
relationship of a symbol's meanings to other symbols. This association discloses
meanings that may be veiled and unknown to the subjects (Sosa 1985, 133) as not all
articulations of multivocalic symbols are expressed in any one symbolic or ritual act
(Giddens 1984, 5). Full meanings can be "got at" via correlations with other symbols that
occur in differing ritual contexts and symbolic acts, making these meanings, and by
extension positional resistance, apparent to anthropologists and researchers examining
symbolic action across time and space. By these means and to these ends, I examine the
relationship of Garifuna symbols/symbolic action in diasporic contexts.
3.5. Brief Application of Resistance Theories to the Garinagu

While a more complete treatment of resistance in the Garinagu diaspora is reserved for Chapter Six, this section provides a brief example of some of the possibilities offered by our discussion thus far.

Consider the following keynote address at the unveiling ceremonies for the "Drums of Our Fathers" monument situated at the entrance to the Garifuna community of Dangriga Town, Belize. Garifuna elder and community leader Roy Cayetano's invocation concluded with the following remarks:

The Drums of Our Fathers are a call to war. A call to war to take action to preserve our language, music, dance and values. A call to war for the promotion of Garifunaduáü and the nurturing of Garifuna Pride. A call to war to fight against the marginalization of our people. A call to war against the scourge of drugs, HIV/AIDS, poverty and ignorance. It is also a call to war on the dance floor between the man and the woman as they outdo each other with their moves tábugien goubana. War is a struggle, an ongoing struggle; and I salute each one of you who is engaged in the ongoing struggle to improve the quality of our lives. I especially acknowledge the struggle of our Area Representative, the Hon. Sylvia Flores, whose vision of monument to our struggle at the proud old entrance of Dangriga, this culture capital of our country, is being realized here at this time and in this place.

Kirtsoglou and Theodossopoulos (2004) correctly argue that Garifuna cultural performances involving drums, songs in the Garifuna tongue, and Garifuna folk dances, are cultural property that provide statements about the collective identity of Garinagu. Garifuna music, song, and dance, within the context of globalization's forces of commoditization, are arguably for the sole benefit of Western tourists and the nation's

tourism industry. The system, by way of national and local capitalist agents, is literally threatening the lives of the Garinagu of Roatan, Honduras, taking both their land and culture away. Here, Garifuna resistance to local and global structures of power manifests itself as a battle for cultural ownership that takes place on the periphery, but speaks to the larger political issue of self-representation and position in the capitalist world system.

Much like the sentiment captured in Cayetano's speech, Kirtsoglou and Theodossopoulos' ethnography of Garifuna emic insights and understandings reveals their duplicitious interests and counter efforts to power and actions undertaken to bring about structural transformations. The reality is that cultural performances can be consumed by tourists within a mutually beneficial framework based upon cultural exchange and mutually beneficial opportunities, rather than the current western hegemonomically rooted arrangements that increasingly define the times.

Barbara Flores (2001) similarly examines the dialectical tensions that arose from contact between the dominant attitudes of the power wielding Western Christianity and the Garifuna spirituality and rite of ancestral veneration. For Flores, the Garifuna diigü represents an historical opposing ideology that continues to the present as a counter-narrative and form of resistance to western tenets imposed by way of European religion. According to Flores (2001, 128):

As an essential element of the historic resistance of the Garifuna, from the original homeland of St. Vincent to the present day, has been the safeguarding and preservation of the dugu as a space of Garifuna freedom.

21 Oliver Greene's (2001) "Aura Buni, Amuru Nuni", "I Am For You, You Are For Me" Reinforcing Garifuna Cultural Values Through Music and Ancestor Spirit Possession provides an examination of the Dugu ritual of placation in Belize by providing interpretations of drumming, song texts, and spiritual possession. See also Idiaquez (1993) and to a lesser extent Coe (1992) on walagayu (diigü) ethnomedicinal practices among the Garifuna of Nicaragua.
and subversion. Ironically, the space that has created the struggle has been the space that has empowered, given life and generated creativity to resist oppressive powers. This space of dugu, which Garinagu believe has been uniquely gifted to them by God and the ancestors for healing, has indeed become the catalyst for transformation and has faithfully attempted to ward off evils of erasure and oppression. In spite of assault from various historical and colonial forces, the dugu ritual, in its on-going physical enactment, its historical survival and its current resurgence, has remained a witness and testimony to the resistance, empowerment and survival of the Garinagu.

Matthei and Smith further identify the Garifuna 1797 revolt against the British in Yurumein/St. Vincent island as their only armed, and arguably their only organized, overtly resistive action. However, they suggest that the Garifuna see their historical trajectory as characterized by resistance to globalizing forces, though there has been but one insurrection and revolt. As Matthei and Smith (2008, 222) explain it:

The only indisputable organized anti-systemic movement that the Garifuna can lay claim to is an ill-fated armed insurrection against British Colonizers on St Vincent in 1797 which resulted in their forced exile to a small island off the coast of Central America. Yet their entire history is one of continuous struggle and resistance, however subtle these efforts may appear to the outside world. For the Garifuna a firmly held (yet rarely recognized) identity as a people of Afro-Indian descent who successfully resisted slavery underlies a centuries-long history of accommodation and opposition to forces of global capitalism.

This sense of sustained opposition and revolt stemming back to the initial genesis of the diaspora lies deeply embedded in Garifuna culture and consciousness. Though relatively inaccessible to observers looking for overt organized political action, or those unfamiliar and/or indifferent to Garifuna culture, or even to many Garifuna themselves, such opposition, within the hidden, double-valenced, and flexible symbolic expressions of drum beats and speeches and hip-hop cultural forms, continues into the present. It is seen in Cayetano's invocation of Garifuna language, folkways and traditions as resources not solely construed as wherewithal worthy of protection, but additionally as the space
and inspirational tools with which to battle hegemonic ideals and socio-economic and political structures that hinder the self determination and success of the community.

3.6. Conclusion

Resistance, whether as organized collective action, or seemingly "trivial" local acts, is as widespread as the reach of globalization itself. It can also be as elusive to model, interpret, and investigate. Diasporic communities like the Garinagu, with their complex placement within transnational and global processes that marginalize them, present special challenges to investigators wishing to "read" their resistance. Their resistance fundamentally works on multiple levels, a condition where Dumcombe's theory of "scales of resistance" becomes very useful. From this theory, the idea of the "positioned resistance" accessible to a participant-observer, is advanced as an effective vantage point.

Scott's theories on the importance of taking account of everyday acts, which otherwise may not be easily noticed as resistance, serves as a basis for considering the case of the Garifuna, whose only form of overt attempted revolt occurred centuries ago. Yet this act has lived on in their consciousness and cultural forms and practices, translated flexibly (exhibiting Jean-Klein's "duplexity") within the changing circumstances of history, and on the not-completely hegemonic "battle-fields" of transnational and global/localizing networks, in which the Garifuna participate.

Fundamentally, it is worth bearing in mind that the Garifuna community's socio-cultural and political practices and transcripts, their rituals and folkloric texts and expressions, their "commonsense" and "good sense" practices - public or otherwise – enact Garifunaduáü, as they define it. The Garifuna in diaspora are essentially adapting,
and adopting, and still yet resisting, globalization's more harmful effects. In so doing, they actively engage in transforming their lives from the injustices they endure, the understandings they have of themselves, and the understandings and misunderstandings the larger communities in which they live continue to have and act upon. The Garifuna work locally and transnationally to resist cultural homogenization into dominant culture via culturally based counter-hegemonies that are instructive in regard to their desire for societal transformations that favor socio-economic opportunities, respect, and equality for their people.

In the following chapter, I present an examination of Garifuna ethnohistory, migrations and return-migrations, socio-political affiliations, cultural performative practices, and territorial land claims within the context of the kind of resistance described in this chapter.
4.1. Introduction

The comedic opera *Inkle and Yarico*, first produced by George Colman, opened in 1787 at the Haymarket theater (Colman, 1806). The Englishman, Inkle, a trader in search of fortune, becomes shipwrecked and saved by an Afro-Amerindian (Black Carib) native, Yarico. The two fall in love and Yarico protects and teaches Inkle all he needs to know about her island home, so that the two may survive there together. It is most certain Inkle would have been doomed there without her. After a time, an English ship appears and Inkle is rescued; Yarico, his love, goes with him. Upon arriving in Barbados, Inkle sells Yarico into slavery.\(^\text{22}\) As deconstructed by Hulme (1986), the play is indicative of the European mindset at the time of European contact with Native Americans and interaction with Africans in the New World. In the story, the newcomers were greeted peaceably and greatly assisted in terms of their acclimation to the environment by natives, but the European in return committed acts of violence and land seizure from the natives. Moreover, the view of natives from the fifteenth century on portrayed them as savage, cannibalistic, and barbaric, the consummate problem and threat to European civilization.

\(^{22}\) According to Bhattacharya (2001) the story first appeared in Richard Ligon’s (1657) *True and Exact History of the Island of Barbados*. In this original version, Yarico was pregnant with Inkle’s unborn child at the time she was sold. Upon learning of her pregnancy, Inkle increased her sale price.
There must be an explanation for these and other inversions of the truth that devalued native customs and practices, delicensing them while advancing those of the Europeans.

This chapter briefly explores Garifuna colonial encounters in the eastern Caribbean in Joseph Palacio’s first historical period. I will devote particular attention to European claims to dominance and power over the natives, and the accommodation and resistance of the Garifunas’ Afro-Carib progenitors. Interpretivist Clifford Geertz, among others, theorized that one's ethnography is something different from reality. This premise represented a transitional phase, in anthropology, that was increasingly characterized by doubting how one represented other people. As historical accounts have omitted the native voice, Geertz's thick description – sorting through layers of significance to derive the native perspectives and hence a more accurate account – was part of the continuum leading to post-modernism and the doing away with the European canon of knowledge previously held as truth. Canonical works have silenced the native voice, validating European power and wealth but concealing how said status was achieved. The following reconstruction, by way of the post-modernist tool of peeling back some of the layers of European colonial practices in regard to the native population, allows for a better understanding of the biases that influenced European actions or the inversions of historical circumstances. Sorting through the natives’ and the European authors' webs of

\[\text{Kirby and Martin open}\ The\ Rise\ and\ Fall\ of\ the\ Black\ Caribs\ (n.d.,\ circa\ 1972)\ with\ this\ assertion,\ and\ further\ demonstrate\ the\ basis\ for\ bias\ and\ prejudice\ of\ three\ primary\ sources\ on\ the\ history\ of\ the\ Caribs\ wars:\ Sir\ William\ Young\ (1795)\ was\ Chairman\ of\ the\ subcommission\ of\ the\ encroaching\ British\ Government\ and\ Charles\ Sheperd\ (1831)\ was\ commissioned\ by\ planters\ to\ document\ their\ experiences\ in\ St.\ Vincent.\ Lastly,\ Rev.\ Coke's\ (1810)\ introspections\ must\ be\ understood\ in\ the\ context\ of\ Methodist\ proselytizing\ which\ he\ sought\ to\ advance.\]
significance elucidates the Carib natives' agency and resistance, as they were not passive to European encroachment and domination.

4.2. The Arrival of the Spanish

Christopher Columbus arrived to the "new world" (the Americas) in 1492, seeking a trade route to India. While Columbus did not reach India, he insisted upon calling the native peoples in this new world Indians. One group of Native Americans, the Tainos of Arawakian stock, told Columbus of another Native American nation who were their longtime enemies, the Kalinago or Kalipuna, names still used today by Carib-speaking tribes of northeast South America. I will at times utilize the term Kalipuna to refer to the so-called Yellow Caribs and employ Garifuna to refer to their Afro-Amerindian descendants, as these are the names they use(d) themselves (Suazo 1997). The Kalipuna for many centuries had been subduing the Arawaks, killing their males and making off with their women. Though they referred to themselves as Calinago according to Bretton (1665) and Carifoona in the work of Ober (1880), Columbus called the Kalinago nation Caribs. He believed them to be warlike cannibals, though he had never witnessed the custom among them. Undoubtedly he obtained this misinformation from the Tainos, who would have wanted his support in their battles with the Caribs (Palacio in Krohn 1987, Sale 1991, Lawrence 1987).

24 The distinction here could be understood in the terms used by their Central American descendants. Garinagu is the plural form of the singular Garifuna. Garifuna also refers to their language. Linguistic shifts in pronunciation through African admixture to the natives would indicate these forms derived from Kalinago and Carifoona, respectively.
Columbus did not encounter these so-called "Caribs" until his second voyage (1493), at which time he describes them as wearing a woven garment beneath their knees. Later, Girolamo Benzoni described how he was greeted by naked and red-painted Caribs in the 1530's when he stopped at Dominica, in the Lesser Antilles, while en route to Santo Domingo. These Kalipuna identified as their ancestors the Kalipuna of the South American mainland. Their forebears had migrated here, in the earlier part of the twelfth century, from the Orinoco and Magdalena river valleys in Venezuela. Migration also occurred after pursuing the Arawaks into the Greater Antilles and warring with them in the early thirteenth century.25 Having been victorious in battle, the Kalipuna took the Arawakan women as wives. Their resulting offspring spoke a language with two versions: an Arawak version spoken by women and a widespread "Carib"-based pidgin spoken by the males. This "Carib" pidgin was a language for purposes of trade that was widespread in South America (Taylor and Hoff in Allaire 1997, 181). The two spoken forms were distinct yet mutually understandable between the sexes. This Island "Carib" language continues to exist today in the Central American Garifuna language. The versions have merged to a modern form of Garifuna in which Arawakan words are used by women while Kalipuna words are used by the men; these are mutually understandable (Cayetano 1989, Taylor 1951, Conzemius 1928). Bretton (1665) identified "Youlou" or "Ioulou main" (Yurumein) as the native's name for St. Vincent. Yurumien came to be the Kalipunas' capital island in the Lesser Antilles and the name remains today as a key

25 See Young (1795, 5) and Kloos (1971, 13). The Ciboney, of what came to be known as the Caribbean, had followed a similar migratory pattern. They were displaced by the Arawaks who had followed them in the migration out of South America similar to the Carib and Arawak pattern (Franzone 1995, 37).
symbol of the ancestral homeland among their descendants, even though the island is most commonly known worldwide by the European designation St. Vincent.26

The Kalinago of this encounter period hunted agouti, rice-rats, iguanas, and turtle. They collected shellfish and trapped land crabs. While they did fish, they were not characterized as a society of fishermen. The Kalinago were farmers of manioc and sweet potato gardens. As did their forebears and cousins on the South American mainland, they baked manioc (cassava bread, which remains a staple and powerful symbol among Central American descendants today) and cooked the pepper pot, a dish comprised of meat and fish bits that were stewed in manioc juices and spiced with lots of chili peppers. Cassava beer-making was also a major Kalipuna food activity (Allaire 1997). It remains a significant aspect of Garifuna food culture today; referred to as hiu, the beer is a staple at ancestor rituals I witnessed in Dangriga, Belize.

European technology in the Americas seemed to be magical to natives. These "magicians," however, were incapable of feeding themselves. Carib interactions with them were characterized by offerings for exchange that included potatoes, plantains, pineapple, fruits, turkeys, turtles and iguanas. In Columbus' correspondence with the Spanish Crown, he plays up the favor which God would show the Crown for having converted the so-called pagans, whom he describes as, "...a people very free from wickedness and unwarlike," and he goes on to identify his plans to acquire gold, spices,

26 Contemporary Central American Garifuna Song text indicate Yurumei Guierunege Wayuna "St. Vincent is the home of my ancestors." This particular song serves as sort of a Garifuna National Anthem across Central American nation states and the U.S.
and land in the name of God as a means of attracting further European investment in the region (Hulme 1986, 129). Regarding the Caribs he writes (in Hulme 1986, 42):

They refuse nothing that they possess, if it be asked of them; on the contrary, they invite anyone to share it and display as much love as if they would give their hearts. They are content with whatever trifle of whatever kind that may be given to them whether it be of value or valueless. I forbade that they should be given things so worthless as fragments of broken crockery, scraps of broken glass and lace tips, although when they were able to get them, they fancied that they possessed the best jewel in the world.

What contributed to the deterioration of the Carib/ Spanish relations is threefold. According to Hulme’s research a) A sword sold to a Carib Chief contrary to instruction was reclaimed by the Europeans without any compensation, b) Spanish inquiries of Caribs with regard to gold were met with varying responses which the former interpreted as villainous treachery, and finally c) the Caribs ceased trading and supplying food when they realized the Europeans had come to stay. The dependant Europeans then resorted to stealing foodstuffs from native gardens for survival.27

The first lasting characterizations of the Caribs by the Spanish, however, came to be that of brutal savages and idolaters who knew no civilized arts and who failed to cultivate the islands where they lived. As such, their enslavement for savagery was permissible by a Spanish royal decree that dated back to 1503 (Williams 1994, 62; Franzone 1995, 31).

27 Bartolomé de las Casas’ (2003) An Account, Much Abbreviated, Of The Destruction Of The Indies illuminates the brutality the Spanish meted out upon the natives and Caribs in the name of the Spanish State, the spread of the Gospel (processes that required material resources and labor), and personal bravado and wealth. Las Casas argued against the Aristotelian natural inferiority/superiority voicing that natives were noble men, corrupted by the horrific behaviors of Europeans (Williams 1994, 110). He, however, also recommended Africans be used to replace native slave labor. Considering his stance on humanity and justice, it is unlikely he would have presented such an alternative had he known how the Portuguese captured and enslaved them (Williams 1994, 141).
Peter Hulme (1986) estimates that the identification of these natives as Caribs or man-eating savages was ideologically loaded from the beginning. Europeans associated their concept of anthropophagi with "New World" natives. The association was moderated by the Orientalist and Herodotean discourses evident in Columbus' journals, the two being brought together by his pursuit of gold. Oriental discourse was the only available language in which the Genoese western circumnavigation project could be articulated. These expeditions through "exotic" lands were aimed at identifying a direct and unobstructed western route for commerce with India that would lower prices and raise profits for the Spanish Crown. There exists no evidence that the Native American people of the Caribbean were "caribes" or cannibals other than Columbus' unsupported suppositions. They are more appropriately identified as victims of racism and of a European worldview that gave rise to centuries of European attempts at native enslavement, beginning with Columbus' quest for personal prestige that was obtainable by bringing wealth, profit, and saved souls to the Spanish Crown at any cost (Hulme 1986).

Columbus was told of, "one eyed savages, dog nosed peoples. . . ." who inhabited the land of gold that he sought (Hulme 1986, 32). Though he possessed no supporting evidence of such behavior, he came to view such persons as monstrous and anthropophagous, man-eating, savages. Columbus, however, could not possibly have understood what the Tainos (of Arawakan stock) were communicating to him upon their first encounter, and if by chance he did, the Tainos who offered such reports may have stretched truths in order to seek assistance in repelling their more powerful *Kalinago* foes. Columbus' journals give the impression that communication with the natives was
straightforward and mutually intelligible. This was hardly the case, as the ship had but one interpreter, Luis de Torres, who spoke Hebrew, Aramaic and limited Arabic. Gesturing was employed as the main means of their communication but the Spanish logged how they were pleased that whatever they asked of the natives was nearby; they thought this indicated that they were truly comprehending one another. On December 11, 1492, Columbus' journal indicates that, "Everyday we understand these Indians better and they us although many times there has been misunderstanding" (Hulme 1986, 20). For the first three months of the encounter, therefore, Hulme finds no support that what Columbus presented as dialogue was anything more than monologue.

Moreover, historical records stress the friendliness and passivity of the Kalinago, the so-called Caribs, and real evidence shows the notion of Island Caribs as cannibals to be merely a myth. Columbus and his men never saw or recorded, save for two "flimsy" accounts, any real evidence of cannibalistic activity among the Kalinago people. Louis Allaire (1997, 184) describes Carib cannibalism as over exaggerated by Europeans. Edward Conzemius (1928, 188) also writes of early authors' great exaggerations regarding Carib "cannibalism," stating "These Indians did not undertake any expedition with the sole purpose of producing human food." Kirkpatrick Sale (1991) reports that William Sheldon's review of all literature germane to the Kalinago or Carib cannibal debate resulted in no believable evidence of Carib cannibalism. Scholars in the fields of
archeology and linguistics could find no evidence in support of the Caribs "human eating" activities either.  

After a century of distant contact between the Spanish and the Caribbean natives, the French, in 1635, and later the English sought the expansion of their national boundaries and began moving into the Caribbean to challenge the Spanish and pursue regional exploitation of their own. Entangled in their interest for St. Vincent, the French and British rendered the island off-limits to each others territorial expansions under the Treaty of March 31, 1660 (Basse Terre, Guadeloupe). The French were early violators of the treaty. As a result French missionaries of the 1650's entered, and offer descriptions of Carib life that we may use to infer what life was like during the French phase of the colonial period.

4.3. Antagonism and Association with the French

According to French descriptions, Carib villages were comprised of round huts for women that circled a larger rectangular men's house. With regard to social structure the Caribs were an egalitarian society with a tribal lifestyle. Their villages were ruled by headmen but no chiefs ruled over groups of villages. War campaigns brought changes, however, as war leaders assumed leadership over warriors from various islands and led

28 To be clear, actual cannibalism is documented on the mainland, so the practice did exist. The issue is not strictly whether or not the Kalipuna ever practiced cannibalism, rather, how the Europeans used the claim to legitimize their own enterprises with no real evidence. Europeans aggression would not have been justified if the Kalipuna had been cannibals either. We should recall that the Spanish also documented and utilized Aztec cannibalism as their justification. Peter Hulme's review of the historical development of the "Carib" cannibal myth in Cannibalism and the Colonial World (1998) traces back to one Dr. Chanca who sailed with Columbus and wrote an entry dated November 4, 1493. Hulme (1998, 19) is of the opinion that, "Chanca's report does not provide -as often stated- evidence for cannibalism in the Caribbean Islands.
expeditions as far away as the coasts of Venezuela and the Guianas. During the later colonial period, these generals may have held greater political authority than the power they originally held with their own societies (Kirby and Martin n.d., 41; Dryfuss in Allaire 1997, 182).

Native material objects of the time include "carocoli," a small crescent shaped gold copper piece that is believed by some to have originated among their South American ancestors. Green stone pendants and parrot feathers were also used in arenas such as public ceremonies and for personal ornamentation. Caribs made use of calabash containers, wooden canoes and posts on which they sat their huts, and wore little to no clothing. Weaponry, however, is described as the major element of their material culture. They made use of longbows with wood or stingray-spine arrows. These arrows were poisoned with manchineel juice. The Caribs also equipped themselves with an arsenal of blowguns and war clubs which they used to complement their surprise attack tactics and dangerous fumes of their burned pepper gas strikes upon the huts at enemy camps when in battle (Rochefort 1666, 325; Allaire 1997, 183).

The Carib religion did not include diversified deities (as did the Tainos’) but an evil being or devil, "mabouya," who was their major spiritual preoccupation (Franzone 1995, 42). Shamanistic practices were part of their daily life. Their specialist was called "Boye"

However, its history of transmission, elaboration, and embroidery provides evidence of a European fascination which requires more analysis than is usually given.”

Lawrence (1999, 195) claims this "crescent-shaped alloy of gold and copper framed in wood" was the most "prized possession" of Carib men and links such objects not only to the South American Caribs and Arawaks but to Muslim Mandinga Africans whom his research indicates predates Europeans and enslaved Africans' arrival to the Americas.
and his role was to provide healing of the sick and mediate ancestral veneration. This is similar to the practice of the "Piaye" of South American Carib groups (Allaire 1997, 184) and the "Buyei" of their Garifuna descendants in Central America today (Flores 2001, 94; Wells 1982, 10; Foster 1986, 8; Greene 1999, 145).

In a hut with an altar covered in banana leaf, cassava, ouicou (hiu or cassava beer) and first fruits when available, the presiding boye uses cigar smoke and mutters and/ or sings as part of calling upon a spirit helper to diagnose sickness and cure. At the close of the divining process the spirit consumed the foods, though they remained whole. Now holy, edibles were made available to elderly and others of import. At death, bodies were washed and painted with roucou prior to internment below the deceased's hut. Labat (1724, 88-89) indicates that relatives stretching across St. Vincent, Martinique and Guadeloupe traveled to these post mortem rites to insure death occurred from natural causes. Mourners placed food and drink at the head of the interned departed and asked questions of them. During the course of bereavement the boye would be consulted to ascertain the cause of death. According to Borde (1674) four days and nights of dancing occurred after all were satisfied that no wrongdoing had caused the death. Typically at a ouicou feast, songs were sung while men played open-ended drums, string and wind instruments and women danced in circular form (Rochefort 1666).

---

30 From my experiences in Dangriga, these gourd containers are referred to as rida in the present day Central American Garifuna context. The rida is dipped into hiu, for example, and used as a vessel for drinking.
4.4. Black Caribs/ Garifuna

The Garifuna (Black Caribs) have phenotypic characteristics of Africans. It is believed that the influx of African traits into the Kalipuna culture of their forebears began as early as 1517, when captured and enslaved African peoples were first brought into the region by Europeans. There are three possible explanations. Africans may have been taken in raids as captives by the Kalinago from as early as the 1520s. Second, the Kalinago found the Africans stranded in 1635 when two Spanish slaveships transporting them from the Bight of Benin to Barbados shipwrecked near Bequia, off the southern coast of Yurumein - St. Vincent. The Kalipunas took the Africans in to live among them as Indians and to intermarry. Or third, the Africans escaped from neighboring islands, making their way to Kalinago territories, and were taken into the their fold. All theories are plausible with the end result that any combination of such possibilities resulted in the intermarriage of these two groups and gave birth to the Garifuna who were born into Island "Carib" culture (Gullick 1976; Iyo 2000, 193-195).

They made a living hunting, fishing, and cultivating cassava for consumption and tobacco for export to Martinique. Within the new group, the Island-Carib language and ancestor cult became dominant (S. Cayetano 1989). For example, the term Red-Carib referred to the Carib custom of applying a reddish-orange dye, from the arnatto seed, bixa orellana or in the Garifuna tongue gusewe, to their skin (Gullick 1985, 75-76). In the year 1700, French Roman Catholic priest Pere Labat described his encounter with Caribs, depicting this practice thusly, "Our vessel was no sooner anchored than it was filled with Caribs and Negroes come to see us and to ask for brandy. All these gentlemen were rocoued-that is, painted red…” Marilyn Wells (1982) writes that gusewe remains, to the
present, a dominant symbol in the Garifuna ritual of placation, the Adūgūrahani or dúgü, though its use has been modified as a result of different social environments. In Belize, the Garifuna dye garments what is termed "red" for use in the ritual of placation (see also Flores 2001, 118-119). This author's research demonstrates that Garifuna cousins in Nicaragua, however, use the arnatto seed to dye string cords "red." The cords are then tied around the wrists and ankles of the sick during the healing ritual referred to locally as walagayu. Diverse over time and space, their curing rites today as they were among their progenitors play a key role in mending imbalance not solely among the living but between the living and the spirit world (Gullick 1985, 76).

The Kalipuna acceptance of the Africans, whether shipwrecked, escaped, or as captives, is interesting because, at the time, Kalipuna practice included killing male captives upon conquest and sparing the conquered women as wives. In this case, however, killing the male Africans was not an issue to the Kalipuna hosts until some generations later when the Garifuna population had grown to be significant in number. At that time, the Kalipuna attempted to kill off the Garifuna newborn males, but the group was too powerful and would not allow it. Subsequently a wedge formed, dividing the two groups mentally and geographically. The Garifuna then took refuge in the hills, taking many women with them. In the mountains, their population growth was assisted by raiding the Kalipuna communities for additional women and by an influx of escaped slaves from neighboring islands (Labatt 1724, Gonzalez 1988, S. Cayetano 1989). 31

______________________________

31 Considering the destruction caused by old world diseases to which the mixed population was more resistant, absorption of Africans was highly adaptive. Incorporating the Africans also bolstered the number of warriors needed to resist European settlement on Carib lands. It is quite possible that this internal
By 1700, their large numbers made the Garinagu powerful enough to force the Yellow Caribs to relinquish land to them (Labat in Matthei and Smith 2008, 223). Labat’s observations at Dominica, Grenada, and St. Vincent indicate that by this time their populations were elsewhere exterminated or driven to these islands by Europeans (Franzone 1995, 49). In 1710, the Governor of Martinique (French) was asked by the Kalipuna to act as arbitrator in dividing the island between the two groups, resulting in the Garifuna settling to the Windward (eastern) side of the island and the Kalipuna to the Leeward (western). In 1719, however, the Governor of Martinique sent an expedition of 400 men to St. Vincent with the intention of bringing the Garifuna to submission, supposedly once again at the invitation of the Kalipuna. They were seeking assistance in removing the Garifuna from the land. When the several hundred -man French army landed on St. Vincent, the Kalipuna failed to arrive at the designated rendezvous point. This, coupled with the numerous and powerful display of resistance by way of guerrilla warfare on the part of the Garifuna with their bow and arrows, ended the French expedition in defeat. The French survivors fled back to Martinique (Iyo 2000, Gonzalez 1988, Kearns 1983, Gullick 1976) and the Garifuna sued for and obtained war damages (Kirby and Martin n. d., 11). French attempts to take "Carib" Country from the Garifuna conflict was the result of increasingly limited land resources resulting from population growth, the native forms of land use, and European encroachment of native lands.

32 This resolution was favorable on three accords. First, the escaped enslaved Africans arrived from Barbados on St. Vincent's eastern shores which made this attractive to the so called Black Caribs. Second, St. Vincent's western shores facilitated protection from the Black Caribs by the French at Martinique and St. Lucia which the so-called Yellow Caribs sought. Lastly, the French saw the Yellow Caribs' western shore arrangement as an avenue for French settlement in their territory. At that time, however, the island was off-limits to the British and the French under their Treaty of March 31, 1660 (Basse Terre, Guadeloupe) which was reaffirmed in the 1746 Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle which rendered the island "neutral" territory reserved for the "Caribs." Therefore French interests were to bypass such arrangements and ultimately obtain the Island as a whole (Kirby and Martin n.d., 9-10; Franzone 1995, 47).
were futile. The French, however, were able to establish settlements on the western side of the island with Garifuna permission.

The so-called Caribs gained access to European armaments and ammunition during this French interlude. Initially when fighting the encroaching Europeans, the Caribs used bows and arrows and were quite successful in warding them off. With French settlement and trade, the Garifuna became acquainted with the Frenchmen's tools and armaments. This occurred because while the "Carib" women were the agriculturalists, the males traded their surplus with the French in exchange for said items. They became most skillful with the musket and the cutlasses they had secured and it is through this French alignment that the natives learned to trade goods in the European fashion. They further, developed an even greater hatred for the British, who were also the French enemy. Constant battles for control of St. Vincent occurred between the Garifuna, with the French "support," and the British. While the Garifuna had become dependent upon some European goods, the trading process served only as a supplement to their horticulture, which provided for their above subsistence living. Trading with the French provided them the necessary armaments for use against the British. This limited technological exchange without Carib assimilation into the French culture was possible only because the Garifuna lived apart from these Europeans. The French did not live among the Black Caribs and the latter made it clear that they were not nor would they ever be French subjects. In their skillful interactions and negotiations, many Garifuna became fluent in the French language and fond of French wine, reportedly preferring it to rum (Anderson in Hulme 1992, Labat in Hulme 1992, Sale 1991, Palacio in Krohn 1987).
4.5. British Aspirations and Carib Self-determination

After losing out on the larger islands, the attention of the British turned to the Lesser Antilles. Initially they planted subsistence crops, having learned the techniques from Arawaks and Caribs. The British would, however, like the Spanish and French, experience great difficulty in wresting the island of Yurumein-St. Vincent, from Garifuna (Franzone 1995, 47).

The island was the center of four British royal land grants by the year 1722, though it was declared neutral territory in 1660 and 1746 treaties between the French and the British. These treaties left St. Vincent for the natives as a means to insure that one rival European nation would not possess it over the other. In 1708, British settlement of St. Vincent was thwarted by the so-called Caribs. Then, in 1722, the English monarch George I granted St. Vincent to the Duke of Montague. When the English arrived to investigate taking possession of the island they met with both the Kalinago and the Garinagu. After meeting with the latter, who needed no interpreter to communicate their thoughts, Captain Braithwaite hoisted anchor and departed. As per Kirby and Martin's (n.d., 16 - 17) retelling of this encounter, the captain had been warned to do so:

The Chief declared that it was just as well that Braithwaite had not mentioned anything about settling in St. Vincent while he had been ashore. For in that case, not even he as Chief could have saved him from the wrath of the other Black Caribs. He went on to state that a Dutch ship had recently tried the same thing but had had to retire very quickly. Moreover, two French ships had the day before come over to St. Lucia, bringing arms and ammunition and warning them that British wanted to force a settlement and to enslave them. The French had also assured them of their support in any undertaking to drive out the English….The Chief made it quite clear that although they were friendly with the French and under their protection, this was only a matter of expediency since they trusted no European and would never put themselves in a position where a European could harm them. The French, the Chief claimed, no doubt in reference to the war damages they extracted from
Paulian's ill-fated venture, had only obtained their good will by providing them with large presents. This did not mean they distrusted the French any less than other Europeans.

For this reason, the surety of Garifuna resistance, the English and French negotiated the treaty of Aix La Chapelle with Garifuna input and participation in 1748. The signed treaty reaffirmed Dominica and St. Vincent as neutral islands for the so-called benefit of the "Caribs" (Taylor 1951, Gonzalez 1969, Palacio 1993). It must be recognized, however, that their welfare was the least of the treaty's concerns. The British and French were engaged in an "If I can't have it, neither can you" battle over the island. Within the context of European struggle for regional dominance, native territory was reduced to only the islands of St. Vincent and Dominica by the eighteenth century. As Garinagu had grown increasingly familiar with European-style negotiations and diplomacy, they entered into treaties and alliances with the officials of the European encroachers to settle land disputes, provide land and travel rights, and return slaves who had escaped European domination by stealing away to native territory. In one such dispute, British authorities granted damages to Chatoyer for unauthorized wood extraction from his land (Gullick 1985, 83) The Garifuna had acquired European languages and conducted such business in the European's tongue, while not letting go of their native Island-"Carib" language. The Garifuna tradition of multilingualism is well documented. For example, Shepherd (1831) characterizes most men as fluent in both French and English, in addition to their native Garifuna language. He also identifies the ten years after the 1773 Peace Treaty as a Garifuna golden decade because of the social and economic successes they experienced during that period, noting that their skills in navigation allowed them to travel long distances on the high seas miles away from the islands. Diplomacy and multilingualism,
therefore, within the context of growing and competing European powers, served as a form of resistance, evidence for which is the persistence of the Garifuna language among their descendants in Central America and the U.S. today.

While the Garifuna were acquiring new talents and skills for engaging Europeans and preserving their culture via negotiations, their labor, in addition to their lands, may have been of interest to the British. Possibly as a clandestine means of gaining control over them, the British hired the Garifuna to transport cargo between ship and shore during this time. As captured in the ethnocentric statements offered by the British Governor of St. Vincent, Sir William Young, that are reprinted in Matthei and Smith (2008, 223):

The Charaibbs [sic] thus begin to taste of money… Money civilizes in the first instance as it corrupts in the last, the savage laboring [sic] for himself, soon ceases to be a savage; the slave to money becomes a subject to government, and he becomes a useful subject. (Young, 1801, p. 299f)

As we will continue to see, Garifuna resistance via skirmishes and battles persisted as they adhered to their belief in their own humanity, sovereignty and right to self-determination, while participating in engulfing global structures.

The Peace of Paris (1763) that ended the Seven Years War (known as the French and Indian War in North America) "legalized" Britain's assumed sovereignty over the two "neutral" islands (St. Vincent and Dominica) as well as Tobago, Grenada and the Grenadines, as they were all ceded to the British by the French under terms of the treaty. No provisions were made with regard to the native populations. The British planned to push forward with using the islands for plantations that would generate profits for national purposes. To this end, the Garifuna were left with only 4,000 acres of land in their windward part of St. Vincent island (Gonzalez 1988, 16). Dominica, at the time,
was populated by 1,718 Frenchmen and 5,872 slaves who produced 1,690,368 pounds of coffee in addition to cocoa and cotton. St. Vincent was settled by 1,300 Frenchmen and their 3,400 slaves but produced only 12,490 lbs of coffee in addition to cocoa and tobacco because the island was the major stronghold of the Garifuna (Marshal 1973). The Garifuna population numbered between 3,000 and 6,000 in 1763 according to the records of Britain's appointed Governor of the island, Sir Thomas Young. The Kalinago numbered approximately 100 families (Gonzalez 1988). Bernard Marshal (1973) estimates the total Black and Yellow Carib population at 3,000, demonstrating the difficulty numerating the population. There is consensus that the Kalinago by themselves no longer posed a threat to the Europeans, who were still interested in possessing St. Vincent island. Again, the Yellow Caribs' rapid depopulation was brought on by infrequent neighborly violence but most certainly disease.

Between 1765 and 1773 commissioners on the board of trade successfully disposed of all arable lands in the newly acquired Dominica (a total of 95,134 1/4 acres), Tobago (the sum of 54,401 acres), and Grenada (some 74,681 acres), as it was British policy to develop all new possessions as sugar colonies. In St. Vincent, however, only 20,538 acres or 1/3 of the arable land was sold. This poor performance in sales receipts was because the most suitable lands for cultivation were on the windward side of the island, which was still inhabited by the Garifuna. These afro-natives had absolutely no intentions of surrendering their land. The windward side of the island was described as most extensive and flat. Its soil was rumored to be the best in all the world, as it was well watered with rivers (needed to power sugar mills). If obtained, the estimation was that St. Vincent would grow to be a sugar colony second in prominence only to Jamaica (Marshal 1973,
Black Carib resistance greatly undermined British sugar plans in St. Vincent, however. Vincentian land sales, therefore, had to be restricted to the mountainous rugged terrain of the island's center and leeward side, which was more appropriate for coffee and cocoa, but not at all suitable for the sugar. For these reasons, settler pressure upon the British Governor of St. Vincent, Sir William Young, and the board of trade increased as the settlers were of the opinion that their self-determination was being compromised by the "savages" of the Windward.

In 1768, the Governor authorized construction of a road through Garifuna territory for land survey purposes that would lead to eventual land sale. He offered them the King's protection and participation in securing "Carib" reserve lands (i.e., reservations) in the hopes that the road could be carried out uninterrupted. The Garifuna, however, refused to acknowledge the sovereignty of King George. Chatoyer, the Paramount Chief of Chiefs, rejected the Commissioner's offer and warned him not to enter into the windward territory. When the Commissioner's construction survey party attempted penetration of Garifuna territory their advance was stopped by armed Garinagu (Gonzalez 1990, Hulme 1992).

The British attempted to resume road construction through the Windward in 1769, but this time with the accompaniment of one detachment of the 32nd regiment and four others on standby. The Garifuna took the 40 soldiers of the 32nd captive and ordered the land surveyors to remove themselves from the territory. The intruders did so quickly without taking their belongings. The three remaining detachments arrived along with all white planters fit to bear arms and a number of slaves, all with the intent of rescuing the first detachment. The soldiers were released only after the Garifuna were given 'clear and
explicit assurance', which they demanded, that the British 'give up all immediate pretensions to interfere with their country and never again attempt to make roads of communication through it" (Marshal 1973, 8).

The colonists who comprised the Assembly and Council of St. Vincent (local government) urged the king to either take control of the "Caribs" or identify them as "...dangerous insolent rebels and deal with them accordingly" (Gonzalez 1988, 237). Again, the colonists were jealous because the Garifuna occupied the island's most fertile lands. The Europeans viewed their fixed-plot agriculture, swidden horticulture with extensive forest fallow system (slash and burn), as near disuse, believing that sugar plantations would be a better use for the land (Young 1971, Hulme 1992, Franzone 1995). Since the Garifuna would neither surrender their territories to the Crown nor cooperate with England's intentions for St. Vincent, plans for removing them completely from the island and relocating them elsewhere arose. The British, from as early as 1765, intended to expell the natives from St. Vincent, knowing from experience that they could not be enslaved and thus would continue to hinder their imperialistic goals for the island. In the year 1765, August 10th, the Island Commissioner wrote the following to the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury:

...they live in scattered huts in an unregular manner, a great distance from each other, without established subordination, claiming large tracts of woodland intervening, of which they make no use; and besides possessed of other lands in cleared parts of the country, which interfere much with the laying out plantations for sale. They had hitherto occasioned no disturbance, but still we are in doubt if they can ever be made useful; or whether in many instances they may not prove dangerous. The measure that appears to us, from these considerations, to be safest and most for advantage of the colony, would be as soon as possible to remove as many of them as can be prevailed upon to quit… (Sir William Young in Hulme 1992,191)
Note that the letter claims that the "Caribs" made no use of their lands, and states that they had caused no disturbance but were dangerous. The letter continues on to suggest the Natives be removed from St. Vincent and the remaining few be confined to proper boundaries and subjected to regulations, i.e., placed on reservations. One of the regulations identified was that there would be no land ownership for the "Caribs" that remained.

In 1770, the commissioners of St. Vincent received permission from the Crown to make proposals for land purchases from the Garifuna. Chief Chatoyer and his 40 men (chiefs) rejected the treaty, refusing to sell any of their land. As a result, the settlers and the commissioners' petitions directed to the Crown for "Black Carib" removal increased. They insisted that offers of money and land to the Garifuna would not be sufficient to meet their goals. They demanded military force for the total removal of the Garifuna from the island as the only remaining sound measure for British acquisition and control of the islands. The continuous perception of "Carib" threat made mercantile houses increasingly reluctant to extend credit to the island. Unlike the settlers, Garifuna did not pay taxes: none of their earnings from tobacco sales to the French went to the Crown. The Garifuna controlled two-thirds of the island's richest land and loyal British subjects were relegated to rugged terrain, causing planters/settlers hardship in regard to paying their taxes. The English settlers' sentiment was that the situation would not change as Garifuna consistently refused to sell any land, and even if they were forced to surrender their territory by force they would return to re-occupy the area as soon as the opportune situation to do so presented itself. Therefore, in English eyes the Garifuna continued to be "savages": a public nuisance and threat to the English settlements on the island. A letter
from the Earl of Hillsborough dated April 18, 1772, proposed not only Carib removal as a remedy, but offered a way forward with its execution:

… if necessity demand the removal of the charibbs, you do take up such vessels as can be procured, to serve as transports for the conveyance of them to some unfrequented part of the coast of Africa, or to some desert island adjacent thereto, care being taken that they be treated on the voyage with every degree of humanity their situation will admit of; and whatsoever may be judged necessary to subsist them for a reasonable time, and with such tools and implements as may enable them to provide for their future subsistence. (Gonzalez 1988, 19-20)

The Garifuna relationship of trade with and support from the French only heightened matters making the threat not only real but immediate. Something would need to be done to control them as the British authorities' continuous failures in offering "protection" to settlers increasingly indicated weakness, and placed the honor and dignity of the Crown at stake (Marshal 1973, 10).

4.6. Forced Migration from Yurumein to Roatan Island

The First Carib War

The First Carib War between the Garifuna and the British began in 1772, after the Garifuna met with Britain's Governor in Chief of the island and made it clear that they would not yield up any portion of their lands, which "were transmitted to them from their ancestors and in defense of which they would die..." The Garifuna further promised "to behave themselves well," if left in peace with their land but, "let the consequences be what it would," if disturbed, they would not surrender their land (Craton 1996, 12). The British, however, pushed forward with their agenda to take possession of the territory for the so-called protection of British subjects and to maintain the Crown's honor. They
conducted dubious practices that only agitated the Garifuna. These included conducting surveys through their territory, using French proxies to purchase lands, and repeatedly requesting that Garifuna accept subject status under the King and relocation for their own safety. The Garifuna rejected resisted European efforts at every turn. Chief Chatoyer reportedly stated that, "they [the Garifuna] knew of no king… and would acknowledge no king… that they were independent of the kings of either France or England, and would continue so, though indeed attached to the French" (Young in Franzone 1995, 59). As a result of continued hindered progress, perceived losses, and with the Crown's honor at stake, the British deployed six companies of the 68th regiment who were stationed in Grenada and Dominica, and two regiments from Boston, with instructions to round up and transport the "Caribs" from the island in 1772. Major Darymple, leader of the imperial troops, took a year to subdue the Garifuna after meeting with fierce resistance. The affair, however, became the subject of a parliamentary inquiry spurred by the public's familiarity with the concept of natives being "noble savages," coupled with ideas associated with the "rights of man," as both were available at the time. Whether in plays, literature, or operas characters such as Prospero and Caliban, Robinson Crusoe and Carib Friday, and certainly Inkle and Yarico were important to garnering sympathies for the unfortunate plight of Afro-Amerindian representatives of innocence and suffering under the expanding forces of capitalism. According to Quinn (2002, 390), Colman's Inkle and Yarico: "…is much more concerned with a critical yet exculpatory reading of mercantile ideology that paves the way for precisely the kind of arguments against the slave trade which simultaneously highlight its economic obsolescence and its moral turpitude." The liberals had a strong case regarding the injustices of British imperial policies on the
Garinagu because of their combined genetic and culture traits of both the African and the Amerindian. The expedition for their extirpation was indeed found unjust and inhumane. As a result, Major Darymple was immediately instructed to negotiate a treaty that would leave the Garifuna in full possession of their lands if he had not already reduced them. Oddly enough, under the terms of the resulting treaty, the Caribs were expected to accept full allegiance to the British government and permit roads of communication through "Carib" territory. Among other stipulations, sale of any Black "Carib" lands from that point forward required approval from the King of England (Marshal 1973).

The resulting commission of enquiry on Dalrymple's campaign as quoted in Kirby and Martin (n.d., 25) asserts that the war against the Caribs, "was founded on injustice and reflected dishonor on the national character, was a violation of the natural rights of mankind and totally subversive of that it gloried to defend."

While supporters were well-meaning, they too had political aspirations/considerations that would in a sense limit their march for Carib justice. The Carib controversy came amidst the broader evolution of British ideas about race and empire, spurred on by controversy (which led to the Regulating act of 1773) evident in the parliamentary and public debates over the sphere of the East India company's power in India and British internal politics, the status of Indians in British-dominated territories, and the behaviors of "nabobs", the most "fortunate and unscrupulous" company servants (Craton 1996, 77; Osterhammel 1997, 32). Nabobs and the West Indian absentee planters (local colonial authority) were equally disliked and distrusted by new planters in St. Vincent. Increasingly, with the growing sympathy of North American colonists for the treatment of Native Americans, the imperial government faced criticisms for their treatment of subject peoples. This became a highly divisive issue after the Stamp Act Crisis (1765-66) and Pontiac's rebellion (1763). Government critics advocated for justice to the Caribs on the grounds that they were "a defenceless, innocent and inoffensive people. . . fighting for liberty, and every English heart must applaud them"(Craton 1996, 77). Motions in parliament included a) that the expeditions against the Caribs was taken without sufficient provocation at the instigation of persons interested in the extirpation of the Caribs, and b) the expeditions were undertaken without direct orders from government and were mismanaged to the degree of causing disaster and dishonor.

Chatoyer and twenty-seven other chiefs signed the treaty. Kirby and Martin (n.d.) question the validity of the treaty on several accords including the Caribs grasp of the foreign English language and swearing allegiance to God and Jesus Christ a Christian pantheon unfamiliar to them. Additionally, the authors assert that the treaty could not be understood or endured on the grounds that it significantly reduced the lands that Caribs considered their own; land being the consummate bone of contention in Carib and European relations.
Another factor pressing for the close of this war was that there developed among the commissioners a grave concern that British fighters had embarked upon hazardous and uncertain service. War reports of the day indicated that the Black Caribs were getting the upper hand in the battlefields. Consider, for example, an excerpt from the Governor to the Crown on October 9, 1772:

I flatter myself, we shall soon be able to give your Lordship some satisfactory account of our proceedings, tho' I must confess the conduct of the Charibbs is more serious and formidable, and I see greater difficulties in the execution of His Majesty's commands than I expected. I very much fear their reduction will be a work of time… (Marshall 1973, 14)

In fact, the British troops' situation was so critical that additional reinforcements were called upon for fortification in preparation for protracted conflict because it was recognized that the Black Caribs knew the Vincentian terrain and were good strategists and fighters. By the time the warring nations of Britain and Garifuna assembled at the bargaining table, Marshall believes the war was at a stalemate. The resulting peace treaty of 1773 ceded 2,000 acres of Garifuna land to the British. They removed themselves from the area with reluctance and then resettled it in 1775. Though the windward was left to the "Caribs" in perpetuity, many concessions and clauses were included in the treaty that were, in time, to favor the colonial regime. This accord, however, actually resulted in a nearly twenty-five year postponement of colonialists' plans to remove the so-called "savages" from St. Vincent (Gonzalez 1988, Franzone 1995, Craton 1996).

War of 1779

The year 1779 presents yet another chapter in the battle for Yurumein- St. Vincent. In that year, the Garifuna and French joined together to drive the English out of the island.
Dorothy Franzone (1995, 63-66) indicates that there are discrepancies regarding who initiated the combining of forces for ousting the English settlers. What is clear, however, is that France's declaration of war on Britain and associated rhetoric surrounding brotherhood and liberty provided the impetus for the Carib-French alliance to attack local forts and drive English settlers from the windward part of the island. Frenchman Porcin La Roque subsequently served as Lieutenant Governor of the island, and the Garifuna regained sovereignty and control of their lands. The Peace Treaty signed at Versailles, however, temporarily closed that chapter of the French–British conflict, having returned the island to Great Britain on January 1, 1784. What the treaty did not do, however, was end Garifuna self-determination in pursuit of sustained autonomy and retention of their lands.

Second Carib War

The Second Carib War (1794-1796), also referred to as The Carib War or the Brigands War from the perspective of the French, was long and complex. It occurred within the context of French revolutionary sensibilities, French entanglements at home, slave revolt in Haiti, and waning French power in the Eastern Caribbean. It begins the final episode of the phase of Garifuna history in the eastern Caribbean. In many ways, the outcome of this war was decided by the availability of reinforcements available to each side of the conflict. The Garifuna reinforcements were once again provided by the French, which presented some challenges as the two continued to have different war strategies and strengths. The Caribs used guerrilla warfare (ambush) tactics, with many of their advances being made by small parties that converged on opponents. On the other hand, the French were more regimented and preferred fighting in set positions and
formations. Tactical strategies notwithstanding, initially it appeared as though the Garifuna and their French allies would take over all of St. Vincent.

On the night of March 10, 1795, the final uprising began. Chief Duvallie led the more windward Garifuna warriors and the Chief of Chiefs, Joseph Chatoyer, commanded the more leeward forces. The two were quite successful in battles along their respective routes to rendezvous with their allied French troops. At Dorsetshire Hill, Chatoyer was slain in battle by Major Leith; the date was March 14, 1795.\(^\text{36}\) Reportedly, in the fallen Chief’s hand was a sword that had been given him by Sir William Young and around his neck was a gorget (throat armor) that was said to have been a gift from Prince William Henry (later King William IV), who had previously visited the island. An inflammatory French proclamation was found in the slain Chief’s pocket. Shepherd (1831) quotes the propaganda that began spreading among the Garifuna in 1794. Kirby and Martin caution readers regarding its portrayal of support and commitment on the part of the French, reasoning that undoubtedly many hoped the Garifuna and the British would exterminate each other, leaving the island open for French rule (Shepherd in Kirby and Martin n.d., 36). The rhetoric included the following text:

Behold your chains forged and imposed by the hands of the Tyrannical English! Blush, and break those ensigns of disgrace, spurn them with becoming indignation, rise in a moment, and while we assist you from

\(^{36}\)Chatoyer was slain only four days after the fighting began. Salvador Suazo (1997, 124-126) reports discrepancies indicating 1. that English accounts suggest he was stabbed by Major Leith, 2. French accounts indicate Chatoyer was winning the battle but was shot in the back by English soldiers, and 3. Leith instructed five of his soldiers to simultaneously attack the chief. Suazo offers a fourth possibility which was obtained in government interview of a witness conducted some time after the event as the most likely rendition of the slaying to have actually occurred. The English attacked during/after Garifuna victorious battle celebrations. At about midnight, on a night offering no moonlight, Leith charged at Chatoyer and missed with his bayonet at which time British soldiers fell upon the Paramount Chief. Only then was Leith able to stab the Chief. Upon his death, his son of the same name assumed Chief status.
motives of the philanthropy and zeal for the happiness of all nations, fall on these despots, extirpate them from the country, and restore yourselves, your wives and children to the inheritance of your fathers, whose spirits from the grave will lead on your ranks, inspire you with fury, and help you to be avenged.

The Garifuna, having a century-long history of resistance to European encroachment of their territory, did not require French agitation to rise up against the British. However, the French were certainly a key factor. Victor Hugues, a French Mulatto revolutionary, and his agents spread such influential rhetoric to French settlers in Guadeloupe and St. Vincent as well as other islands (Kirby and Martin n.d., 36-37; Franzone 1995, 66-67). According to Curtis Jacobs (2003), who conducted archival research in France on the topic of the Brigands' War, Hugues made direct communication with Chatoyer and the Garifuna in Yurumein-St. Vincent with the following text, "Tell our brother general Chatoyer that the lands usurped from him by the English will be returned by the French nation."

The "Carib"-French uprising that began with assistance of French fighters dispatched by Hugues on the night of March 10, 1795, was timed to coincide with similar rebellions orchestrated by Hugues and his agents on neighboring islands.

The Garifuna were demoralized with the loss of their paramount Chief. Many from the French ranks exited the conflict upon learning of the Chief’s death. The Garifuna,

---

37 Curtis Jacobs (2003) indicates that Hugues was also a Jacobin, or member of the largest and most powerful political club of the French revolution. He was officially dispatched to Guadeloupe as Civil Commissioner by the French National Convention after they ended slavery and declared all persons residing in French territories citizens of the Republic of France regardless of station and origin. The French hoped that emancipating a half million enslaved Africans would create an army to resist British invaders. Hugues role was to implement the plan on the islands and thereby reacquire France's eastern Caribbean empire. Towards this end, he backed the Caribs with arms and French fighters (Gonzalez 1988, 20).

however, continued fighting the British for more than a year (Stone 1990, 24). On June 9-10, 1796, General Abercrombie's military attack forced all remaining French fighters to surrender. Though the Garifuna persisted, more were rounded up in each victorious British encounter. In December of the same year, an act was passed declaring that anyone harboring "Caribs" would be punished. In the main, the Garifuna had been routed but would continue to be viewed as enemies of the state for their self determination and valiant spirit in defense of their lands.

Victory was not enough to allay the British fears of future Garifuna revolts in efforts to regain Yurumein-St. Vincent. The possibility of resurgence, as evidenced by the Garifuna demonstrated power and determination, was the Crown's continued incentive for removing them from the island.39 A total of 5,080 Garifuna (102 Yellow Caribs were initially included but were returned to St. Vincent by the English) men, women, and children were moved by British warships to Roatan, one of the Bay Islands off the coast of northern Honduras. The convoy transporting them reportedly consisted of seven ships. Gonzalez's (1988, 36) research reveals inaccuracies and variance in the records on the matter, but she determines the names of the vessels used to transport the Caribs. They include the HMS Experiment, Sovereign, Boyton (Boyston or Boston) Topaze, Ganges,

39 The British had a history of deporting those they deemed problematic or undesireables under varying circumstances. British convicts had been sent to the North American colonies from very early on. By 1705, Pennsylvania law provided for deportation of negroes, whether free or enslaved, convicted or charged of crimes. From 1755-1762 Colonial courts provided for the deportations of approximately 10,000 Acadians (French) from Halifax, Nova Scotia to South Carolina, Pennsylvania, the Carolinas and Georgia (Plank 2001). Some 568 escaped Africans called Maroons were deported from Trelawny, Jamaica to Nova Scotia by the British in 1795 for the criminality of seeking to preserve autonomy and freedom from enslavement and European domination (Grant 2002). Australia was established as a penal colony "effectually disposing [Britain] of convicts, and rendering their transportation reciprocally beneficial to themselves and the state" and thereby removed "… a dreadful Banditti from this country" circa 1786 (Macintyre 1999, 30-31).
Fortitude, Prince Henry William, John and Mary, Sea Nymph, and Britannia. Only 2,026 survivors arrived in Roatan on April 12, 1797. Many Garifuna had died at Baliceaux, one of the Grenadines, where they were held in concentration camps after their capture for approximately five months prior to their expulsion. There they lost over 2,000 persons to yellow fever exacerbated by malnutrition. Still others died en-route (S. Cayetano 1989). Nancy Gonzalez (1988, 21) depicts the exile numerically and geographically as follows:

**Table 4.1 Measures of Black Carib Survivors During 1796-97 Deportation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BLACK CARIB SURVIVORS AT DIFFERENT POINTS IN THE DEPORTATION, 1796-97</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Children</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Captured and taken to Baliceaux, July 1796 – February 1797</td>
<td>1,004</td>
<td>1,779</td>
<td>1,555</td>
<td>4,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embarked, March 11, 1797</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>7202</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landed, Roatan, April 12, 1797</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>1,362</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>2,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landed, Trujillo, September 23, 1797</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>1,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Still at Roatan, October 17, 1797</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Women and Children were not counted separately.

---

40 The Fortitude "went aground", Prince William Henry was captured by Spaniards, and John and Mary was presumed abandoned in Jamaica after having docked there for needed repairs (Gonzalez 1988, 35-36 note 10).

41 According to Gonzalez’s figures, 222 Garifuna who departed from Baliceaux did not reach to Roatan. Perhaps many of their lives were cast with the lot of the three ships that did not make it to Roatan. A number of them perished from illness (the rampant yellow fever that spread in Baliceaux) during the passage.
The English chose Roatan island as the destination for the Black Caribs because of British interests in the mainland area (Gonzalez 1990). It was their hope that the Black Caribs' history of ferocity and strength would deter the Spanish, who controlled much of the area, from British interests there. The Garifuna did not limit themselves to Roatan island, however. Though they established a town there, many sailed to the mainland, arriving onto the Atlantic coastline at Trujillo after negotiating with Spanish authorities and subsequently dispersing throughout what are presently the nation states of Honduras, Belize, Guatemala, and Nicaragua, where their settlements can still be found today (Bradley in Krohn 1987, Hadel 1974, Gonzalez 1989, Davidson 1976).

Though the Black Caribs were forcibly removed from the island, the Garifuna threat remained clear and present to the British. In St. Vincent (1803), a reward of $20 was offered for each "Carib" man or woman killed or brought in as a captive. In June of 1804 an act was passed stating that the Caribs had forfeited their claims to the land given them in the 1773 treaty as a result of their so called high treason against the British crown (Gullick 1985, 85). In 1805, the war was declared officially ended. In reflecting upon their history of struggle, defeat and removal from Yurumein/ St. Vincent, and their positioning today in (Belize) Central America, Sebastion Cayetano (1989, 35) offers the following:

There exists a hungu hungu (semi sacred) song among the Garifuna of Belize that states "Nigita ubahu Nuari nei, Wageira Hamuga… ibiriwahati huagu afarahatiun. "See that island there, that is our land… it has been taken over by killers." The late Andy Palacio (2007) in a Boston performance interpretation this text as the possible sentiments of the Garinagu as the ships taking them into exile made their way from the shores of Yurumein. As discussed in Chapter 2, the versions of the Garifuna national anthem known throught the diaspora records a similar preoccupation with the Europeans having driven them out from Yurumein. The experience being one of many shared historical experiences linked to community values that is employed to maintain group cohesion.
But to their credit the Black and Yellow Caribs fought a good fight, had stood up with their mighty bows and arrows against the mighty guns and cannons of the three European powers, namely Spain, France and Britain. They resisted slavery in all its forms, even preferring to jump off high cliffs and drown rather than be enslaved. Because of their strong resolve, the rich, vibrant and dynamic Garifuna heritage has survived intact.

As for the "Garifuna heritage having survived intact," cultural survival remains a work in progress for the descendants of the Kalinago living in Central American states and North America. Chapter 6 will examine the particular case of one Garifuna community and the conclusion to this dissertation will elucidate the interconnections that exist between their micro-history of cultural continuity, change, and resistance and those of their Garifuna cousins in the diaspora.

4.7. Conclusion

In this chapter, I have sought to provide a fuller understanding of the Garifuna history by way of a post-modern reconstruction, or what Geertz (1973) identifies as the peeling back of the layers of significance surrounding texts about their ancestors in the Eastern Caribbean. Colonial history has excluded the native voice, thus empowering westerner producers for the centuries that followed. Through deconstruction, elements of the subalterns' micro-history can be brought to light. In re-examining and re-presenting aspects of accounts provided by colonial writers, I have with the assistance of secondary sources included the political context in which select events have occurred, highlighting authors' biased leanings with the European powers, and providing descriptions of "Carib" colonial encounters as a way of constructing a more inclusive Garifuna history in the Eastern Caribbean.
What has been presented here in regard to the Kalinago encounter - colonial experience is not unique. Their history conforms to what we understand to be the broader issues of imperial domination and power. The Europeans that first encountered Native Americans in the Americas could only make sense of the cultures and events via their own cultural concepts, context, and history. The same holds true for the natives' comprehension of the newcomers. Their interactions were initially based on equality, but changed when European concepts of the Native as "others" (lacking culture and being "barbarians") led to inversions of the actual state of affairs for the purposes of dominion and capital gain. For example, the Europeans' very survival was assured by their initial exchanges with the native populations, but the former were always suspicious of the latters' intentions and concerned about their few numbers among the natives, and later Africans, who had done them no harm and sought only the freedom of their people and communities.

Consider, too, that Native agriculture yielded returns far superior in quality and abundance to those of the newcomers, but when settlers wrote their communications to the mother country, the native cultures were ultimately portrayed as uncivilized. Their lack of adequate land use and "nature" was used to justify European confiscation of native territories. Hundreds more of such examples of European inversions, essentially contradictions to the actual state of events, can be drawn out via deconstructed texts. They provide insights to the contradictory character of the colonial projects and a more balanced portrayal of the motivations underlying the "distancing, hierarchizing and incorporation" of the native peoples, who nevertheless survived the terror that
accompanied the European march toward imperial power (Thomas 1994, 142). Further elaborations, however, are beyond the scope of this work.43

Colonial history is largely communicated as the destruction of inferior native populations for these capitalistic imperialist endeavors. It is an incorrect analysis, however, to implicate the natives as savage, inferior, and their response to European intrusions as passive in nature. As illustrated by the so-called Carib case study, knowledge and resistance take many forms. Social scientists can access the power natives exerted in encounters with Europeans by including, in our reconstructions, an inversion of the rhetorical flow. In so doing we can access native peoples’ agency or control over particular situations via the choices they made from available options (Burkhart 1998).

Finally, the historical account of the "Caribs" of the Lesser Antilles presented here evidences the importance of asking questions in regard to what claims texts are making, and why. One must draw out what is the author's understanding of nation, race, and cultural difference, and ascertain how such concepts are being used to mitigate political concerns which may have given rise to the particular or influenced description (Thomas 1997, 26). Everyone writes with a particular goal, or agenda in mind or even at a subconscious level. When examining historical relationships of power, or in writing our own histories or ethnographies, a more complete and accurate account will include many voices from the many positions involved, thus undoing the trappings of neo-colonial thought and insuring at minimum a non-sterilized Garifuna history. The next chapter will

---

continue to examine the Garifuna trajectory but will do so within the context of the rise of nation states, wage labor, cultural continuity, change and resistance through a factious and developmental period in Central American history. Its transnational approach recognizes socio-cultural diversity both in the region, and in Garifuna experiences as well, and demonstrates the latter's pattern of migration in relation to marginalization and the opportunities and challenges associated with colonial, and later, neo-colonial projects.

five most often referenced researchers on the subject of the Garifuna at the time; Douglas Taylor, Ruy Coelho, Nancie Gonzalez, CJMR Gullick and Virginia Kerns
CHAPTER 5: GARIFUNA DIASPORIC RESISTANCE, RESILIENCE, AND RESURGENCE ALONG THE ATLANTIC COAST OF CENTRAL AMERICA

5.1. Introduction

The ongoing evolution of Garifuna cultural resistance and resurgence in diaspora may in part be understood by looking at the historical context of the Atlantic coast’s incorporation into global processes. The exiled Garinagu, forcibly displaced from St. Vincent to Roatan, quickly made their way to the Central American mainland and established communities along the Atlantic coastline of what are the present day nation-states of Belize, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua, as illustrated here:

Figure 5.1 Garifuna Settlements Along the Atlantic Coastline of Central America.\(^\text{44}\)

\(^{44}\) Source: Sarah England (2006, 3). With regard to site F, Santa Fe, the name of the Nicaraguan Village is La Fe; it has a barrio named Santa Fe where a Creole family was allowed to settle many years ago.
The Garinagu immediately found themselves embedded in a region that was in dispute, as both the British and Spanish wrestled for control of the coast.

This chapter presents a brief treatment of Garinagu colonial and post colonial history on the Atlantic coast within the context of international and transnational domination by capital-earning interests into which the Garinagu were inserted. The chapter details Garinagu economic survival mechanisms, including temporary wage earning strategies such as soldiering, forestry works, coastal transporting, and employment in fruit company enclaves. A portrait of Garifuna life emerges through periods of persistent contact, struggle, movement, cultural assimilation and resurgence, across shifting terrains, and over the course of two centuries.

The socio-political and economic predicaments of Garinagu in Nicaragua in particular serve as the focus in the latter part of the chapter, which culminates with Post Sandinista developments that lay the foundation for current Garifuna movements.

**Garifuna Emigration to Belize at the Turn of the Nineteenth Century**

When many Garifuna emigrated to the British settlement in Belize (present day Dangriga / Stann Creek) after their expulsion to Roatan Island, they encountered a political and economic context in which the British had been long struggling for control of the region's timber industry. For nearly two centuries previous, history also had already demonstrated how European economic interest in the region had led to their disinterest in the self-determination of Indigenous and enslaved Afro-descended peoples caught up in this competitive imperial project.
The arrival of the English at Belize is presumed to have commenced with the arrival of a privateering Scotsman named Peter Wallace. In 1617, Wallace and a crew of eighty men arrived at the mouth of the Belize River, the site of present day Belize City. The first true settlement did not emerge there until 1638, some twenty-one years later, when shipwrecked English seamen sought refuge and later took up residence at the old Wallace River site. They were later joined by settlers from Jamaica, and expanded their homestead to St. George's Cay, where they conducted raids on Spanish ships carrying gold and silver bullion from the "New World" back to Europe (Stetzekorn 1975, 128). These first settlers, also referred to as Baymen, extracted their own logwood (valued as a source of dye), but by the 1720s had begun importing slaves to conduct the laborious work for them. Slave imports resulted in Blacks outnumbering the Baymen from as early as 1745, when the 120 slaves comprised seventy-one percent of the total population. Slaves were largely imported from Jamaica and Barbados, and were primarily used for the difficult task of logwood extraction for export up until the 1770s (Bolland 1977, Shoman 2000, 40).

The Spanish launched attacks on Belize in 1716 and 1724. Another attack in 1730 forced the Baymen to retreat, joining their counterparts on the Mosquito Coast. Belize was attacked and burned in 1733 and 1737, and camps were, again, destroyed in 1745. Two years later the Baymen were routed and forced to Roatan Island. Spanish attacks

45 The very name Belize may have come about through Anglo-Hispanic means; the corruption of the English name "Wallace" with the Spanish "Valeese" which may have through time and language shift become the present form "Belize." The name Belize, however, may also have arisen from Francophone and/ or Mayan sources (Hernandez 1990; Dobson 1973, 49).

This last event almost precipitated a war between Britain and Spain; Spain disavowed the attack and promised to make restitution. The settlers returned within a year, and in 1763 [via the Treaty of Paris] Spain gave them license to cut logwood... Thus, when the Garifuna arrived in the early 1800s, circumstances were ripe for their integration into a thriving logwood industry. Even though the British successfully repelled the Spanish on occasion, the vulnerable state of British settlements on the Atlantic Shore was characteristic of the times. The 1763 treaty reduced such attacks, but did not eliminate them, as indicated by the 1779 Spanish capture of three hundred ninety persons at the Belize settlement. Two hundred fifty of these captives were slaves. Additionally, in 1798 the Baymen repelled some thirty-one Spanish attack ships at the battle of St. George's Caye. The Baymen's successful show of resistance was made possible by naval assistance from Jamaica. The battle itself represents the last physical show of Spanish aggression against the Belize settlement (Dobson 1973; Vernon 1997; Shoman 2000).

Pre-History in Nicaragua Before Primary Garifuna Emigration

The setting for Garifuna emigration to Nicaragua\(^{46}\) is the Miskito Coast, a stretch of coast approximate 60 km wide encompassing the southeastern coastal tip of Honduras and extending into most of the Nicaraguan coastline. Competing interests and populations in the region helped create a complex ethnic and racial milieu that would help establish the socio-cultural, political, and economic context for the Garifuna in diaspora. Named after the indigenous Miskito population (a subtribe of the Sumu), the Miskito Coast, like regions of Belize to the north, was defended by the British against Spanish encroachment.

\(^{46}\) The name Nicaragua no doubt derives from the Nicarao who settled near what we know today as Lake Nicaragua in the twelfth century AD. Like other Nahuatl-speaking groups in Central America, they were sometimes referred to as Pipil, meaning ruler in the Nahuatl language (Pineda 2006, 24). Conquistador Hernandez de Cordoba settled the area as a Spanish colony in the 1520s, a time when the indigenous Chortotegas comprised forty three percent of Nicaragua's Pacific coast population. See Carmack (2002, 16) for Maribios, Nahuas, Chontals population figures.
Drawn by the opportunity to exploit natural resources such as dyewoods, medicinal products, gums, and resins, the British in time also took advantage of the area as an important political and military base of operations for Westminster. The Mosquito Kingdom served the British as a base of operations for attacking Nicaragua and Costa Rica, while serving as well as an important hub for contraband trade.

The English opened a trading station at Cabo Gracias a Dios on the Atlantic coast of present day Nicaragua in 1633, where pirates had developed friendly relations with the Miskito, that later mixed with shipwrecked and escaped Africans (1641). The post was established under the auspices of English adventurers from Providence Island to facilitate trade between the Europeans and indigenous Miskito Indians. By 1638 there were a reported one hundred African slaves working in the British indigo plantations situated along the Rio Coco and the Bluefields lagoon. Their population grew by taking in the remnants of peoples they defeated, using arms they acquired from trading with the English. European weaponry presented expansion opportunities as the English sought local natural resources from the Miskito, who subsequently obtained these and other trade goods from neighboring Indian groups such as the Rama, Cookra, Woolwa, Prinzapolka and Sandy Bays by way of their newly acquired European firearms (Olien 1988, 45).

The Miskito became middlemen in trade with Spanish communities. The Gracias a Dios trading post was ultimately closed in 1641 as a result of the Spanish capture of Providence, Tortuga, and Roatan islands, the latter serving as the future destination for Garifuna forced exile. After the closure of the Gracias a Dios post, many captured slaves were taken to "Nicaragua" (interior Nicaragua along the Pacific coast) while others who managed to escape were absorbed into the Miskito Indian population (Dobson 1973).
Though the British established settlers, known as "Shoremen," along the Mosquito Coast (Olien 1988), fear of Spanish aggression aimed at asserting Seville's sovereignty over these areas remained (Woodard 1985, 65). Such fears were justified given the concurrent aggression in Belize described above. The British colonists ultimately did expand their political-economic control in the region during the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries via a gradual but incremental process. This occurred as the Miskito population was augmented by the remnants of peoples they defeated with the help of arms acquired from trading with the English. In a mutually advantageous arrangement, the Miskito traded the dyes and other natural resources obtained from neighboring Indian groups, such as the Rama, Cookra, Woolwa, Prinzipolka and Sandy Bays, for European weaponry that fulfilled Miskito designs for expansion (Olien 1988, 45).

The strategic adaptation of the Miskito to the political and economic conventions of their trading partners was a precursor to the positioned resistance and adaptation of the Garifuna across space, time, and domains of legitimacy. For example, to solidify their position, the Miskito sought recognition of English titles they had been using among themselves (i.e., admiral, governor, captain, general, and king) from the British in 1687. The British accepted the relationship as a means to galvanizing their own interests in the coast. Miskito Kings were crowned in Britain until 1816, after which coronations took place in Belize. As a hereditary position, kings were educated in Jamaica. For a period of approximately 240 years the Miskito were more than puppets to the English; they can be understood as powerful middlemen who used their association with British economic
interests to quasi-dominate the Mosquito Coast (Olien 1988). The liminal role of the Misquito in some ways mirrored the mediated positioning that the Garifuna would assume as they joined the region in subsequent years.

As political and economic tides ebbed and flowed between imperial Britain and Spain, a trans-regional movement of people, goods, and loyalties that involved Baymen, Shoreman, enslaved and formerly enslaved African-origin populations, and indigenous groups came to characterize the full gamut of the Atlantic coastal region. Gordon (1998, 33) describes the shore's population at mid-eighteenth century as follows:

Anglo-dominated British/ African/ Amerindian communities dotting the Caribbean coasts of present-day Honduras and Nicaragua [the Mosquito Coast Shore]. Major settlements included Black River, Cabo Gracias a Dios, Bluefields, Corn Island, Bragmans Bluff, Punta Gorda, and Pearl Key Lagoon, among others (Hodgson 1766, 8). The Mosquitian social formation consisted of two separate but interrelated race/culture - and class-segmented societies - the first composed of indigenous communities, the second of multiracial/multicultural immigrant communities. Jamaica was the main source of the Shoremen's steady imports of African slave labor. By 1778, the Mosquitia's population was comprised of 450 Brits, 4,500 enslaved Blacks, and 100 Indian laborers engaged in logwood cutting (Stone 1990, 15).

**Belize in the Late Eighteenth Century**

By the latter part of the eighteenth century, the 1763 Treaty of Paris and the 1783 Treaty of Versailles outlined usufructory rights granted by Spain to the Baymen at Belize. These rights came with a host of conditions leading the British to appoint Belize's first

---

47 For a contemporary ethnohistorical treatment of the origins of the Miskito and its use as a toponym of the Atlantic coast of Nicaragua, see Pineda (2006, 34 - 53).
superintendent to insure that the settlers complied.\textsuperscript{48} The superintendent of Belize and his counterpart on the Shore were subject to the authority of the Governor of Jamaica (Dobson 1975, Shoman 2000). The Baymen, however, found the arrangement too restrictive. This led to the 1786 Convention of London which, while asserting Spanish sovereignty over Belize, gave the Baymen increased usufructory logging and fishing rights.

The convention, however, also called for the British evacuation of the Mosquito Coast and the Bay Islands. Subsequently, a total of 2,214 Mosquito Coast evacuees were re-settled in Belize in 1787. Seventy-five percent of the evacuees (1,677 persons) were enslaved Africans. \textit{En masse}, the evacuees outnumbered the Belize settlers by a ratio of 5 to 1, and thus raised the settlement's total population to just under three thousand persons (Shoman 2000, 30). The population boom greatly aided Belize's development as an entrepot for the insertion of inexpensive British goods into Central American markets (Woodard 1985, 81).

The Englishmen who remained in the Mosquito Coast did so after "pledging" loyalty to Spain and "converting" to Catholicism, establishing traditions and ideologies that would contribute to the Garifuna diasporic consciousness and identity. The areas where they eventually concentrated their numbers, places like the Rio Negro, Pearl Lagoon, and

\textsuperscript{48} The 1763 Treaty of Paris provided for logwood extraction after British fortifications within the settlement were destroyed. The treaty did not however delineate the boundaries for the lumber enterprise (Dobson 1973, 82).

The 1783 Treaty of Versailles permitted logwood cutting between the Belize and Hondo Rivers. It restrict the Baymen from the cayes and their fishing rights were limited to the shore. With the Supplementary Convention signed in London (1786), the settlers were allowed to extract both logwood and mahogany, and the settlement's territory was extended southward to the Sibun River and the cays (small
Bluefields areas, would become the locus for the incorporation of Garifuna wage labor (Olien 1987; Stone 1990, 16). Their populations were later augmented by escaped slaves from Spanish territories, and freed persons of color from elsewhere along the coast, Jamaica or other Caribbean islands (Olien 1987; Stone 1990, 16).

Edmund T. Gordon suggests that many persons of color did not evacuate the coast\(^49\) in 1786, or if they did, they returned shortly thereafter.

**Garifuna Dispersal into the Atlantic Shore of Nicaragua**

**circa 1830-1910**

The Garinagu started arriving at the Atlantic coast of Nicaragua between 1832 and 1860 on a temporary basis. A main push factor was their flight from Government reprisals in Honduras and Guatemala.\(^50\) Pull factors to the Nicaraguan coast presented themselves in the opportunity for employment within the North American business enclaves that developed in the Mosquitia Reserve by way of US/ Britain treaty. As the Garifuna became explorer-adventurers at Greytown (south of Bluefields on Nicaragua's Atlantic coast) for a proposed canal route in 1860, they developed a good reputation as boatmen and mail handlers.

---

\(^49\) According to Gordon's research, traveler reports dating back to 1790 describe English-speaking families of color residing at Bragmans Bluff, Walpasixa, and Pearl Lagoon. Additionally, these records indicate that Shoremen were living with the Miskito King at Sandy Bay, as well as with the Miskito Admiral at Rio Grande. Their descendants are the Creoles, the ethnically mixed black descendants of these Shoremen and enslaved Africans. (1998, 35).

\(^50\) The Garifuna had sided with the losing conservative faction in an attempt to overthrow the Central American republican Government (Gonzalez 1988).
Gonzalez’ description (1988, 131) of a twenty-two-hour canoe ride (Pim 1863: 273) from Greytown to Ft. San Carlos on the Lake of Nicaragua by way of the Colorado River aptly captures the sense of admiration and pride in the cutting and seamanship skills of the Garifuna:

Six Carib paddlers performed almost unbelievable feats, including cooking the travelers’ lunch during their only (two hour) stop. When Pim complimented them on their hard work, they claimed they often worked much harder and longer at mahogany cutting. In addition to their strength and endurance, experience allowed them to beach their canoes in the often treacherous surf – a skill that is today fast disappearing, even though it is still attributed to them. All of these skills, of course, were invaluable in escaping pursuers, whether government authorities or pirates.

The Garinagu most likely entered into seasonal mahogany cutting during the 1860s and 1870s. During the off seasons, they returned to their families in Honduras. Geographer William Davidson (1980, 38-39) demonstrates that between 1880 and 1910 sixteen families representing three generations of Garinagu migrated to Nicaragua; 15 families presumably from Honduras and one, the Estradas, from Belize. Their first permanent settlement was established by Joseph Sambola in 1881 and was named Saint Vincent (which, according to elders at this community, was subsequently changed to San Vicente, as it is currently known); the last in 1912, founded by his son John was named "Orinoco," the name of the river valley homeland region of South America from which the Garifuna Kalinago progenitors emerged.

In all, six Garifuna settlements emerged. Today there are only three Garifuna villages remaining, but Garinagu have relocated into other communities where they have found employment or intermarried with differing ethnic groups. Garinagu have also become an
urban population. Approximately fifty families of Garinagu live in the City of Bluefields today.

The entry of capital-intensive North American extractive companies to the Nicaraguan coast for economic interests brought about the decline of British dominance in the region. The accompanying shift in ideology brought about changes to the established coastal socio-economic and class based hierarchy that had developed there. For example, waning British power and rising US commercial investments increased the economic earnings of Creoles, who were small agriculturalists, traders, laborers, small business owners, and professionals.\(^{51}\) According to Perry (1991), Creole power and domination peaked during the years 1860-1896. Conversely, this shift reduced Miskito hegemony over the region as the semi-autonomous Miskito Kingdom was a dependency of the British crown. This alliance tethered the Miskito to British power and subsequently British decline.\(^{52}\) By 1880, US investment grew to control between 90 and 95 percent of the commerce on the coast (Idiáquez 1997, 171). The English Creole language was bolstered with growing Creole prestige and spread to ultimately replace the Miskito language as the *lingua franca* of the region.

---

\(^{51}\) Creoles are the descendants of the enslaved Africans and British Shoremen who settled along the coast from as early as the seventeenth century. After the settlers left the coast, they used the term Creole to mark their mixed Anglo-black culture and to legitimize a high social status and dominance in economic and political spaces based in that heritage. Their population was later augmented by Jamaican and southern US African-Americans.

\(^{52}\) From as early as 1849, the British had introduced the Moravian church in Bluefields and in the Pearl Lagoon basin, and this also contributed to their ascendancy. The education they obtained from the Moravians led them to see the coastal natives as inferior and to denounce them as pagans. The Moravians extended their mission to the Miskito and other coastal natives in 1880, thus furthering ideals associated with those of the foreign companies (Idiáquez 1997: 171-172).
Creole and "Mosquitian" Influence Along the Coast

These developments only partly characterize the Nicaraguan coastal context into which the Garinagu entered. Gordon et al. (2003) explain that by 1860 Creoles, holding key positions in the reserve council, were the dominant figures on the coast. Additionally, the government seat was relocated to the Creole towns of Pearl Lagoon and Bluefields, and the Miskito Kings, they indicate, were themselves culturally Creole or creolized by that time. As such, Creoles were asserting political control of the coast via a "Mosquitian" identity rooted in a mixed heritage and background. The reannexing of the Mosquito Coast to the Nicaraguan state as the Department of Zelaya in 1894 resulted in poor Miskito and Creole treatment from the Mestizo government officials of the Pacific Shore, who came to the coast to provide a degree of administration. Their ethnocentric attitudes led them additionally to see their charge in the territory as being to uplift, that is to say, assimilate Black and Indigenous cultures--from their presumed cultural and racial inferiority--into the superior Hispanic culture. The ease with which the influx of Pacific Coast Mestizos obtained and usurped Miskito lands, along with the land taxes levied, made coastal affairs tense and characterized Mestizo state rule as unfair in the eyes of Miskitos and Creoles (costeños). The Harrison-Almirano Treaty of 1906 did grant land titles to most of the established Miskito and Creole communities within the bounds of the former Mosquito reserve by way of the Comisión Tituladora (1910-1916). This too, however, was not without significant dilemmas. According to Gordon et al. (2003, 374), what the two communities were actually granted: "...did not correspond to their [costeños'] land use patterns or the communities' own perception of what belonged to them. Moreover, there were no provisions for population growth or systemic protection of the ecosystem..." Costeños were granted insignificant amounts of land, while massive
parcels were declared "national lands" available to suit government and private interests. While the direction of the Comisión Tituladora process represents the last British act on the coast, the authors suggest it would be misunderstood if viewed solely as the definitive British withdrawal from the coast. The Costeños had sought British participation and direction in matters on which they did not trust the Mestizo state. The struggle only heightened Costeño social memories of local "self" rule over the region (Ibid., 2003).

**Socio-Cultural and Ethnic Tensions on the Shore**

Within this context, the capital intensive foreign-owned industries that were flourishing on Nicaragua's Atlantic coast leading up to 1880 were mahogany cutting, gold mining, banana production, and rubber extraction (Perry 1990, 47; Pineda 2006, 150). Social tensions were also booming. A new racial and ethnic-based social order created tensions among coastal groups, in general, and contributed to suspicion of the Garinagu in particular, causing difficulty for them along several fronts. By 1910, North American racial and racist preconceptions favored Creoles, whom they employed as administrators, chiefs and more qualified workers. Mestizos (from the Pacific coast) were slightly favored over the indigenous Miskito. Each group, however, was hired for temporary and camp-based work.

During this period, the Garinagu were hired as contract laborers to work machinery and to manage boats. They developed a reputation as good workers here, as they had done elsewhere, and supplemented earnings by taking pineapples and other subsistence crops they farmed in or near their home villages to market (Idiáquez 1997, 175).

But the Miskito rejected the Garinagu wage laborers because, at the time of their arrival, Miskito were losing economic, political and military power in the region, as
British influence was being supplanted by that of the North Americans. At the same time, the Creoles were engaged in trying to protect the political and economic advantages and prominence they had achieved by way of North American company enclaves. Additionally, both the Miskito and Creoles belonged to the Moravian church; therefore, the Catholic Garinagu, with a growing local reputation for being good workers, were considered a threat to both the economic ambitions and Moravian interests of their new Miskito and Creole neighbors. It appears to be the case that, with employment opportunities, and what they perceived as "support" of North American companies, Garinagu were safe to continue their language and other cultural practices in their home villages within the Nicaraguan enclave until the time the companies pulled out of the region. These included the walagayu ritual of placating ancestral spirits in a thanksgiving ceremony that heals the sick and restores community/spiritual reciprocity.

5.2. Garifuna Cultural Formation as Marginal Workers Mediating Competing National Interests

The Garifuna emerged as an important and flexible source of labor across the tenuous and embattled shore, and the skills they supplied would become key components in their developing sense of culture and trans-national self understanding.

Garifuna Soldiering Across the Central American Region circa 1800 - 1833

Soldiering was the first wage labor in which the Garinagu exiles engaged within the Central American context. One hundred Garifuna men aided in the defense of Trujillo

53 The Catholic Church came into Nicaragua with Government support in 1909. The Capuchin order was authorized to establish a Vicariate at Bluefields in 1912 (Idiáquez 1997, 176).
against two British ships in 1799. They later became key components in the Royalist armies and were described as desperate fighters by General Gutierres under whom they served against revolutionary insurgents in 1812. Their presence was noted to have invoked fear in both the enemy and their allies. A large Garifuna force stationed at Trujillo aided in repelling adventurer and French revolutionist General Aurey in 1820. Other Royalist military posts manned by the Garifuna during the 1820s and early 1830s include Omoa, Tegucigalpa, San Felipe, and Guatemala City (Conzemius 1928, 190; Gonzalez 1988, 56). By 1827, they were described as having been "more civilized," and a superior quality of soldiers compared to the Belizean slave recruits who had also been recruited for Royalist service.

The Central American territories won their independence from Spain when the Kingdom of Guatemala was annexed to Mexico on September 15, 1921. Absolute independence was achieved in July 1823, when the provinces of Guatemala, Salvador, Honduras, Costa Rica, and Nicaragua broke away from the Mexican Empire and later established themselves as the United Provinces of Central America on September 15, 1823. This name was later changed to The Federal Republic of Central America in their federal constitution of 1824. Manuel José Arce became the republic's first president, but was overthrown by Francisco Morazán in 1829. Arce and supporters, including Creole elites and the Catholic Church, orchestrated numerous counter-revolutions in which the Garifuna soldiers were prominent.

In 1832, some Garinagu were deceptively recruited by a Morazán government agent, and they subsequently found themselves in battle against Garifuna fighters in Arce's allied revolutionary forces. The latter had taken control of Trujillo as part of another
attempt to overthrow the Central American republican government. Upon realizing they were engaging other Garifuna, Morazán's Garifuna contingent refused to fight, thereby undermining, but not altogether undoing, the republican effort. Ultimately, Morazán's forces were victorious on all fronts; they defeated the conservatives and condemned the failed rebels for high treason. As a result, the Garinagu were persecuted for their participation\textsuperscript{54} and, therefore, fled from Honduras and Guatemala to avoid reprisals. Many relocated to Stann Creek, Belize, where Garinagu had existed from as early as 1802 (Staiano 1986, 46).\textsuperscript{55} Other Garifuna escapees moved along the coast towards Nicaragua (Idiáquez 1997, 165). The Miskito King had granted them an eastward settlement, but, due to oppressive treatment under Miskito General Robinson, the Garinagu retreated and settled in the Black River area (Conzemius 1928, 190).

Generally speaking, Morazán's liberal projects also threatened Garinagu interests due to the changes his policies made with respect to land tenure and the removal of communal land rights, each of which affected Garinagu settlements and subsistence practices. Additionally, the liberals had a hostile posture towards the Catholic Church, to which the Garinagu belonged (Idiáquez 1997: 165-166).

\textsuperscript{54} We saw this theme of alliance, participation, and subsequent persecution in their Eastern Caribbean affiliation with the French, and will see this theme reemerge again in the 1990's Nicaragua for their participation in the Sandinista military at Orinoco.

\textsuperscript{55} In Gonzalez's (1988, 55-58) account of the occurrence, there existed silent Arce support in Belize among merchants.

On another note, November 19\textsuperscript{th} is celebrated annually in the country of Belize as Garifuna Settlement Day. Its early occurrence dates back to 1941 and commemorates Garinagu arrival and survival, and this solidified their future ambitions in Belize. It was adapted by the Nicaraguan Garinagu as Garifuna Day and has occurred annually in that country since its inception in 1995 though not a bank and public holiday there as it is in the Belizean context.
There is no evidence to support permanent Garifuna settlements in Central America until roughly 1836 when the Guatemala Governor passed the Amnesty Act, allowing those Garifuna who escaped reprisals to re-enter Guatemala and Honduras. This move was taken on the part of government in the interest of insuring workers to fill labor needs (Gonzalez 1988, 58-59). Many Garinagu, however, chose to remain in southern Belize, and by 1841 they constituted one thousand persons in Stann Creek, southern Belize (Conzemius 1928, 190).

**Garifuna as Forestry Workers in Belize circa 1810 – 1835.**

Logging was probably a close second in terms of wage labor involvement of the Garinagu soon after arriving to Central America. Establishing temporary independent fishing settlements as early as 1801, "Carob" sailors visited Belize for brief periods (Stone 1990). Soldiering for the Spanish notwithstanding, the Garifuna soon hired themselves out to the Baymen as seasonal and temporary logwood cutters from as early as 1802. Later, for the extraction of mahogany (circa 1838), Garinagu were paid monthly wages plus rations. Half the wage itself was paid in goods, including items such as clothes, ornaments, dishes, and pots and pans. The impact of these goods on the Garifuna domestic way of life further molded their tastes and preferences towards European cultural items. Moreover, this means of payment for services had the additional effect of helping to perpetuate the flow of Garinagu laborers into European enterprises as a means of ensuring access to European goods they increasingly sought. E.G. Squier (1891) provides his observations of the Garinagu at Brus Lagoon during an annual festival celebrating the return of the woodcutters, some returning from as far away as Belize. The welcome home celebration was replete with *chicha* (corn liquor), drumming, and musket.
fire. Squier (1891, 321) describes the influence wage labor had on Garifuna behavior and taste as follows:

As a consequence [of mahogany work], they have among them a great variety of articles of European manufacture selected with a most fantastic taste. A Carib dandy delights in a closely-fitting pantaloons, supported by a scarlet sash, a jaunty hat, encircled by a broad band of gold lace, a profuse neck-cloth, and a sword, or purple umbrella. It is in some such garb that he returns from the mahogany-works, to delight the eyes and affect the sensibilities of the Carib girls; nor does he fail to stuff his pockets with gay beads, and earrings and bracelets of hoop-like dimensions,… He then affects to have forgotten his Carib tongue… scorns the native *chicha* for the first day, but overcomes his prejudice, and gets glorious upon it the next. -

We should be very careful not to over generalize these observations to the entirety of the Garinagu, but rather consider the changes in styles and tastes that some Garinagu laborers may have been acquiring with experiences beyond the home village, and how such exposure may have impacted the home village upon their return.\(^{56}\) The experiences contributed to the ever-evolving Garifuna culture at a time when, by way of their village communities, they were not fully absorbed into mainstream society.

**The Anti-French Years in Belize**

The good reputation the Garinagu earned as tree cutters (and also to a large extent in soldiering, but with, as we have seen, mixed results) does not indicate that settling along the Central American coast was easy for the Garinagu. Negative sentiments and suspicion followed them, and this led the government to consider expelling the Garinagu from the settlement upon their earliest arrival to Belize. The period of 1803 to 1812 was intensely anti-Napoleonic and anti-French (Idiáquez 1997, 162). Though developing a reputation as

\(^{56}\) See also Squier (1855, 216).
good soldiers and workers, the Garinagu were considered dangerous as they had French names, spoke the French language, and were aligned against the British with the French in the war on the island of St. Vincent.

Fears were likely further exacerbated by a text that was available throughout the British West Indies, authored by a Vincentian planter (Young 1795), and was most likely available in Belize at the turn of the century. Written solely from the ethnocentric perspective of the British settler, it referred to the "Black Caribs" as, "the ferocious inhabitants of the eastern district," "savage warriors," "lawless savages...of an intractable disposition," and "a people whom law could never reach." As for "Carib"/ British relations, the planter's book reported (Young in Hadel 1976, 562):

...perfidy is the policy; of the Charaib... he is most submissive when he meditates revolt, most complacent when he designs outrage; and prepares for devastation and murder by acts of conciliation and professions of attachment... such savage spirit of disgust and enmity towards the English then appeared in the Charaibs... as might warrant future distrust and alarm in the bravest of our British planters.

By 1811 the Belizean magistrates capitulated to their fears and the many pressures placed on them by frightened settlers. They directed the high constable to warn all "Caribs" who could not produce permit or ticket, signed by the superintendent, to leave the settlement within forty-eight hours (Hadel 1976; Gonzalez 1990). Those Garifuna who did obtain permits to remain in Belize received them because the settlement needed cheap labor, as the influx of slaves was drastically reduced with the British abolishment of the slave trade in 1807. In 1812, a fine in the amount of fifty pounds sterling was
established for those who employed Caribs, French, or free Spanish Blacks. The Spanish Royalists and Belizean woodcutters, however, continued employing Garifuna soldiers and cutters (Gonzalez 1988, 56). Increasingly, they were recruited from Trujillo, Honduras, to work in Belize's forestry pursuits in response to the need for cheap labor in the territory (Stone 1990). From as early as 1832, they were cutting in Nicaragua as well (Gonzalez 1988, Davidson 1980).

In 1835, Belize's court clerk and keeper of records argued before the magistrates that restrictions on agriculture needed to be lifted so that Belize might prosper. The petitioners identified the Garinagu and Miskito peoples as the intended sources of cheap labor for such a pursuit. It is highly probable that the Baymen's fears of the Garinagu people had been lessened by the realization that the Garinagu had been living peacefully in Stann Creek, also known as Carib Town (or present day Dangriga), for some thirty years. With a population of several hundred persons, Carib Town had become a thriving permanent settlement (Hadel 1976; Bolland 1988).

In 1841, there were an estimated three hundred Garifuna employed as logcutters in Belize, but Bolland (1977) still characterizes them as an independent, self-sufficient, and unincorporated people at that time. Southward European expansion and the increasing

57 Though the Garifuna were temporary wage laborers in Belize, they where not permitted to live in the Belize settlement itself. Rather, they were forced to settle in the controversial southern area south of the Sibun river a distance of some thirty six nautical miles from the Belize colony. In settling there and at Punta Gorda further south, the Garinagu essentially extended the boundaries/borders of Belize southward beyond that which was outlined in the Supplementary Convention signed in London (1786).

58 This move was the result of international occurrences as slavery was abolished throughout the British Empire by way of The Act for the Abolition of Slavery which passed in Britain in 1833. Enslaved Africans, however, continued to labor free of wages under required apprenticeship to their former masters. Apprenticeship ended in 1838 after which time the colonists were unsure how their labor needs were going to be met.
need for labor brought on by the emancipation of enslaved Blacks in 1838, coupled with
Belize's growing agricultural interests, eventually subdued the Garinagu's semi-
autonomy. Moreover, the 1855 Laws in Force Act did not grant title to the Garifuna for
the provision of lands they had cultivated with subsistence crops for over fifty years.
Instead, freehold titles for these lands were retroactively given to the European settlers
themselves (Bolland 1977, 133). In 1857, further provisions denied the Garifuna any title
to their lands: "We will by this measure attract near Belize a valuable body of laborers"
(Bolland 1977, 134). As a result, the Garinagu were required to lease their own lands
from the Crown, which pushed them away from semi-independence and into further
dependence on wages as mahogany cutters and sugar laborers.

Garifuna Sea Captains, Crewmen and Contraband Runners Along the Atlantic
Shoreline circa 1850 - 1910

The Garifuna seamanship inherited from their Kalinagu and Island Carib forebears
remained in the Central American context and was a valuable economic vehicle. The
Garifuna men were expert seamen and brought back contraband items for sale in
Honduras when returning home from logwood and mahogany camps in Belize. Many had
their own vessels, or doreys, that they carved or dug out from hardwoods. Once in their
home villages, they carried their women's produce to markets and traveled to and from
fishing and turtling sites as far away as Nicaragua (Gonzalez 1988, 131). For their
seamanship, they were heavily recruited to crew sloops and schooners by both the
English and Spanish, as these powers had sought the labor of the Miskitos previously.
The Garifuna ferried goods between ship and shore, and they transported contraband
items such as arms and ammunition. Garifuna sailors also assisted escaping slaves and
undocumented aliens to move along the coast between Belize and the Spanish Central American provinces. Craig (1966, 55 in Gonzalez 1988, 132) states: "By the 1840s Black Carib fisherman from Trujillo to Stann Creek were supplying doreys to the Creole and White inhabitants who had formerly depended on [the Miskitos] to provide them with these dugout canoes."

The Miskitos demonstrated an unwillingness to become dependent upon wage labor (Helms' Purchase Society). They may have been preoccupied with factors such as internal fractioning, concerns over the Miskito throne, and a return to empire. The Miskito did not take on European dress styles, for example, and while they were once favored by Europeans, by the mid-nineteenth century, the Miskito had been castigated as less civilized than the clothed, increasingly literate, European language speaking Garifuna (Gonzalez 1988, 133). Given this vacuum, the Garifuna, therefore, became increasingly favored by, and more attached to, the Western capitalist system as employees and consumers of European goods. In addition to constructing doreys, the Garinagu were also known to have repaired them, and were paid for these services as well. Gonzalez goes as far as to describe this Garifuna coastal transportation business as a kind of monopoly that endured for just shy of a half century (1825 to 1870), after which time fruit trade with the United States flourished, creating additional economic opportunities on the coast. The Garinagu, therefore, gradually replaced the Miskito in most parts of the local market.
Garifuna Banana and Fruit Company Enclaves Along Atlantic Shoreline circa 1850-1910

Garifuna incorporation into fruit company enclaves also presented economic opportunities and challenges to Garifuna self determination. The banana company enclaves had their origins in 1850 when two Englishmen from Belize began shipping coconuts, grapefruit, plantains, oranges, mangoes, and sarsaparilla to the United States from the Bay Islands on an irregular basis. The two Englishmen found that they could increase their shipments to the states by sailing up and down the Honduran coastline and purchasing fruit from the natives. As per Gonzalez (1969, 31):

The natives of the area, including the Caribs, brought their fruit to the beaches; and the Caribs with dugout canoes, carried the fruit to the [Englishmen's]schooners lying at anchor out from the shore... since the Caribs lived along most of this coast, it affected all of them, whether in Honduras or British Honduras. Many of them began planting bananas for sale, this being the responsibility of the men...

Between 1870 and 1890, there were over one hundred small transnational companies purchasing fruits from the Garifuna and other natives along the Atlantic shoreline for export to the United States. These were later consolidated into the United Fruit Company in 1899. Their ships were arriving regularly from the United States - as Britain had been muscled out by the U.S. prior to this time - picking up fruits from the Caribbean coastline's Belizean, Guatemalan, Honduran, and the Mosquito Coast ports and as far south as Colombia (Bourgeois 1989). The companies employed large numbers of men in every port area to load and unload the many ships carrying bananas. The Garifuna males soon found wage opportunities within this enterprise as well. According to Gonzalez (1969, 34):
The companies found that Caribs worked very well as dock laborers. Indeed they were employed in all phases of the transport process. However, Caribs were not used to any great extent on the plantations themselves. For this type of work the company found it necessary to import Negro labor from the West Indian islands - particularly from Jamaica...Caribs ...could not be persuaded to work inland [on plantations]...

The importation of West Indians started in 1912. These new recruits were characterized as more formidable workers for being able to withstand taxing work conditions such as extreme heat and disease, conditions under which Mestizos were reportedly not as capable. Furthermore, the Blacks filled a void as Miskito and indigenous populations were generally not attracted to wage labor (England 2006, 42). These imported Blacks spoke English and were Anglo-postured, which made them preferred workers for service on railroads, in cities, and on ships. Within this context, the Garifuna were classified neither as *Hondureños*, a Ladino marker, or *negros*, a term used to refer to West Indians, but *morenos*, meaning local and Black non-West Indian (Anderson 2000). This proved to be an advantageous marker to the extent that the Garifuna were even more preferred as "good laborers" over *negros* and obtained positions such as railroad mechanics, stevedores, carpenters, and metalsmiths. Preferred status notwithstanding, the Garifuna would not achieve the socio-economic and social status held by Anglo employees or Ladino elites and capitalists, who considered the Garifuna to be racially inferior. Paraphrasing Sarah England's (2006, 44) description of the situation, their earnings would not be sufficient for wealth accumulation and entrepreneurship. Rather, the "good laborer" status merely ensured their continued participation in a structure that limited their options and potential for true development and economic gains.
Similar to the periods of soldiering and forestry work employment, agricultural wage labor pursuits allowed Garifuna men to return to their home villages after contract periods, usually about ten months of service, and for holidays. During these periods they cleared plantations, reaped harvests and/or transported women's produce to market. With regard to the division of labor, we can speculate that the Garinagu avoided the plantations because in their society such labor was handled by women, a continuation of gendered traditions from Yurumein. Thousands of West Indian Africans were brought to the coast to work on the fruit company plantations. Bryce-Laporte (in Bolland 1997, 81) describes the fruit company enclave's pull factor for economic exploitation as the second plantation system of the African experience. With the influx of English speaking Blacks from Jamaica, Colombia, Panama, Caymans and Belize to fill plantation needs, Garinagu may have preferred coastal work perhaps as it was less regular and facilitated travel to their home villages (Gonzalez 1988, 136). This, coupled with their continued posture towards the sea and their earnings from transporting both goods and people between ship and shore, and coastal towns and settlements, indicates their adherence to the cultural norm of their contribution to subsistence at home and a modicum of independent entrepreneurship. The Garinagu continued to meet their economic expectations through this period of increased contact with various outside peoples and the subsequent changes that come along with such influxes, namely, from international interests in profit maximization and national interests in foreign financed development and nation-building.

Central American states depended on expanding their economic ties with the exploitive industrialized nations because, as new states, they viewed such relationships as necessary for nation building. Foreign-led development, they envisioned, would empower
their respective capitals and port cities, and increase the wealth of elites. British, and later US, investors provided the Central American states with infrastructure, such as railroads and telegraphy, that aided the nation building process. Reduced isolation for these states occurred at the cost of European and North American expansion and resource exploitation within their borders (Helms 1975). It is during this phase of coastal development that the Garinagu entered into Nicaragua.

The Colonial Duplex Image of the Garifuna

Alice D. Le Plongeon's (1886) Here and There in Yucatan makes reference to the Garifuna of the period. This piece of "travel writing" tells us more of the author's own biases and ethnocentrism than of the Garinagu themselves. She refers to the Garifuna language as "gloo-gloo" talk, which, to her surprise, includes the French *un, deux, trois, quatre* within it. Le Plongeon's writing reveals the negative qualities she freely attributed to the Garinagu, despite the likelihood that she had direct conversation with relative few. Repeated invocations of qualifiers like "It seems" and "It is reported that" suggest the author actually spent no significant time at Belize among the so-called "Caribs."

Le Plongeon reports that the late Lieutenant-Governor of Belize, Sir Frederick Barlee, had an interest in putting an end to the rumored human sacrifices occurring at Stann Creek (1886, 71). She indicates that the accounts she received conflicted, as "some assert that no boy is sacrificed…," but privileges the account, stating that:

Every year one child disappears after having been led to an… empty, well cleaned house away in the woods. They go in procession to the beating of a drum, taking with them one male child five or six years old, whose mother is compelled to remain in the village. The child is said to be taken by mafia or the devil."

She presents another rumor about a mafia dance in which:
They make a maiden as intoxicated as possible, undress her, then form a circle round her and dance, performing all sorts of silly antics; a banquet being spread in the adjoining room for the benefit of mafia. The lieutenant-Governor sought to put an end to the practice and authorities at Stan Creek forbade the dance; which only resulted in the Caribs going further away to accomplish it."

This description portrays ethnocentric fear, ignorance, and lack of appreciation for what presumably were aspects of the Garifuna thanksgiving and healing rite of Dügü/Walagayu dedicated to ancestral veneration, spirit possession and non-human sacrifice to appease ancestors. Other inaccuracies in Le Plongeon's work include her claim that the Garinagu count by using French words, including "Un, Deux, Trios." As it pertains to counting numerals, French influence in the Garifuna language begins with the number four. Le Plongeon simply reproduces the unfounded prejudices she encountered during her brief visit to Belize. Undoubtedly, such rumors exacerbated local fears of Garinagu as vicious "others," and served to complicate relations with neighboring peoples.

Thus the characterization of Garinagu in Central America by competing imperial powers vacillated in complex ways between their reputation, on one hand, as accomplished and hearty workers, and, on the other, as island "Cannibals."

5.3. Economic Depression and Cultural Suppression: 1930-1960

The 1930's world recession coupled with the spread of banana disease significantly hurt production and caused the United Fruit Company to withdraw from the Atlantic coast of Central America starting with Colón, southern Belize, and the Mosquitia (England 2006, 44). Idiáquez explains that conditions on the coast turned difficult for the Garinagu, as well as for other ethnic groups on the Atlantic Shore at that time. Idiáquez (1997, 178) describes the experience of suffering as follows:
En aquellos años, la población costeña sufrió los efectos de una baja actividad económica causada por la depresión mundial, la escasez de los recursos naturales, el agotamiento de suelo, la falta de infraestructura regional y nacional de Mercado, etc. Eran muchas las dificultades que los grupos étnicos enfrentaban para obtener ingresos económicos y poder subsistir. Tras la prolongada presencia de la economía de enclave su probeza quedó. Los garífunas, al igual que los miskitos, tuvieron que regresarse a sus comunidades de origen, y volver a su forma de vida tradicional a cultivar arroz y frijoles para la subsistencia familiar y para la venta.

He continues on to explain that, as the Creoles did not have subsistence to return to at this time, they went to Managua, or sometimes as far away as the US, for employment.

The Miskito during this period of economic depression were even further reduced by the influx of the Mestizos who took political control of the region but who additionally encroached upon Miskito lands (Perry 1990, 48). As for the Garinagu, one Garifuna consultant recalled these tough economic times in an interview with Idiáquez (1997: 178-179 n168), stating:

…Recuerdo que mi papa y un tío, allá por 1942 o 1943, querían irse para Trujillo a buscar trabajo. Allí tenemos familiares. Sufríamos mucho, porque no era fácil para nosotros los garífunas conseguir trabajo. Si íbamos a laguna de Perlas o a Bluefields a buscar trabajo, los creoles preferían darle trabajo a uno de ellos. A nosotros nos decían que éramos trujillanos. No nos veían como nicaragüenses. Pero aquí en Orinoco, y en los otros poblados garífunas, nosotros compartíamos lo poco que teníamos. Nunca nos vendíamos nada entre los garífunas. Si usted conseguía unos platanitos o cualquier otra cosa, usted le daba a su vecino o otra de la familia. Cuando usted no tenía, pues otras familias le daban. Y así nos ayudábamos.

A cultural value centered on sharing and collaboration with one another, part of what may be called a "Garifuna Way," contributed to their survival. Creoles expressed their superiority over the Garinagu outsiders by referring to the Garifuna language as "Parrot talk" (Perry 1990, 39) or to the Garinagu themselves as "Cumpe" (Obando 1999, 38).
Folding into the present, my consultants recall derogatory terms hurled with great disdain at the Garinagu in everyday encounters. I recorded these and additional hurtful terms in the social memories of Garinagu in Nicaragua. These include being referred to as "Kerib," "salthead," and "Yakata." Teacher Sarah Colindres recalled for me at her home in Orinoco how she and other youth were harassed by the Creole children at Marshall Point for, as she put it, simply "being Garifuna." The following is taken from my field notes of that conversation dated April 31, 1999:

She was scared to go to Marshal Point when she was about 10 -12 years old. "The kids called we the Garifuna Salt head Kerib. They called us Cumpe." Every time she had to go there she said she would cry. The children were sent there [from Orinoco] to get coconut or to get cane syrup when Orinoco did not have. They did not use sugar in those days. Benito Moralez had a mill and a copper to melt and make the syrup. Relations between the two communities were bad. "Marshal gial does chase we… four or five of us… all the way to Justo Point one time." In Bluefields, they [Creoles] gave problems to her and other Garifuna students as well but "we were smarter so they always come to us to help them." She recalled that two of her Garifuna male counterparts took a lot of teasing and were mocked too because they were Garifuna and obtained good marks in class. But still they [the Garifuna students] were sought out for help, even in the classroom. Sometimes she helped, other times she replied "No!"

Canon Jerris Valentine (2002, 36) of the Anglican Church, Belize, relates his experiences, and the experiences of others I have consulted with there, about the challenges growing up Garifuna. As he explains:

As I was growing up in Dangriga, I was acutely aware that there was something wrong with me because I am a Garifuna. Unlike other Garifuna communities, non-Garifuna in Dangriga made it very clear—except a few people—that Garifuna and anything cultural was not acceptable. I spoke Garifuna at home but nowhere else. Even today some Garifuna people are embarrassed to speak the Garifuna language in the presence of a non-Garifuna person. Also, even today, some non-Garinagu find it offensive, and say so, when Garinagu speak the language in their presence! As I was growing up in Dangriga, a person who spoke Garifuna in school was severely punished.
As an indication of Garifunaness' unacceptability, Valentine describes how Garifuna punta dancing could only be done behind the house, or only at beluria (nine night wake). Garifuna ceremonies were discussed in "hushed tones and performed on the outskirts of the town," and the ritual and symbolic bathing of the dead (amuñadahni) was done before day "while it was still dark." Valentine concludes the discussion recognizing the uncomfortable position of the Garinagu at Dangriga in regard to persecution: "Those who participated in the ancestral celebrations were afraid to be discovered by church and school officials. Yet, they are afraid not to participate as they might be visited with the wrath of the ancestors" (2002, 36).

Writing on the Garinagu of Nicaragua, Perry (1990, 39) suggests that such persecution from Creoles at a time when the Garinagu were without North American allies (the company bosses who viewed them as good workers) resulted in Garinagu assimilation of many aspects of Creole culture to avoid continued persecution, suspicion and derogatory remarks. Obando et al (1999, 39) corroborate the Garifuna location in the socio-economic hierarchy of the coast and the Garifuna sentiment in response to the indignities endured within it. Local consultants I encountered during my field stays in Nicaragua confirmed that cultural suppression helped to alleviate shame and protected "we the younger generation [from that shame and hardship]" Such a sentiment was shared by many, if not all, of my non-Garifuna speaking Nicaraguan Garifuna consultants. They suppressed many aspects of Garifuna culture, language, and ritual (walagayu being key), but maintained their Catholic affiliation. I regard this occurrence

59 See also the experiences of Mr. Roysus Bregal and Mr. Peter Ciego of Belize, and Ms. Isabel
as a form of positional resistance. In this case, such strategic action for survival takes the form of an resistance in a hostile environment. I will revisit this example as well as introduce others from the Garifuna diaspora in the following chapter.

**Mosquito Coast Relations with Garifuna in the 1960s**

In the 1960s, North American investors, Cuban investors, and Somoza family investments offered economic opportunities for new industrial and extractive companies on the Atlantic shore. Fishing industries provided economic assistance, and thereby lessened the survival difficulties of the previous two to three decades (Idiáquez 1997, 181).

Pineda’s (2006) research on Nicaragua’s Mosquito Coast illustrates that during the sixties and seventies pan-Costeño sensibilities were cultivated with the assistance of Protest Missionaries, who functioned solely on the Atlantic shore. Pastors and varying community representatives from throughout the region were convened regularly by way of "Synod meetings." These fostered a sense of unity based upon commonalities of faith and religious institution. As a result, being Moravian was equated with being Costeño and was counter to Spanish and Sandinista ideologies which they had some exposure beginning in the late 1960s (ibid., 136).

The Moravian Church simultaneously strengthened distinctness between Costeño groups. Missionary activities were conducted in English for the Creoles, and in the Miskito and Sumu (Mayagna) languages when in those communities. As the work in the latter communities was actually conducted by Creoles educated in the Moravian faith,

Estrada of Nicaragua in Appendices A and B.
Miskitos came to recognize Creoles' belief in their own superiority over Indians based in their North American attitudes. Miskitos were less exposed to "God's teaching," and so they were viewed as less civilized people by Creoles (ibid., 140-141).

By the late sixties, Miskitu and Sumu (Mayagna) organizations began to appear. In 1974, the Alianza para el Progreso de Sumus y Miskitos (ALPROMISU) was formed to petition for better prices for the produce they took to market. The group also served as an advocate for Indian villages whose lands had been invaded by forestry projects endorsed by the National Government. Religious organizations, particularly the Moravian Church, that were shaped by Vatican II and liberation theology, gave support, advice and helped to create the radicalized consciousness of ALPROMISU on the coast (Ibid., 138-144).

5.4. The Sandinistas: New allies and Garifuna Cultural Resurgence in the 1980s

The 1979 Frente Sandinista de Liberación Nacional (FSLN)\textsuperscript{60} overthrow of the government ended fifty years of Somoza dictatorship in Nicaragua. The Sandinista government sought to unify the nation, of which fifty-six percent was Atlantic coast territory. Their national project envisioned an uplift of the poor and the inclusion of marginalized communities in national affairs. The Sandinistas hoped coastal overtures would ensure the support of coastal populations for the revolutionary government at a time of US propaganda and action opposed to the revolution (Perry 1990, 42).\textsuperscript{61} Early on

\textsuperscript{60} Also know as or referred to as Frente or Sandinistas.

\textsuperscript{61} US agents sought joint-operations with many Latin American countries including Honduras, Guatemala, Argentina, El Salvador, Panama and beyond (Saudi Arabia, Israel, Korea and others) who had national security concerns with Nicaragua as a means to support covert actions of the CIA-sponsored supplemental forces to the Fuerza Democratica Nicaraguense (FDN), also known as Contras (Molloy 1992, 118).
the Miskitos and Creole went along with the Sandinistas, having been introduced to them since the late sixties and early seventies. They were particularly interested in the new government's platforms relevant to participation in economic, political, and social affairs (in both regional and national spheres), rescuing different cultural expressions, and providing for the conservation of local languages – validations that were not present under the Somoza government.

As the Garifuna suffered from animosities and oppression from Miskitos and Creoles, Garifuna interest in associating with the Sandinistas was certainly related to mutual interest on the part of the revolutionary government. From the point of view of the Garifuna, such an alliance would be beneficial in achieving the intended outcomes that would alleviate the class, ethnic, and economic turmoil Garinagu endured from the Creoles. As Garinagu were now settled on lands previously held by Miskitos, strong tensions existed between the two as the Miskitos claimed Garifuna to be squatters on their land. The Sandinistas promised to grant ethnic communities legal ownership of traditional lands with which these communities had historical ties. This made the Sandinistas very attractive to Garinagu as potential allies in what they saw as the defense of the ethnic group, culture, and the lands their most recent ancestors made a life upon, and in which they are buried (Idiáquez 1997; Perry 1990).

Positive opportunities began to present themselves to the Garinagu under the Sandinista state government. For example, in 1980, Andy Palacio, a Garifuna school teacher from Belize, went to Nicaragua as part of the Sandinista Literacy Program designed to strengthen knowledge of Amerindian based language for heritage communities. According to informants, the national media reported that he had
discovered a new race living on the Coast, referring to the Garinagu themselves (K. Sambola 2008, A. Palacio 2007). A government sponsored "tienda popular" was opened in Orinoco in 1982, and a health center was opened and staffed with a nurse in 1983 (Perry 1990).

The Sandinista proposals for national unity, however, lost favor with the Miskito and Creoles, who sought opportunities for their people to return to political and economic dominance over the coast. When the revolutionary government's programs did not meet the socio-political and economic expectations of the two coastal ethnic groups, they rejected the revolutionary government (Cayasso 1998), many taking up arms in a counter-revolutionary movement financed by the US that led to civil war between the factions on the coast.

Military service in the Sandinista army occurred locally in the Garifuna sector from as early as 1983, and by 1985, Orinoco had a functioning Sandinista military. By this time, too, there were two Catholic priests ministering there who were themselves Garifuna and Orinoco natives. These priests differed in their posture towards the walagayu, one supportive of the rite and the other finding it contradictory to church teaching. The walagayu ritual's song and drumming repertoire was promoted country-wide by the Sandinista government, who said it would 1) educate the nation about coastal people, and 2) revitalize the beliefs, practices and faith of a people once castigated by neighboring ethnics and outsiders. The support would help to promote Garifuna loyalty to the tenets of the revolutionary government. According to my consultants, the Sandinistas
organized Garifuna cultural presentations in both Bluefields and Managua at which times the Garinagu presented traditional songs, drumming and dances that were key elements of the ritual. Politicians, journalists, Garinagu cultural performers from other countries, and Blacks from other parts of the world all came to the Garifuna community. The Garinagu perspective in Orinoco was that the Sandinistas were certainly making good on their projects and promises.

Perry (1990, 43) and Idiáquez (1997:185-187) correctly assess the Garinagu posture towards the Sandinistas as being that of powerful contemporary allies. As such the Sandinistas arguably provided services reminiscent of those the French provided in Yurumein/ St. Vincent, and reminiscent of the soldiering, logging, and other opportunities afforded to the Garifuna in Honduras. Garifuna efforts to meet their political and economic interests became contributing facilitators in Garifuna ethnic survival through periods of group suspicion, threat and struggle, even as these periods introduced elements that would alter aspects of the culture. Under pressure from Creole and Miskito claims, the Garinagu steered toward the Sandinista revolutionary project. This was a pragmatic move precisely for the purpose of ethnic survival based upon community, tied as any community is to history, physical space (land), language, and lifestyle. 

---

62 See also Perry (1990: 33-34), and Perry (1991: 114 126) whose consultant also indicates that that Sandinistas brought in electricity, basketball court, and companies to purchase fish.

63 One consultant who participated in these presentations informed me of his experiences performing in Esteli, Nicaragua (field notes 1999). See also Idiáquez (1997, 176).

64 According to consultants, not all Garinagu sided with the Sandinistas as did those at Orinoco. The remaining Garifuna villages had community members fighting in the bush with the contra rebels. Some joined the contra voluntarily while others were abducted into their ranks. The Sandinista/ Contra divide split nuclear and extended Garifuna families both politically and physically in its destruction of villages and resources, and the dispersal of families between Orinoco and Bluefields for safe haven.
Ethnography of Post-Sandinista Struggles and Developments

My ethnographic research in the Southern Autonomous Region on the Atlantic shore of Nicaragua was centered on the Garifuna village of Orinoco (pop. 1, 500) and the city of Bluefields (pop. 45,000), where approximately fifty Garifuna families reside. The village community endures poverty in the wake of the departure of extractive industries in this area. This has given rise to absentee parents who have gone to Managua or traveled abroad for wages they remit to sustain their families. As a result of hurricane damage and the Contra war, many families lost their homes and farms (often referred to locally as plantations) and their livestock (Jamieson 1999, 26). For example, the Garifuna village of La Fe was completely abandoned as a result of the armed battles that occurred in the village itself. Residents fled to safety in Orinoco and Bluefields and in the process lost their plantations to the war.65 After the war, many younger residents have abandoned subsistence farming of cassava, yampi yams, dasheen, and plantains for independent commercial interests at the market. "Carib" pine, or pineapple, well noted locally for its distinct sweet taste, failed at the processing plant as reportedly the textural integrity of the pineapples did not meet the needs required for plant processing. The time, costs, and undependability of crop yields due to disease, forest fire, and the difficulties associated with getting produce to market, remain deterrents.66

---

65 According to consultants, Orinoco had been "well prepare" or "fix up" by the "old man" John Sambola himself and others of their Garifuna ancestors As a result of this protection and guard upon the community, no battles occurred in the village of Orinoco though there were many contra military efforts to invade. Residents did, however, lose farms and livestock located up in the river areas of the lagoon basin as a result of the soldiers on both sides of the war.

66 Interview Professor Victor Obando, Sociologist, University of the Autonomous Regions of the Caribbean Coast of Nicaragua. April 24, 1999.
As for marine resources from the lagoon itself, seasonal lobster and shrimp have markets at Corn Island and Bluefields processing plants, respectively (for the few with the interest, means, or opportunity for such employment). Fish, such as snook, jack, drummer, and catfish, when available, are mostly consumed locally. Since the introduction of the gill net, fish and shrimp are also in significant decline. As the shortage increased, so have concerns of its implications for sustenance and survivability, during each of my field stays across a span of 10 years. With increasingly limited resources, Lapourte (1999) notes the increasing effect waged labor has on community members; they no longer share their resources as did generations past. Where the ancestors and older generations of Garinagu placed primacy on a Garifuna way, which depended upon sharing and reciprocal exchange as extended family members, cash has become the new medium of exchange in the contemporary period. Limited access to an educational system that has historically alienated Garifuna language, history and cultural forms has contributed to the migration of youth in search of secondary education beyond the village to the City of Bluefields (Zoe 2006). For those that remain in the village, impoverished conditions with seemingly little opportunity for improvement, a growing lack of esteem (Zoe 2006), drug use, and high teen pregnancy rates (Ramos 2008) partly characterize their demographic, and influence their life chances. Their Garifuna counterparts in Bluefields arrive there low on the funds needed for school materials, food and lodging, or

67 During a one week visit to Orinoco in 2008 there was much concern over the fish shortage as we had no fish during my stay.

68 Interview with K. Sambola, President of the Association of Afro Garifuna of Nicaragua, at her Orinoco home, October, 2006. Interview with M. Archbold, Executive Board member of the Association of Afro Garifuna of Nicaragua, on the campus of the University of Connecticut, in Storrs, Connecticut, August, 2010.
their parents arrived there struggling to get by while in search of employment. As English is the language of instruction in the village, they additionally experience culture shock in navigating Spanish instruction offered at the schools they relocated to attend in Bluefields. City life offers many additional challenges. With few socio-cultural bridging mechanisms, with limited financial resources in place, and with academic growing pains, some Garinagu exit school in search of nonexistent local employment. They may additionally seek jobs in Managua, or Costa Rica, or if they can come up with the required associated broker fees, submit paperwork for opportunities in the U.S. cruise ship industry, which seeks English speakers at Bluefields to provide shipboard services for U.S. international cruise ship travelers.69 Others struggle to find the costs associated with returning to their home village, where dreams of out migration are plentiful. For those who do travel abroad, again, many to work on board United States cruise ships, their monetary remittances home to family remaining in Orinoco or Bluefields offer a significant economic boost to family, community, and local economy (Obando et al., 1999)

For contemporary Garinagu, the double jeopardy of a legacy of Creole ethnic discrimination and subordination, itself couched within a national Mestizo racial and economic domination, remains. Mestizo land encroachment continues to pose a clear and present threat to communal lands and lagoon resources throughout the coast. Not limited to the reach of Mestizo nationals, land access has been facilitated for foreigners with

69 Personal communication with D. Estrada Pondler, Oct 2008.
global interests.\textsuperscript{70} Titles for the communal based lands in the Autonomous Regions of the Atlantic Shore have been sold, for example, by Ministero del Ambiente y Recursos Naturales (MARENA) to international business interests from Korea,\textsuperscript{71} Australia, Greece, and the U.S. According to an Orinoco community director interviewed in 2008, such global interest in usurpation and exploitation of natural resources hit too close for comfort. The coordinator and his colleague described the gravity of the situation, emphasizing the necessity of securing land titles for the Garifuna community and the frustratingly slow pace of government processing, all of which further exacerbated the threat.\textsuperscript{72}

The \textit{walagayo} (dügü) healing ritual has declined significantly due to historical ethnic persecution in the decades leading up to the turning of the twenty-first century – a matter of grave importance to the Garifuna culture. This ritual is marked by ancestral veneration, spirit possession, and varying aspects of Garifunadüü, including drumming, song, dance, foodways, and cosmology. In 1999, the last \textit{walaguyu} recalled by consultants occurred in the late 1980's.\textsuperscript{73} Another indication of the severity of issues of cultural survival is the declining state of native Garifuna speakers. During my first field study among the

\textsuperscript{70} See Gordon et al. 2003.


\textsuperscript{72} Glenford Bonilla-Lopez, personal communication, October 2008.

\textsuperscript{73} See also Idiaquez (1997 and 1993), Minority Rights Group (1996 and 2002); Noticen (2005), Cunningham et al (2006).
Garifuna of Nicaragua, there were an estimated dozen or more native Garifuna speakers. Current approximations put their number at only three to five persons.

The changes observed among today's Garifuna result from a historical legacy of unequal power relations in which hegemony and neo liberal policies have threatened the practices and underlying values of the Garifuna way, and thereby the very continuity of the culture itself.  

5.5. Conclusion

Throughout their Central American history, Garinagu have been caught up in local webs of significance within the context of regional and global economic and cultural process which they have both embraced and resisted. Via both visible and obscured forms of adherence to aspects of Garifunadüü, the Garinagu of Nicaragua have demonstrated that the cultural death knell proclaimed after exile and subsequent persecution was sounded too soon. Though they distinguished themselves from their earliest arrival as "good workers" in nearly every economic capacity in which they found temporary waged employment, the Garinagu living in exile along the Caribbean shores of Central America were, and largely remain, marginalized racially and ethnically via suspicion and fear from governments and ethnic neighbors alike. The economic boom that occurred on the coast with the arrival of US extractive industries had the effect of all Costeños becoming dependent on various interests and earnings linked to the exploitive extractive

74 Further ethnographic background with respect to the Garinagu with respect to the Contra War is available in Appendix A: Garinagu Diaspora in Nicaragua.
international companies. For the Garifuna, they provided quasi-alliance-like sentiments that allowed Garinagu support and a modicum of prosperity.

This was, however, undermined by nation building interests that required the creation of landless cheap laborers after slavery ended, and by bust periods associated with international economic market collapses or cheaper markets elsewhere. To further complicate matters, racial segmentation along the coast was exacerbated by, at least initially, Europeans racial preferences, and local elites' knowledge of the Garinagu's armed resistance and French affiliations in St. Vincent/ Yurumein, which rendered them suspect. Miskitos and Creoles in Nicaragua would additionally take issue with Garinagu insertion into local wage labor, in which they replaced the Miskito in certain temporary and travel-based arenas. Settling on Miskito land became cause for Miskito rejection of Garinagu. The Creole's treatment of Garinagu was perceived as harshest during the absence of the international companies. They excluded Garinagu from the few economic activities available on the coast, which made the depression years on the coast more unbearable. With much suffering at the hands of Creoles, the Garinagu suppressed ethnic markers, such as language and ritual, and shared what little they had with one another to ensure their survival. In this way, their hope was that future generations might see better socio-economic days.

The revolutionary project of the Sandinistas who took control of the government presented an opportunity for Garinagu improvements via socio-economic inclusion. Unlike the Miskito and Creole communities of the Nicaraguan Atlantic coast, who each sought a return to political and economic dominance over the coast and ultimately rejected Sandinista revolutionary programs for not meeting their socio-political and
economic expectations, the Orinoco community of Garinagu aligned themselves with the Sandinistas, even taking up arms in defense. The new government, from the Garifuna perspective, delivered on their promises at Orinoco even though the Sandinistas evacuated North American companies from the coast. Garinagu shifted their affinity to the revolutionary government as a means to protect their community from ongoing ethnic devastation at the hands of Creoles and the current circumstance of potential physical destruction by warring Sandinistas and Contras in the Peal Lagoon Basin.

The next chapter will examine the post Sandinista cultural resurgence and cultural resistance undertaken by the Garifuna of Nicaragua. Garifuna movements in Belize and the US will be drawn upon as a means to conceptualize the Nicaraguan enclave's positional resistance in the regional and international context of a transnational Garifuna nation. Key in this analysis will be considerations of community organizing, cultural performing groups, political participation, music, and the international super highway (the internet) as spaces in which obscured transcripts with socio-cultural messages, from a positional standpoint, lie awaiting re-interpretation and subsequent cultural action by organizers and participants alike who are both actors and consumers in the Garifuna movement.
CHAPTER 6:
GARIFUNADUÁÜ – RESISTANCE WITHIN THE CONTEMPORARY
DIASPORA

6.1. Introduction

This final chapter illustrates Garifunaduáü (Garifunaness, or the Garifuna way) as a positionally defined cultural resistance revealing the confluences and divergences of Garifuna political, economic, and cultural responses to the historical legacy of diaspora and the challenges of increased global incorporation. Data derive from my participations, observations and consultations with key elders and community leaders in the transnational and diasporic sites of ethnic revitalization and mobilization across the Garifuna geographic diaspora (including those in Belize, Nicaragua, the United States, Honduras, and Guatemala). The activities of various Garifuna community organizations, voluntary associations, celebration committees, party promoters, business enterprises, and performance groups described represent an array of interests and represent important sites of community agency by local and international actors. Such agency occurs within the structure of capitalist globalization via even-handed exchanges that seek to alleviate their experiences of oppression and socio-economic and political exclusion rather than exploit them. These sites also connect with the negotiated transformation of space and time made possible via new information and communication technologies, corroborated by Garifuna political and economic participation in globalizing spaces as strategically tethered to Garifunaduáü.
Elevating Key Garifuna Concerns – The Candidacy of Estrada

Political participation involves action that can serve as a means to both participate in and offer resistance to the current state of societal affairs. In one historic example of political participation, an official called attention to a core set of concerns that neatly encapsulated those of Garifuna across the global diaspora. In 2008, one of the co-founders of the Afro-Garifuna Association of Nicaragua (AAGANIC), Ms. Isabel Estrada, accepted the nomination of her political party, the FSLN, to run as candidate for the post of Vice Alcalde for the City of Bluefields. Ms. Estrada was the only Garifuna on the ticket, and her candidacy marked a historic event on two counts: she was the first Garifuna candidate in the Municipality of Bluefields, and, as far back as many could recall, she was the first female candidate as well.

The very manner in which she campaigned illustrated an important theme in Garifuna mobilization – the concern for *ethnic and racial relations* and *inclusivity*. She indicated that she was the candidate of Garifuna and non-Garifuna, Black and non-Black alike. The campaign itself encompassed a key set of issues for the Garifuna. She also linked three pervasive and historically difficult issues: *adequate employment, education,* and *medical services*, especially for the most vulnerable populations. As she states: "Garifuna also need help to better their education level. Drugs is a very serious problem that is growing. We need [drug] prevention programs to save the little children that is coming"

---

75 From our earliest introductions in 1999, I knew Ms. Estrada, president of the AAGANIC, to be a trained nurse, as well as a vocal advocate for the rights of women and children, and a health and safety community educator. Much of this section is taken from interview dated October 2008.

76 For more background on the work of Ms. Estrada, see Appendix A: Garinagu Diaspora in Nicaragua.
up. We need somebody in some spot [including elected government positions] that will be able to fight the situation inside the community."

Addressing the *particular concerns of the women* of the city, she understood their particular interests included the challenges of single mothers managing as head of their households, a condition common in the City. Her vision included securing a small percentage from the municipality's income to allot toward assistance for women facing these and other issues including health and domestic abuse concerns. Ms. Isabel also noted the high unemployment rates for Garifuna women along with an increasingly limited access to employment opportunities beyond that of a teacher or nurse.

She also called attention to the effects of *environmental neglect and devastation* upon the community:

This is how I look at it. There is a lot of needs. For example, look at La Fe [village]. The bank is washing away every year piece by piece. It is a great and urgent need and that is what my mind is always thinking on. I wrote that poem entitled La Fe. Not only La Fe has this problem. Orinoco is also washing away. San Vicente washing away [too] and we need help. Only the people who are in position with the government could stand a possibility to see how we can save these communities.

The latter part of this quote calls attention to another perennial concern: the need for *active community political participation* (formal and informal). Ms. Isabel's intentions for the Garifuna communities included taking advantage of the influence of government officials to meet and obtain "donors" as a means of supporting and connecting the Garifuna community to power. A recognition of *Garinagu activism and solidarity* also comes through in statements such as: "I believe they are not going to turn their back on me once we are there [as elected officials] because they know people out there will look
forward to my support. If they turn down to me then all the Garifuna would have to come out and make some noise."

**Sharing the Garifuna Way in Diaspora**

The documented record of Estarada's candidacy also offers an opportunity to examine the manner in which a core sense of Garifunaness itself is invoked as a pivotal and positioned resource in the struggle both to overcome historical and systemic obstacles and give the Garinagu its greatest expression. Pertaining to a "Garifuna Way" or her understanding of Garifunaness in Nicaragua, Ms. Estrada explained it poignantly in terms of loss of cultural understanding and continuity. She noted that, in the contemporary period, many Garifuna children born in the city of Bluefields do not have the relationship to place and the importance of a sharing community that is central to the Garifuna way of being. As she explained it to me one afternoon at the Sandinista Headquarters in Barrio Central, Bluefields:

> They grow [up] here and [spend] all their life here. Many [of their] family [members] live here [having] come down [from the lagoon area]. They don't take them back to the homeland [the village]. You can count the families that take their children back to the homeland. And that is the way that Garifunaness [the Garifuna way] has been going further and further [away, out of practice]. The people need to be aware of that but many are not aware and as much as I could manage about Garifunaness it's a way of… it's family… it's one family. Wherever there is one Garifuna who have a need, you never turn your back…I think that there could still be a little still there. But it's the sharing that… if I have something that my neighbor need, my

---

For my part, this has been a ten year conversation among community elders who identified the need for a breakwater wharf in La Fe and Orinoco during my 1999 field stay. Indeed, cultural geographer William Davidson (1980) wrote about land loss to the lagoon waves some twenty years prior to that. Davidson (1980, 41), writing on the case of La Fe indicates an annual loss of three feet in the village's western sector and between ten to twelve feet annually in its northern and eastern region. If these measures were consistent throughout the twentieth century, an estimated 14 acres of land has been lost to the lagoon since the community's founding in 1906. In nearly thirty years little, if anything, has been done to move the conversation into action.
Garifuna family, we'll share. In this town, Bluefields, it's not possible because we live so far apart so it does not feel to that. The only time you have a big body of Garifuna is November 19th. Then everybody will get together. Besides that, you have to organize some kind of fiesta and then you can get them. But to a meeting, to do work, the group is weak.

The sense of the Garifuna as people, as an extended family, with a familial obligation to assist any member in need by sharing resources emerges in this account as elementally Garifunaduáü.

The Garifuna Way is expressed symbolically and materially through everyday cultural practices such as cooking with an eigi (grater), children playing with a Garifuna muyega (doll), or participation in the arts: for example, in special dances like the wanaragua (mask) and wababa (crown) Jankunú dances, and through the most sacred and important of Garifuna spiritual dances, the diigü (informally translated as "family reunion"), a rite involving dance and food aimed at healing through connection with ancestor spirits. The term diigü is used in Belize, Guatemala, and Honduras, while walagayu is commonly used in Nicaragua.

The 2001 awarding of the UNESCO global proclamation of the Garifuna language, dance, and music as Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity was opened with attendees participating in a dramatization or simulation of the most sacred

78 These particular crafts were used by the University of the West Indies, Belize Centre, in a cultural retrieval program under the direction of resident tutor Joseph Palacio. It linked university with community to document the construction of these crafts 1) for their cultural value 2) for the possibility of economic benefit. In this way everyday Garifuna practices could be used to support cultural survival and maintenance.

part of the dügü ritual, the mali. One of the recurring refrains in the call and response structure of mali song is "Aiũ bu, Amũrũ Nu" or "me for you and you for me" and communicates a core Garifuna value of familial reciprocity among the living, between the living and the environment, and between the living and the ancestors (Green 1999, Valentine 2001). This is the very sharing that Ms. Estrada in Nicaragua introduced in Chapter One as a key component in the Garifuna way. I will revisit the import of Garifuna spirituality and the Garifuna way later in this chapter. This interconnected sense of Garufuna-ness across temporal, spatial, and spiritual domains constitutes a key area of inquiry and investigation as we consider how it has translated in the long duration of Garifua diasporic history and its inevitable participation in the transformations made possible with new information and communication technologies.

A prime vehicle that needs to be noted in any discussion of Garifunaness is language. The Garifuna tongue is an Arawakan-based language spoken across the diaspora with influences from Carib, French, English, and Spanish. Language revitalization has been a central focus for many groups concerned with Garifuna cultural survival and continuity. In 2010, two Garifuna school teachers, one of whom teaches Garifuna language at the primary school level, and three students spent one month in an Honduran village to further develop Garifuna linguistic skills. The stay was part of the community's ongoing collaborations with local university and international Garifuna organizations for the ends

---

80 The Buyei Juan Lambey Institute was formed to fill just such a concern over the growing lack of understanding of Garifuna spirituality within and beyond the Garifuna community. Spirituality was seen by organizers as representing a consciousness gap that needed to be filled as contemporary volunteer grassroots organizations such as the NGC and the Garifuna World Organization (WGO) had agendas that placed primacy on other areas of socio-cultural and economic importance. In Jan 2010 a spirituality workshop of some 60 participants was held in Dangriga Dabuyaba or dugu temple (M. Palacio 2010).
of language reclamation and revitalization. Within the context of Nicaragua's North and South Autonomous regions, RAAN and RAAS, respectively, established in the FSLNs New Political Constitution of 1987 and the Autonomy Law #28, the national government officially recognizes the rights to preserve language, culture, and religion, and to obtain an education in their native language as well as in Spanish (Kjaerby 2009, 1; Koskinen 2009, 782). These laws, achieved through government efforts to end the civil war on the coast, and thereby inscribed by blood, provide an invaluable tool for cultural participation and resistance and require AAGANIC and individuals as agents with governing structures to insure they have a salience beyond the written word, in local and national practice.  

**Garinagu Diasporic Sites**

Garifuna community organizations, voluntary associations, celebration committees, party promoters, business enterprises, and performance groups have each advanced aspects of Garifunaduáü. Here is a brief summary of those whose activities are described in greater detail in this chapter:

---

81 Additional laws of importance that advance self determination include the: 1993 Law of Languages #162 in which article 4 denotes the coastal languages of Miskito, Creole, Sumu, Garifuna and Rama as official languages of the Autonomous regions, 2003 General Health Law which protects local community understandings of health, the 2003 Law 445 which provides for systems of communal ownership of indigenous and ethnic communities of the Autonomous Regions of the Atlantic Coast, and the 2006 General Education Law which sanctions the Regional Autonomous Education System (SEAR) which, again, provides for language instruction that corresponds to the language, culture, and history of the Indigenous and Afro descended costeños (Kjaerby 2009; Koskinen 2009).
### Table 6.1 Summary of Garifuna Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Garifuna Organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The National Garifuna Council (NGC)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dangriga Town, Belize</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The NGC is a non-governmental voluntary organization of Belizean Garinagu that was founded in 1981 to engage and move the community beyond challenging obstacles. The NGC has branches in Garifuna communities throughout the nation and represents the Garinagu of Belize in national arenas and international affairs that involve governments or non-governmental organizations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **The Afro-Garifuna Association of Nicaragua (AAGANIC)**    |
| **Bluefields, Nicaragua**                                   |
| Formerly the Organization of Afro-Garifuna of Nicaragua (OAGANIC), from its earliest manifestations in 1995, is a group dedicated to supporting Garifuna culture locally and in diaspora. It has coordinated its work with the Central American Black Organization (CABO) also known as ONECA in the Spanish language, and the Institute for Promotion, Linguistic Investigation, and Cultural Rescue (IPILC) at the Universidad de Las Regiones Autónomas de La Costa Caribe Nicaragüense (URACCAN). |

| **The Garifuna American Heritage Foundation United, Inc. (GAHFU)** |
| **Los Angeles, California, U.S.**                            |
| The GAHFU is a 501 (c) (3) tax exempt organization dedicated to "the preservation and dissemination of the Garifuna culture" inclusive of its history, language, music, arts and crafts and values. It has been active in language revitalization, education, the sponsorship of forums, and in direct action supporting Garifuna culture. |

| **The Garifuna Coalition USA, Inc.**                         |
| **New York City, N.Y.**                                      |
| The Garifuna Coalition USA, Inc. is a nonprofit, nonpartisan, 501(c) (3) tax-exempt organization in New York City. The Coalition serves as a resource, a forum, and advocate group for Garinagu, and an ally to other Garifuna entities and organizations. |

---

82 These include the Central American Black Organization (CABO/ ONECA), Organizacion Negra Guatemalteca (ONEGUA), Organizacion Fraternal Negra Hondureña (OFRANEH) and the Asociación Afro Garifuna Nicaragüense (AAGANIC), and the United Nations Education, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO).

83 GAHFU website http://www.garifunaheritagefoundation.org/192.html [retrieved May 1, 2010]

84 For more information on the work of the Garifuna Coalition USA, See Appendix C: Ethnographic Supplement – Garinagu Diaspora in the U.S.
6.2. Garinagu Cultural Revitalization and Resurgence

Garifunaness Through Language

Support of the Garifuna culture through language has been a major theme across virtually all sites I have investigated. Efforts occurring on the local, regional, and international level exhibit, in content and form, a coming together in support of Garifunaness through the symbolic expression of language.

In Belize, for more than a decade the Dangriga-based National Garifuna Council (NGC) has had noteworthy successes in supporting the Garifuna way across the diaspora through language-focused work. The Council has supported the Gulisi Community Primary School, which opened in September of 2007. Adjacent to the Gulisi museum in Dangriga, the school features an intercultural and bilingual curriculum and offers standard pre and primary school education to students. Reportedly, the primary school is planning to open the 2010 academic year with enrollment extending to the standard four levels of study. In terms of regional work, for example, in 1999 the NGC sent teacher Linda Castillo to Nicaragua to teach the Garifuna language to school children and adults there.85 While various other organizations have contributed to Garifuna cultural revitalization through language, the University of the West Indies Belize Centre stands out by having offered college level Garifuna language study in Belize City, where the second largest Garifuna population in the country resides.86

85 For more ethnographic background on the work of Linda Castillo and Garifuna language education, see Appendix B: Ethnographic Supplement – Garinagu Diaspora in Belize.

86 Personal communication with instructor Ted Palacio April 15, 2003; see also the documentary Garifuna Heritage (2002), produced by Andy Palacio and Suzette Zyden.
Further south in Nicaragua, no formal Garifuna language education has been offered. But through a collaboration between the Institute for Promotion, Linguistic Investigation, and Cultural Rescue (IPILC) at the Universidad de Las Regiones Autónomas de La Costa Caribe Nicaragüense (URACCAN) and the Orinoco community, grade school children in Orinoco have received basic language instruction for over a ten year period now. Just within the past year a pre-school component, based in the nesting model for target language acquisition, has been successfully instituted. Pre-schoolers in Orinoco are taught Garifuna words of identification by native Garifuna speakers, Mr. Velasquez and Mr. Morrow, each in their eighties, working in collaboration with the pre-school teachers at Wamasa Garinfuna (Our Garifuna Nest).  

While the importance of local instruction in the Garifuna language is represented in the mission statements almost universally by groups across the diaspora (including organizations in the United States), sustained efforts to communicate its importance internationally have also played an important part in Garifuna struggles. For example, in 2000, Garinagu representatives participated in international forums on developing their indigenous language’s orthography. In that year, teacher Sarita Estrada of Orinoco was but one of 81 registered diasporans from Belize, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua in attendance at the Garifuna language standardization seminars and workshops held in Batalla, Honduras (Martinez 2000, 57). The NGC also made an important international contribution by facilitating the UNESCO 2001 process that gave rise to the global

87 Personal communication with Arja koskinen. Director of IPIILC, URACCAN, Feb 2010.
proclamation of the Garifuna language, dance, and music as Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity (Cayetano and Cayetano 2005).

Garifunanness Through Dance

In addition to local, regional, and international recognition of the importance of language education in the survival, resistance, and expression of Garifuna culture, another form of symbolic expression, dance, has also served as such a vehicle.

In 2005, the NGC helped to organize the Habinaha Garinagu [Garifuna Dance] Youth Dance Company with funding obtained from the World Bank Indigenous People's Grant Facility. Two Garinagu, Mr. James Lovell and Ms. Eleanor Bullock, both originally from Dangriga, but residents in the US, were brought "back home" to conduct a four-week intensive workshop on Garifuna music, song, dance, and performance arts that served as the national feeder to the dance company. As temporary return migrants, they served as Musical Director and Artistic Director, respectively, and worked in collaboration with Mrs. Phyllis Cayetano, the Company Director. Fifty children, youths, and young adults participated in the workshops. They hailed from Garifuna communities across Belize, and concluded the summer training with a national tour offering performances in Punta Gorda Town, Dangriga Town, and Belize City's Bliss Theatre at the Bliss Centre for Performing Arts (Lovell 2008).  

88 See also the NGC website http://www.ngcbelize.org/content/view/82/212/ [retrieved July 28, 2010].
In Bluefields, Nicaragua, the AAGANIC-sponsored Ruguma dance group was still in its infancy when I first arrived in 1999. Participants were given daily opportunities to engage in what is nothing short of alternative highs, constructive group activities outside the sphere of drugs and alcohol by way of participation in the Ruguma dance group. Jovel Bodden St. Clare, Clarence Gonzalez, and Vernon Ramos who were each participants in the Ruguma dance group during my earliest arrival, each developed over subsequent years to become either directors of the group or founders and directors of other Garifuna dance groups such as Garifuna Power, Black Horizon, and Spirit Dancers (these operated independently of AAGANIC).

The story of the Spirit Dancers group illustrates how dance has functioned as a source of community away from home, an opportunity to connect with important networks, and a space for continued cultural development and leadership. The Spirit Dancers group was founded in 1997 by Clarence Gonzalez and Vernon Ramos, both from Orinoco and each of whom relocated to Bluefields for education and employment. The group offers live cultural performances to tourists for a fee. Spirit Dancers also perform locally at varying ethnic and cultural events and university programs. On a national scale, Spirit Dancers have performed in Managua and also in Mexico and Costa Rica.

89 Ruguma is also known as wowla and is a woven strainer or press used to squeeze juice from grated cassava root. In 1999, Absalam Velasquez (70 years old) was the last remaining Garifuna who knew how to weave this instrument, having learned to do so from his “old people”. It has since that time fallen out of use. A Crocus Sack (burlap bag) is now used for such straining purposes. The Ruguma used for presentations offered by the dance group had been obtained from Honduras.

90 At present, Ruguma still functions as the children and youth extension of the organization with a leading counterpart in the children’s group operating in Orinoco, Nicaragua.

91 Both Ramos and Gonzales learned Garifuna drumming and dance at a young age from the efforts of Purificacion “Popo” Areolla, director of the Barauda Dance Company in Honduras, who by way of a
During my stays in Bluefields, the group practiced nightly with garawon (drums), sisira (shaka, maraca), wadbuagei (conch shell trumpets), complete with dancing and singing reminiscent of the AAGANIC Ruguma. Participation in the group allows for one's individual association to Garifuna identity and a means of Garifuna self-expression in a way that did not exist in Nicaragua previously. Dancing groups in the post Sandinista period perform more than aspects of the walagayu tradition their elders drew from at the request of the Sandinista government in the eighties for the purposes of "spectacle." In fact, the great majority of the Spirit participants had little if any exposure to the rite. But they were observed to perform a number of genres, including the punta, paranda, hungu hungu, and wanaragua.\footnote{The genres were first introduced to them by Purificación "Popo" Arriola López of Honduras. Ramos is a former participants in "Popo" Orinoco workshops that were the product of international collaborations between AAGANIC and Celio Alvarez of ONECA/CABO in the late nineties. Popo is director of the Barauda Dance Troupe from Honduras. http://www.stanford.edu/group/arts/honduras/discovery_eng/art/dance/popo.html [Accessed July 5, 2010].} Practices drew crowds from the passers-by, making aspects of the culture and their identity readily visible to those onlookers, and certainly those to whom they perform for a fee.

A look at the different collaborations involved with the Spirit Dancers illustrates its function of fostering the Garifuna sense of ethnic and racial solidarity and cooperation among its populations spread across the diaspora. The Garifuna dancers are increasingly popular, and other folklore and ballet groups have asked to be taught them according to Ramos. They teach some, but not all, of their repertoire, as he has seen cases where "they take it over from you."\footnote{Interview with Vernon Ramos in Bluefields, Nicaragua Oct 14, 2008.} This has occurred especially on the Pacific Coast, where
sponsors can cut the costs of bringing a Garifuna group from the Atlantic Coast by contracting a non-Garifuna group from the Pacific who can perform the genre. Members of the *Spirit Dancer* group informed me that Creole young people increasingly have taken to the Garifuna music and dance forms, and are claiming themselves to be Garifuna when they have neither the place of origin, name, or parental lineage. Some Creoles have sought and achieved participation in *Spirit Dancers*. According to Rodrigo Centeno (2008), a Garifuna elder and former leader within the AAGANIC structure who stopped in at a *Spirit Dancer* practice for which I was in attendance: "Most of the Boys in *Spirit Dancer* are Creole. You can readily see at the practice that they [are] making the biggest effort. It made me feel good that they are making that effort to learn where most Garifuna don't. They are helping us to keep it alive."94

In this way, then, *Spirit Dancers* are not only learners but are informal teachers. They are imparting more than the Garifuna drumming and dance, which historically had no place in the formal education and socialization of many Garifuna of the prior and present generations. They are creating a space in the town where historically much oppression of Garinagu occurred. Therein, cross-cultural understanding, respect, and appreciation for difference can be fostered regardless of what was the draw to group participation. Via a positional lens of interpretation, we can see how such a space serves as an off-stage component that is required to oppose societal forces that alienate and marginalize those

94 After a practice in 2008 Ramos and I walked a young female member, who was a Mestiza, to her lane to insure her safe passage home. In 2006 at a presentation I was invited to participate in at BICU, I noted that the group contained a number of Creole young ladies.
who are different from the mainstream. Wittingly or not, in their own way the dancing groups challenge mainstream ideologies and contribute to achieving the goals of a multicultural society.

**Dance as Relief From Economic Hardship**

These cultural performances do not earn group members an income with which to survive economically. They do, however, provide some financial help to the majority of members, who, unlike Ramos, a teacher at the Normal School, and Gonzalez, a lecturer at the URACCAN, had to "stop school," or dropped out from their academic studies, citing the challenging pressures of culture shock, and "low marks" or grades in schools of more rigorous study than that afforded them in the village. One member in particular was waiting to "ship out," having successfully completed all required paper work for employment on an American cruise ship.

*Ruguma* has helped AAGANIC progress toward its intended goal of developing Garifuna cultural competencies; aspects of Garifunaduáü or Garifunaness.

**Reciprocity and the Spiritual Component of Garifuna Cultural Production**

According to Ramos the name *Spirit Dancers* refers to the spirit of their ancestors that has gifted them and works through them to keep the culture alive. This ever present preoccupation with the interests of, and personal relation to, the ancestors, as symbolically stated in the group's name, is consistent with Garifunaduáü.

---

95 For examples of temporary Garifuna émigrés from Nicaragua to the US for college education, see Appendix C: Ethnographic Supplement - Garinagu Diaspora in the U.S. The student demonstrates how young adults are taking their culture abroad with them, plugging into larger Garifuna networks via the world wide web, and inspiring pride and leadership within the Garifuna diaspora.
As indicated by its name "Spirit Dancers," the prime position of a sense of spirituality has guided the performance of Garifuna dance, and, as with language, informs the gamut of Garinagu activities in the political, economic, and cultural spheres in their diasporic expression. Whether appearing as part of dügü and other workshops sponsored by groups such as NGC, or referenced on the airwaves of community radio, or integrated with language instruction in Los Angeles by GAHFU, or appearing as a theme in songs by punta rock groups, or variously streamed worldwide on the internet, the message of the tri-part reciprocity among the living, the environment, and the non-living holds a central place in the positional unfolding of Garifunaduáü across the diaspora.

A closer examination of references to spirituality in song lyrics helps to amplify particular aspects of the Garifuna understanding of spirituality and its place in the Garifuna Way. Consider the lyrics to a song that I heard in both the Nicaraguan and Belizean context:

"Gudemeti, mortu- irahu, Gudemeti, murutina haganagugeindiwa nirahu."

According to Chana B. Velasquez of Justo Point, Nicaragua, the song lyrics discuss a woman that has children but does not take care of them, even aborting them. She describes the case as sorry and sad because of a failing to take up responsibility and care

---

96 Interview with Vernon Ramos dated Oct 14, 2008 in Bluefields, Nicaragua.
97 NGC Council Representatives such as the late Mr. John Mariano, Mr. Roy Cayetano, and Canon Jerris Valentine conducted Garifuna spirituality workshops in Nicaragua in 2001 and 2002 accompanied by then NGC president the late Mr. Austin Flores.
98 Besides the Spirit Dancers, other groups emphasizing spirituality, including the Hamalali Wayunagu (Voice of Our Ancestors, based in the Bronx, NY) and Lirahunyu Satuye (The Children of Satuye, youth arm of the National Garifuna Council based in Belize), represent adult and youth civic and performing groups assembled around the theme of furthering the name and ways of the Garifuna ancestors.
of the family. 99 Buyei John Mariano of Belize, interprets the text to mean that, in death, one without children will have no descendants. Who then would give them food and offering? Who would give them diügü per se? These deceased persons' spirits would have to "beg" from those spirits that did have grandchildren, to put down food, and/or make walagayu in Nicaragua or diügü in Belize in their honor. "They would beg for food and drink."100 At Walagayu foods that are both traditional and personal favorites of the ancestors are prepared and offered in an effort to appease the ancestor that has afflicted the living, so that they may be healed. Therefore, the reciprocal relationship continues beyond the grave.

Understanding of the primacy of reciprocal relationships is expressed in the song lyrics that appear in the mali (the most sacred part of the diügü ritual) as preformed in both Belize and Nicaragua:

"Aü bu amürü nun"

I for you and you for me

A participant in diügü rituals in Belize, Jerris Valentine (2002, 39), an Anglican priest and part of the leadership of the Garifuna Spirituality workshops in Nicaragua (with Buyei John and Mr. Roy Cayetano), explains that the phrase signifies that the commitment to caring for one another must always begin with me. The "I" must always be prepared to make that first step. The second thought in the phrase, "you for me," means that the "you" must be prepared to reciprocate, and in so doing maintain harmony.

99 Interview, Justo Point, Laguna de Perlas, Nicaragua, April 1999.
According to Valentine (2002, 40), when the reciprocity is broken and "When family members stray, he or she is visited by angry ancestors with accidents, bad luck, sickness and sometimes even death." This suggests that the ramifications of a breach in the Garifuna way extend to the Garifuna afterlife (ibid, 32), and so the ancestors do much traveling between that afterlife, Seiri\textsuperscript{101}, and the world of the living as they aid the living in the maintenance of harmony. \textsuperscript{102}

To sum up, the reciprocal nature of community, \textit{Me for you, you for me}, which grounds Garifuna spirituality and represents \textit{Garifunaduáü} at it most profound levels, guides these collaborative facets of Garifuna movement in diaspora. The agents within, at varying levels of understanding as they are, are teaching and being taught that the outward symbols of the Garifuna culture alone, such as language, attire, food, dance, attending cultural events and the alike, do not alone constitute one's Garifunaness, but outward representations of what, at a deeper level, is the Garifuna way\textsuperscript{103}.

\textbf{Community Engagement and Political Activism}

The promotion of a Garifunaness via the expressive forms of language, dance, and spiritual practices constitute their own form of politics, resistance, and action for a

\textsuperscript{100} Interview, Dangriga, Belize, July 1999.

\textsuperscript{101} Seiri is a spiritual place of manioc fields that Garinagu go to in the afterlife. Described as located at God's seat (Valentine 2002), it has been translated as "heaven," "sky," or "paradise" by GAHFU Garifuna language class instructor Ruben Reyes. (Online Garifuna Dictionary at the online Garifuna Institute www.garifunainstitute.com/).

\textsuperscript{102} Valentine (2002, 38) offers song text to support this frequency of travel from seiri. In Nicaragua, I recorded the following song text from Chana B. Velasquez (1999) and her brother Absalam at Justo Point which also speaks to travel between seiri and earth: Buinha Kalisura, wabu Sei(r)u(gie)n or "Kalisura, our dorey, was full of us as we were coming from 'Seiri.'" The text goes on to discuss earthly preparations for the walagayu the ancestors were traveling to attend.
constructive future. But Garinagu, as the case of the Estrada candidacy illustrated, have also sought to achieve their goals through politics, both with and without a capital "P." Indeed, activism in education, the arts, formal politics, and grass roots politics should not be considered entirely divorced from one another. Sometimes one becomes the springboard for the other.

For example, in a recent communication, Clarence Gonzalez, who was involved with AAGANIC-supported dance groups in Bluefields, describes how he had furthered his interests from dancing group to organizing a citywide student organization under the auspices of URACCAN, and in collaboration with Garifuna from Bluefields and Indian Caribbean University [BICU] and the local high school. The goal is to provide additional support systems to assist Garinagu in transitioning to and finding success in social, economic, and academic life amid the challenges facing them in Bluefields. As Gonzalez (2010) explains:

Until now a lot of students are pretty much concerned and interested in the Garifuna Student Association (GASA) here at URACCAN. GASA will represent the interests of all members in whatever way possible, including among other things…general welfare, social problems, language, accommodation, admission to the different universities and to forward good relations between members and the Garifuna students' community in which they live and study. Also, [GASA will help in] strengthening the unity among Garifuna members and other ethnic and indigenous groups of people.  

One draw for students to join the group is the opportunity to have a space in Bluefields, recognized and supported by the University, that approximates home by way

---

103 For more ethnographic background on the work of Mr. Caeytano and on Garifuna spirituality, see Appendix B: Ethnographic Supplement – Garinagu Diaspora in Belize.

104 Taken from personal communication with Clarence Gonzalez dated February 18, 2010.
of the Garifuna student members and their interest in cultural foods, drumming, dance traditions, and shared experiences. These are each components of Garifunaduää introduced by elders starting some fifteen years ago that are now bearing fruit as young adults are using the culture as a means to coping, surviving and potentially thriving in difficult terrains.

It is interesting to consider how such politics can be culturally constructed through the lens of Garifuna custom, as both a vehicle for resistance and as a mechanism of a hoped-for sharing between relevant parties – "Aü bun, amüörü nu". Thus, as the numbers of students that had taken interest in GASA were very high, undoubtedly non-Garifuna students had expressed interest in participating. This new venture, then, additionally has the potential to transform hostile neighbors into allies, and advocates via this sharing and extending of some aspects of the Garifuna culture with them.

Such sharing at times does translate into lobbying for local recognition, as Garinagu have achieved at various diasporic sites. For example, in 2007 the Garifuna Coalition of New York began a campaign to co-name Dawson Street, between Longwood and Intervale Avenues in the South Bronx, known as Waporu (ship) in Garifuna, in honor of Garifuna Chief of Chiefs Joseph Chatoyer, and to claim the space for the estimated 100,000 Garifuna residents (Hardman 2009) of the Bronx–many of whom frequent the park situated there with family and friends for informal weekend gatherings or the annual Punta Rock Festival.

105 Following a 2008 interview with AAGANIC members, I noted that the organization does not intentionally program to the university population of Garinagu, although a number of the more enthusiastic
According to garifuna.com, which provides Garifuna news updates, the Coalition and the United Garifuna Association (UGA) recently held a Town Meeting with New York City Mayor Michael Bloomberg. According to the online article topics included education, housing, immigration, crime, rent, HIV/AIDS, employment, the need for a cultural center for Garinagu supported by the mayor's office, and the declaration of 19th of November as Garifuna Settlement Day in New York City. The Mayor assured participants that he and his staff would devote energy and attention to meeting the concerns raised. In parting, the mayor was presented with the powerful symbol of a garawon (a Garifuna drum). In the dugui and walagayu the center of the three ritual drums used is called lanigi garawon ("heart drum") and symbolizes the living Garinagu. The Garifuna Coalition USA, Inc., like GAHFU on the west coast, also have been active mobilizing Garinagu to participate in the 2010 elections as a means to obtaining recognition and access to state and local resources. As indicated on the Garinagu Wagia Campaign brochure: "We are Garifunas, we vote and we count."

Jerry Castro is a former director of the Coalition who was engaged in an additional campaign of a related nature. Castro was venturing for a candidacy for the New York State Assembly, 79th district in the Bronx. He is an advocate for universal healthcare for New Yorkers and supports an independent prosecutor to oversee cases involving police

young adult affiliates over the years are from this demographic. Until now, no formal college-recognized student organization had garnered interest.


During our Bronx interview in 2007 and many subsequent phone dialogues, he has expressed the need for increased and improved housing in the Bronx, the creation of local jobs and job training, and the creation of an office of NY State Immigrant Affairs all of which are vital to the needs of Garifuna as well as other residents of the Bronx. He was the first to call to my attention the need for a Garifuna center for Garinagu of the Borough, who mostly rely on the community centers of neighborhood ethnic groups to serve as venues for their activities and events.  

Garifuna grassroots political activism came to the fore in the case of a boycott organized by GAHFU in 2006 against the Walt Disney film "Pirates of the Caribbean: Dead Man's Chest." The protest took place at the film's world premiere at Disneyland in Anaheim, CA. Protesters decried what they saw as stereotypical images of the Kalinagu (so-called Caribs) as cannibals. Tainos, in particular, and Indigenous communities, in general, were invited to attend the protest. Interested parties were encouraged to bring: "sticks, drums, shakers or anything that could be used as a weapon to the event. Also, teenagers are encouraged to come with their parents to join us for this peaceful protest." Here, traditional musical instrumentation was being likened to weaponry used in a planned peaceful engagement of the goliath Disney corporation. This peaceful act of

---

108 List of fatal police shootings of unarmed Black males in NY and the Borough of the Bronx includes the 2007 shooting death of Fermin Arzu, a Garifuna originally from Honduras (Fernandez 2007).

resistance to persistent worldwide dissemination of harmful stereotyped images of native savagery is significant. Such images have historically been used to justify enslavement and profit maximization, and have resulted in generations of youths ashamed of their cultural heritage. Protesters sought to prevent further exploitation and save current and future generations from a similar fate. International objections were lodged to Disney executives by Chief Charles Williams of the Carib community in Dominica, Chief Ricardo Bharath of the Carib community at Arima in Trinidad,\footnote{111} and Michael Polonio, President of the National Garifuna Council of Belize,\footnote{112} representing Kalinagu/Garinagu descendants in diaspora.

6.3. Garifuna Music and Performance as Sites of Global Engagement

While Garifunaduáü has had multiple expressions through language, dance, spiritual practices, and formal and informal politics, its particular expression through music seems to best piece together the participation of the Garifuna Way in what Anna Tsing (2000, 337) refers to as "circulation," in regard to how diaspora entails a kind of mobility (often circular) or transferal of a people's cultural heritage: "A focus on circulation shows us the movement of people, things, ideas, or institutions." Tsing further cautions, however, that circulation alone "…does not show us how this movement depends on defining tracks


and grounds or scales of agency” that create local, national, and international openings in historically closed spheres and hostile venues. The inadequate socio-economic conditions and their effects on the youth, interrupting sensibilities that are in keeping with the Garifuna way, that the masses of Garinagu in diaspora bear are contested in song. Positionally speaking, musicians are agents in the cultural resurgence and resistance. In the case of the Garifuna, a number of notable punta rock musicians have filled this role.

In 1978, Pen Cayetano created punta rock, a contemporary version of Garifuna punta drum music that traditionally was reserved to beluria (ninth night wakes) and celebrations. He had been inspired to do so having recognized a generational clash that occurred in Dangriga surrounding Settlement Day celebrations. He attributed the discord to the socio-economic circumstances in which Garifuna parents migrate for employment, and the children who remain behind lose the language and also love respect for the knowledge and traditions of their grandparents and community elders. According to Pen Cayetano (2002):

> For me it was sad to watch what had happened, but at the same time it opened my eyes and mind that something had to be done for the younger generation. Instinctively I knew that the Garinagu culture had reached the time for a change. I studied the old songs and started to write my own songs and played the Garifuna drums and also discovered how to use different sizes of turtle shells as a percussion instrument.113

In 1982, the now popular Turtle Shell Band ventured beyond Dangriga to perform in Belmopan and subsequently Belize City. Since that time, Punta Rock has become a

national and international sensation with not only Belizeans but Garinagu and their neighbors throughout the diaspora. According to Greene (2002):

Today, punta rock is the musical craze among youth and young adults in Belize and in Garifuna communities in the United States. In Guatemala and Honduras, punta rock is second only to the salsa-like music and dance known as cumbia.

In the mid nineteen-nineties, the New York based Garifuna Kids punta rock group asserted lyrically that whether born in a Garifuna village or an urban United States (Meriga) city, Garinagu Wagia, "we are Garinagu," on their first CD. These Garifuna-Americans indicated their efforts at Garifunizando America, the title of their second album, with songs such as Yurumein ([We are from] St. Vincent/Yurumein), Nalagante (My Garifuna legacy [or way]), and Meredebadina (I will not stay [here]). The CD's liner notes indicate "Garífunizing America is our second recording, which carries with it the full force of our feelings and the deep-rooted cry of Garífuna values against the acculturation of the peoples of the world at this historic moment. Naturally we hope that you will enjoy this legacy inherited from our forebears…" Both the group's CDs contain traditional punta songs in punta rock form as well as reggae, hip hop, and soca beats that combine Garifuna, Spanish, and English call-and-responses. These represent

---


115 These titles appear as song numbers 6, 5 and 10 respectively on the Garifunizando America compact disk (1996). The song Niabina Adaguimein, track # 7 on this album was originally composed as a punta song by my paternal grandmother, Leocardia 'Lady Lord' Mariano, but appears here in punta rock style. Additionally, a reggae themed number 8, sung in English and Spanish, addresses its title Why Put Us Down for promoting and representing the culture amid continued societal opposition and criticisms. They assert their message is unity, peace, and cultural survival. To be clear, some elders in the Garifuna community took pause in regard to their rude double meanings in some of their song lyrics and with rude gestures that accompanied their stage performances (Servio 1996).
their experiences growing up as Garifuna descendents in cosmopolitan American cities. Garifuna Kids performed most regularly in New York and other venues within the US. In 1995, however, I attended performances in Dangriga, Belize, and Labuga (Livingston) and Puerto Barrios, Guatemala, and witnessed first hand their message of Garifuna unity across perceived national divides. In Dangriga, for example, Garifuna Kids performer "Cocoman" cautioned participants at an outdoor concert performance to recognize that Garinagu throughout the diaspora are one Garifuna people, when the audience showed a lack of enthusiasm when the singer shouted out Honduras and Guatemala. He indicated that when each Garifuna population-bearing nation state is called out, all Garinagu should shout out in appreciation with equal excitement and enthusiasm because Garinagu Waguiya ("we are [all] Garifuna"). He also expressed interest in reporting that the Garifuna of Belize, Guatemala and Honduras are all united upon returning back to the US.\textsuperscript{116}

Belize's Punta Rebels, another punta rock group, also drew from the contemporary context of local occurrences, regional matters, and histories, as well as love and love loss, and issues relative to spirituality, and blended these with the themes contained in traditional Punta songs to create the punta rock music they performed throughout the Garifuna diaspora. The group was an international sensation as well, and performed at Carifesta 7 in St. Kitts and Nevis in 2000 as part of the Belize contingent.\textsuperscript{117} As a Garifuna and observing participant, I enjoyed many of their Wamasa (Our Nest) club performances in Dangriga, and caught a 2002 performance in Labuga during that nation's

\textsuperscript{116} Personal memorate of the author.
Garifuna Day celebrations organized by the Organization of Black Guatemalans (ONEGUA), a non-governmental organization founded in 1995. According to their website, ONEGUA considers National Garifuna Day, including its musical punta rock component, which is a major attraction, as a means to empowering Garifuna identity and reaffirming its cultural values.

National Garifuna Day thus reflects both the need and struggle to recognize the numerous communities, along with their respective identities, that make diversity …it becomes possible to construct a collective relationship within the country itself as well as allow for the establishment of specific sites, both in the short and long term, that reflect the Garifuna's cultural identity and generate socio-economic benefits for this community.\(^{118}\)

Another example of agency toward a counter-homogeneity and resistance to hegemony is Rhodel "Rhodee" Castillo's 2002 debut album, *In Exile*. Castillo is a resident, businessman and local leader in Chicago's Garifuna circles. I see his work as positionally defined exemplification of cultural resurgence and resistance through music, stemming from his recognition that: "I grew up in Belize but Yurumein is my homeland" (2002 liner notes). The album features songs, lyrical poetry, and interludes that recount historical developments from the 18\(^{th}\) century, such as the signing of treaties with the British and the Garifuna's subsequent expulsion from *Yurumein* after the Second Carib War. He sings of mental and spiritual repatriation and reparations. Other songs call

---


\(^{118}\) The organization serves the needs and interests of Guatemala's Garifuna and Afrodescended populations, including their lack of employment opportunities due to discriminatory hiring practices and inadequate academic preparation stemming from state disinterest. The organization seeks to conduct research and promote the Garifuna culture including the language, gastronomy, crafts, religious practices, traditional healing methods, and create and promote educational opportunities to prepare Garinagu to meet the needs of potential employers.
attention to contemporary hardships prevalent among the Garinagu of Dangriga and elsewhere in the diaspora. Such songs comment on drugs, violence and raising the Garifuna consciousness and self pride as a means to move past such contemporary social problems. The latter is reflected in songs such as *Rubei nun- Liri Garifuna* ("Give me a Garifuna Name") and poems like *Sarawama* ("We Garifuna [must] wake up/stand up," stressing the time to do so is now) and *In Exile*, whose lyrics include such texts as *Dawaguattiwa wageiraguien, gararatiwa yurumeinguien* ("we were pushed from Yurumein our homeland")...and *Keimoun Aguyu, Yurumein* ("Let's return " [to our homeland]) in a song titled *Yurumein*.119

Rhodee's musical selections range between punta and reggae rhythms that feature lyrics that recognize contemporary social problems, honors the ancestors, and highlights a prominent Garifuna church song that opens the door to another aspect of Garifuna music. The cd features a Garifuna-created Garifuna language liturgical song, *Ida Lían sa Biama Lùyeri Üma Le* (track 9), reworked into a reggae beat. In 2002, the same year of *In Exile's* release, the National Garifuna Council of Belize published *Bungiu Wabá*, a texted compilation of Catholic and Anglican masses in the Garifuna language complete with a compilation of songs and prayers. The compilation also contains, four songs that reference November Nineteenth Settlement Day, and I suggest all Garifuna day celebrations by extension. One such song was composed by Godsman Ellis and four by


119 Songs appear on the *In Exile* compact disk as track #3, #1, #7 and #12 respectively. Return here could be interpreted in the literal sense of pilgrimage but certainly also in the spiritual and mental sense via retention of cultural values and traditions in a metaphorically foreign and hostile land. In either event, it is
Abraham L. W. Ramos. Ellis and Banco's song "Their Hate For Slavery Made Them Free – Tribute to Our Forefathers" states: "Garinagu, Rise from where you are, at home or in some land afar, Tell to all the world without What this day is all about. Fathers all we will remember, now and ever more" (Cayetano 2002, 40).

Seven additional songs contained in a Bungiu Wabá volume and categorized under the heading Leremuna Yurumei (Songs about St. Vincent/ Yurumein). This book is a repository of religious songs translated into Garifuna from as early as the 1940s (Cayetano 2002, i), newly composed songs for church use, and/or Garifuna community songs identified as having a suitable place in the liturgical service to honor and praise Bungiu (God). The work illustrates the Garifuna history of persecution, exile, perseverance, and cultural pride within the historically hostile space of the European church. It refers to Yurumein as the revered homeland of the Garinagu from which they were driven out by whites (Cayetano 2002: 40-43). One song, Luagu Ubouhu Balliceaux, by Sebastian Cayetano and Dale Guzman (Ibid, 46-47), captures Garifuna suffering and the sentiment of uncertainty of what the future brings for Garinagu who were rounded up and detained by the British on the island Balliceaux prior to their exile. The song is emblematic of a positional resistance attesting to how, while the

reminiscent of Isabel Estrada's recognition of the importance of connecting the younger generation to the "homeland" as a means of insuring the continuity of Garifuna ways of knowing and being.

120 Hadel (1972, 246-247) describes a hüngü (hú)ngü (semi sacred) song recorded during his fieldwork as popular as he encountered it on multiple occasions. The song addresses the Garifuna departing from Yurumein/ St. Vincent. The text indicates they were with scant food, drink and without Chatuye, their slain Chief of Chiefs, which contributes to the lonesome (saddened) spirit addressed in the song's text.

121 This song also appears on the Garifuna Heritage Foundation United, Inc. website as part of the March13, 2010 listing of language learning and learning materials made available to students in their http://www.garifunaheritagefoundation.com/369.html [Accessed July 31, 2010].
lyricists have become party to Western religion and doctrine, divorce from a Garifuna way is not yet a palpable option.

A final example, on the matter of text and performance is the case of internationally renowned Garifuna musician Andy Palacio (1960 – 2008) of Belize. While working in Nicaragua as part of the Sandinista Government's literacy project in 1980, Andy Palacio, an educator by training, recognized the imminent death of the Garifuna language and culture there. Similar in some regards to Pen Cayetano's realization that something had to be done, the experience fostered a cultural awareness in Palacio that altered his developing ideas and approaches to music. According to Palacio: "I saw what happened to my people. The cultural erosion I saw deeply affected my outlook… and I definitely reacted to that reality."\(^{122}\)

Nearly three decades and several albums later, on March 14, 2007, Palacio released what would be his last CD, \textit{Watina} (I called out), an amalgam of Garifuna music forms with modern (western and world) sounds that conveys conscientious Garifuna centered themes, draws upon Garifuna spiritualities, and uses traditional semi-sacred drum patterns and beats. He viewed this calculated collaborative work with members of the Garifuna Collective as his masterpiece: "It was a conscious strategy. I feel that music was the best way to preserve the culture. It's a way of maintaining cultural pride and self esteem - especially in young people."\(^{123}\)


\(^{123}\)Ibid.
During a Boston, Massachusetts, performance of the Garifuna Collective that I attended in August 2007, Palacio sang the following verse from a traditional punta song he had incorporated as part of a hit punta rock piece named "till da mawnin!" The song was featured in his 1996 CD of the same title (track number 10). The verse states: "Aningita ubóu lira nei, Nageira hamuga. Mábien wali, habien gáfarahátiun." He paused and explained to the overwhelmingly white majority crowd that through this particular song, he could envision his ancestors shipboard during their exile from Yurumein/St. Vincent lamenting by way of words similar to the song's text: "See that island there, that was supposed to be our home. It has become inhabited by murderers." According to Buyei John Mariano, this song is traditional in form but is not an old or ancient song like some others as it is may be a few decades old in age (Mariano 2007). Watina became an internationally acclaimed world music CD.

I have elected to comment here on the song Amuñegu (In times to come, track 10) because Joshua Arana, drummer for both the Watina album and the subsequent tour indicated to me that he found Amuñegu to be the most poignant song on the CD. On this, the final track of the collection, Palacio questions: who will bake the staple food and powerful cultural symbol cassava, speak the Garifuna language, sing semi-sacred songs organized by gender, and heal the sick and community via dügü rituals in the future?

124 This punta song also appears in Bungiu Wabá as song # 98 (Cayetano 2002, 42). The first verse of the song Daübei bigarawoun wouni nei, Abinaha wagía (3x), Chuluhali fedu, Wáhureráliño wafedu [Play your drum for us we are dancing, the celebration is here and we will "play in" the holiday ] In 1999, I recorded the following song text from several consultants who recalled the song as part of the Walagayu: Daübei garawoun Johnny ohh, Daübei gararwoun Johnny ohh, garawoun hisetiwouni[ra [Play the drum Buyei John, we love the drums] expressing desire for drum play as significant component to the experience they are trying to effect.

125 Personal communication, July 2008.
Through Palacio’s communicative medium, song, he cautions his fellow Garinagu, stressing that the time has come to recognize the struggles of the Garifuna ancestors in their work for cultural survival and to insure the culture continues on. In the last verse, Palacio "calls out" to parents and elders, challenging them to teach the youth aspects of Garifunaduáü so that the culture and values contained therein will not be altogether lost (Palacio 2007, liner notes)

Our ancestors fought to remain Garifuna. Why must we be the ones to lose our culture? Let's not do it! Parents, please listen to me. Teach the children our language and songs, our beliefs and our dances Lest we lose it altogether

These varying diasporic contexts, spaces, and communication mediums occurring within the context of Garifuna responses to cultural challenges posed by the global illustrate the crosscutting national and international networks of Garifuna global communication, collaboration, cohesion, and counteraction. As sites of engagement, these locations collectively reveal a brand of non-oppositional practices that both promote Garifuna cultural forms and values while simultaneously, from a positional stance, aid Garinagu in withstanding globally advanced ideologies that undermine their cultural continuity and their self-determination.126

6.4. Challenges, Opportunities, Cultural Continuity

We next consider the broad influences of challenges to the Garifuna way brought on by contemporary globalization, the ways that new information technologies offer

126 For further information about the Garinagu in Boston, see Appendix C: Ethnographic Supplement – Garinagu Diaspora in the U.S.
possibilities for the Garinagu, and, finally, how, in the end, Garifunaduáü persists as a form of resistance, reciprocal engagement, and creative continuity.

The Challenge: Globalization and Resistance

On the subject of the impact of globalization, Mr. Roy Cayetano, former president of the NGC, has provided a number of insights. To Cayetano, capitalism's dominance and advance via globalizing processes the world over is in conflict with alternative ideologies such as the Garifuna Way. He explains their differences as follows:

It is a fact that capitalism is the dominant ideology of the time? Capitalism does not tolerate opposing scriptions because it seems to view other possibilities as competing with it. I think the Garifuna way is more socialist, because its communal living, people looking out for one another and that kind of thing. Capitalism is based on individualism as opposed to focusing on the common/social good. There is a conflict there; no question about it…Those who are encouraging globalization do so because they see it as being to their advantage. It is not [however] driven by I for you and you for me… so when we find ourselves more and more imbedded in capitalist individualism and the taking advantage of others, we come across a brick wall. We buck, because we were not wired that way… One of the things aü bun amüþü nu does is to put a very very negative value on stinginess and meanness, meaning you are not willing to share and this really goes against aü bun amüþü nu we despise angina [stinginess]…mihagabuhuleera, keeping things to oneself and to amass, was really frowned upon. It [capitalism] does not fit well with our worldview… so mechanisms have to be found for us to operate in that context without giving up our principle of aü bun amüþü nu which works for the collective.

Cayetano recognizes that embedded in larger global and national structures as Garifuna are, they must utilize structures imposed upon them as mechanisms for survival. Therefore, preserving and further advancing the Garifuna way within these contexts means using the historically oppressive structures in which they participate in new ways that are available to the present generation as a means to insuring the future of
Garifunaduái. His operational analysis of their symbolic actions are contained here at length:

We learn English in school, in Baranco, Seine bight, Hopkins and so on you are taught by Garifuna teachers but they did not teach us Garifuna they taught us English because that is what was required by the system... and they did [it]. And without us knowing it we changed, our modes of learning changed. We now look to institutions to teach us certain things. We look to the radio, television, new technology to learn certain things and then you do not control those things... its colonization, globalization, imperialism... forcing itself upon us. So Gulisi School and the Garifuna museum represent an attempt to use proper appropriate means those modes of learning after all we are already using schools... why not use that instrument to serve us as well because this is not to say we don't want to learn English and get away from that, we should learn Spanish as well. But, we can use that instrument to transmit our own knowledge... to bring back some of the traditional ways of acquiring knowledge and skill. And in other words, use the very mechanisms that have been used to invade us to send our messages out there... the same tools that globalization uses to invade us to send messages, to send knowledge and awareness of us in the opposite direction. So that requires control and that's where television comes in, that's where the radio comes in, the school comes in, and the museum comes in.

To be clear, the context of Mr. Cayetano's analysis was recognizing the importance of giving, exposing, and sharing Garifuna cultural aspects with others, not just Garinagu, if they are truly valued: "share it (the benefits of our language and culture our music our dance food and so on) with the world" (2008).\(^{127}\) As such, both the Gulisi School and the Garifuna Museum as interventions to halt and reverse the decline and disrespect of Garifuna language, culture and traditions have a better chance to endure than efforts that

\(^{127}\) On this same theme of sharing as means to persevering, Mr. Cayetano (2001) as president of the NGC stated the following during an interview at the UNESCO proclamation ceremony in Dangriga: "We are pushing for the establishment of own our institutions. Institutions that would not be exclusive to Garifuna people, because we believe that whatever we have we should share with the rest of the world. And one the things that the UNESCO proclamation has done, is to recognise Garifuna language, music and dance as a heritage of humanity. Not only as a heritage of, but a masterpiece, which means that it doesn't just belong to us the Garifuna people, it's a legacy of the whole world, of all humanity."
preceded them precisely because of the outside support from the government which, as a partner in these endeavors, will alleviate operational pressures on principals and managers.

This relates to the Nicaraguan context in particular as the collaborations demonstrate a desire as Garinagu to be connected and to exist in harmony via cooperation and collaboration with one another, guided by Garifunduáü in a simultaneous effort across national political bounds to defend the Garifuna way. In March of 2002, Garinagu delegates representing Nicaragua's AAGANIC attended the NGC convention held in Hopkins. One delegate remained in Belize after the conference, in part to study Garifuna songs under the tutelage of - John Mariano. Upon completion of the walagayu, video clip footage was sent to the author and family demonstrating how the training she received was utilized and shared in the ritual context. In 2005, a Nicaragua excursion of AAGANIC members visited Dangriga and as recently as 2009 there were plans in the making for an excursion from Dangriga, Belize, to Nicaragua. Mr. Cayetano conducted an additional spirituality workshop in Orinoco as part of their lead-up to the Garifuna Day Celebrations.128

Since the Garifuna way has been interwoven into the agency of each community and their representing organizations, the relationship between the two communities has developed, by way of Garifunduáü, to one that extends beyond cultural rescue. As a strategy for cultural preservation, collaborating with and supporting the Nicaraguan Garifuna enclave must be understood as being in the best interest of Garinagu

128 Personal Communication with Mr. Roy Cayetano dated November 11, 2009.
everywhere. While different in context it is a kin concept to the admonition of the
Garifuna Kids to the crowd regarding the unity and oneness of Garifuna regardless of
nationality, and the efforts of the GAHFU, Inc. in LA to use funds for the Gulisi school in
Belize. There is a recognition of uarani (oneness) through local differences that has taken
center stage in the preservation of culture and the elevation of Garinagu. Roy Cayetano
explains the development of the international relationship between the two diasporic
communities of Belize and Nicaragua, and its significance, in this way:

Our relation to Nicaragua, is prompted by an awareness of how much they
have lost and its an object lesson of where we are going if we do not make
the kinds of interventions that are required to insure our survival. First of all
we recognize without outside help they are doomed. They recognize that and
we recognize that. If Garifunaduáü, if the Garifuna way, language and other
aspects of the culture can survive in Nicaragua that could be to our benefit as
Garinagu... as I pointed out to them in some of the workshops we’ve had
with them, we believe 'If you value something give it away.' These are the
kinds of interventions that are required to insure our survival. First of all we
recognize without outside help they are doomed. They recognize that and we
recognize that. If Garifunaduáü, if the Garifuna way, language and other
aspects of the culture can survive in Nicaragua that could be to our benefit as
Garinagu... as I pointed out to them in some of the workshops we’ve had
with them, we believe if you value something give it away.

The survival of the Nicaragua Garifuna community is in the best interest of the
Garinagu everywhere, as their experience and challenges, while unique in the context of
their history on Nicaragua's Atlantic coast, resonate with the challenges of survival their
Garifuna counterparts endure in local and particular contexts throughout the diaspora.

**The Influence of the World Wide Web on the Assertion of Garinagu Culture**

Garinagu are utilizing online forums for distribution of their newsletters, press
releases, party flyers, webcasts, blogs, and video streams; these are all accessed over the
world wide web to inform Garinagu across the US as well as their counterparts in Central
America. Global technological knowledge and access informs each other, as well as interested friends, neighbors, and researchers, across diasporic contexts and across the globe and thereby contributes to the perseverance of a Garifuna-heritage based consciousness and international community. As such, Garinagu are channeling the opportunities an increasingly global society technologically connected offers them to be globally informed and advance their own participation. Additionally they are demonstrating that it can be used to endorse their own global concerns, that of Garifuna cultural survival by way of seizing the current globalizing technology and converting it into a virtual ally to insure their longevity.

The internet is yet another site in which Garinagu leaders quietly challenge ideologies that are inconsistent with the Garifuna way. Many Garifuna organizations (and so defined individuals) have homepages online. Garinagu make Garifuna music downloads, compact disks, song lyrics, local and international news, language dictionaries, history books, Garifuna flags and other forms of cultural paraphernalia, and DVD videos of local Garifuna documentaries, workshops, concerts, and celebrations available or consumed from anywhere in the diaspora where internet access is available via purchase or for free on social networking sites such as Facebook and Youtube. Therefore, as global processes pressure their cultural unraveling by making other ways of knowing available within the context of hegemony that favors the external habitus, there is an alternate pressure advanced by the Garinagu agents who simultaneously appropriate the shrinking of "time
and space" feature of globalization in ways that reinforce Garifuna sensibilities, and aspects of the Garifuna way, among diasporans who are open to receiving the message.  

6.5. Conclusion

What has tied these diasporic examples together as positionally defined resistance is the ongoing Garifuna agency in defense of cultural attitudes, talents, and practices that comprise Garifunaduái or the Garifuna way of knowing, being, and doing.

As positionally defined resistance, Garinagu have been able intentionally to advance Garifunaduái within national and international spaces and structures. Garifuna schools, Garifuna liturgical masses, Garifuna media programs, Garifuna internet sites, fielding Garifuna political candidates, mobilization in census participation, and local, state, and nationally recognized Garifuna (Settlement) Days found throughout the diaspora are demonstrative of the interest in and desire for cooperation within state structures as participating citizens while remaining Garifuna; the two are not mutually exclusive when approached bi-directionally via Garifunaduái. Organizations such as the AAGANIC and NGC and umbrella regional organizations such as CABO/ONECA offer information and support and apply friendly pressure, from within, through knowledge of local needs and interpretations of international human rights that they offer to old structures with long histories of marginalizing generations past, and act as new allies for Garifuna cultural perseverance and development.

129 For more details regarding Garifuna websites like www.labuga.com and regarding Garifuna spirituality in Nicaragua, see Appendix C: Ethnographic Supplement - Garinagu Diaspora in the U.S.
The reciprocal nature of community, *Me for you, you for me*, which grounds Garifuna spirituality and represents *Garifunaduái* at its most profound levels, guides these collaborative facets of Garifuna movements in diaspora. The agents within, at varying levels of understanding as they are, are teaching and being taught that the outward symbols of the Garifuna culture alone, such as language, attire, food, dance, and cultural events, do not alone signify one's Garifunaness. but serve as symbols to provide contexts for exploring, reconfiguring, and advancing the Garifuna way.

In an increasingly global society where Garinagu remain plagued by poverty and marginalization within capitalist and individualistic interests, Garifunaduái as a paradigm is doing much to insure Garinagu collective continuity through building confidence in its value within and beyond Garifuna spheres. The data suggests that the Garinagu are working to be good and contributing citizens in their respective nations while maintaining and juxtaposing Garifunaduái within those globally informed and directed contexts. The Garifuna way is a guide for maintaining and developing their culture, while embracing the opportunities global processes can and do offer for mutually beneficial relationships toward the sought ends of equal access, opportunity, human rights, and respect for self-determination for Garinagu in nations whose claim to be multicultural remains a work in progress.
DISSERTATION CONCLUSIONS

Diasporic groups like the Garinagu hold on to ethnicity (and/or religion) as an adaptive strategy as transnational economic activities and globalization create expansive interconnected human networks (Goldin 1999) and flows of labor. Diasporic communities, as we have seen in the Nicaraguan context and in the Garifuna communities of Belize and the US, mediate factors unique to their various new environs, yet also retain a sensibility that unites and mobilizes their members as diasporans (Cohen 2008). I submit that, at a positional level of analysis, the mobilization of Garinagu around Garifunaduáü illustrates the importance of resource and information sharing, responsibility, and reciprocity (concerning self and community), but also resistance to the powerful pressures of Western conformity operating through the global.

According to Kellner (2002), globalization is not monolithic, as people do resist its expansion. Cohen (2008, 146) tells us that at a cultural level globalism paradoxically solidifies and enhances localism. To avoid deficient understandings of the local, Appadurai offers a recognition of blurred boundaries, or scapes, as producing cultural hybridity. This has proven informative as it recognizes increased uniformity of expression, but does not predict universal cultural homogeneity as a result of globalizing processes. Here too, then, cultural forms do not become fully assimilated to Western hegemony's global culture. The Garifuna case sustains this point of view. Therefore, the critical perspective taken on globalization herein has opened the door to recognizing its associated opportunities, as well as the challenges, contradictions, hegemony, and oppression that its very success, from a Western point of view, hinges upon.
In examining the Garinagu habitus, their challenges, opportunities, and therefore possibilities within these networks, I have demonstrated Garifuna cultural resurgence. Further, I have conceptualized their agency as resistance to the subordinate structural positioning and marginalization they endure, which was historically advanced and sustained by state, church, educational structures, and ethnic neighbors. These agents of the global have facilitated the intrusion, ideologically and materially, of global interests into the local, and thereby assist the progress of domination, opening the door to such things as land encroachment, incorporation, and oppression for their own power and economic gain. Through this work, we see that such colonial interests, tools, instruments and agents can be, and are, reconfigured for use in ways that suit local interests and address local needs. The case of the Garifuna presented in the current study, thereby affirms: "difference, hybridity, resistance, and self determination against forms of global domination and subordination," in keeping with Kellner's (2002, 301) requirements for critical consideration of globalization. As I move to conclude, a recap of how this has been achieved is in order.

In making this argument about resistance, I have departed from James Scott's "weapons of the weak" thesis, which relies on "intent," by drawing instead upon Duncombe (2002) and Hollander and Einwohner (2004). Yet, even such notions of externally defined resistance are too much in line with trends in social science that rely excessively on what people say. This differs from the theoretical posture of Geertz who indicates that ethnographic researchers ultimately must rely on interpretation, which is not a project to figure out how people think. I also utilize Victor Turner's British social construct. In following Turner, I have viewed behavior, action, and performance as the
context in which symbols (such as Garifunaduáü, Garifuna drums, language, non-governmental organizations, dancing groups, punta performances, web pages, and the like) become meaningful, and the levels with which people think about them. Comparison of Turner's first two levels, exegetical and observational, respectively, provides the researcher access to a positional level of understanding that is largely unconscious to the native or insider because the positional is buried deep within the exegetical.

In their globally informed local participation, Garinagu are seemingly mirroring and assimilating capitalist logic and Western structures at the exegetical level of symbolic analysis. Elders and specialists' operational insights have unveiled deeper understandings, but still only very few, when asked, have referred to Garifuna actions as constituting resistance per se. Others find disfavor with the negative and oppositional tone of the term resistance. These non-recognitions and corroborations are understandable as in line with the notion of a positionally defined resistance.

The alliances and friendly association status the current generations have orchestrated have been achieved on the shoulders of previous generations who cunningly downplayed distinct cultural features that drew them negative attention. To note just one example, the adoption and adaptation of Creole cultural forms served as a means to protect Garifuna generations from further oppression. This move was taken to bolster inclusion, marked by a sense of sanctuary in a newfound, though tenuous, developing amity. [1] Alliance building is its current manifestation. It is currently characterized with "sharing" aspects of the culture and as a means for developing allies who will in turn aid in the culture's perseverance.
According to common understandings of the Garifuna way, the Garifuna culture has been given "in trust" to the current generation by ancestors. This dissertation has provided an account of a number of ways in which this trust has been met, including: teaching the Garifuna language in schools and online, the translation and incorporation of church songs into the liturgy in the Garifuna language, the official recognition and execution of the November 19th and Garifuna Day celebrations, the creation and dissemination of punta rock music and CDs, and other circulating practices. They can all be understood as giving the culture away (sharing it with others) so that it can be learned, appreciated, respected, incorporated, and preserved. As such the transmission of such a trust becomes resistive action. To borrow a term from Jean Klein (2001), their actions then demonstrate a *duplexity*, as their desire to participate in global society as good neighbors and citizens does not render null and void their desire to do so as Garinagu; their pursuit of these aims I have (positionally) defined as resistance in that their actions demonstrate their unwillingness to accept poverty and marginalization, and their refusal to allow their cultural ways to go gently into that good night.

A prime example of duplexity is the conscious decision of recent generations of Garifuna in Nicaragua to accept mainstream Creole language and culture to spare the children and their descendants from continued attacks and persecution. At first blush they appear to have conceded to Western hegemony, as represented by the dominant language and culture, Creole. At a deeper level of analysis, their accommodation is nothing short of a survival strategy whose wisdom is only beginning to be recognized today. To illustrate further, Ruiz (2010) demonstrates how Garifuna parents and guardians in Corozal, Honduras, prefer fluency in Spanish for their children to reduce the stigma of
ignorance and incompetence attributed to speakers who are not fluent in that dominant language. His study illustrates that, while parents provide for Spanish instruction as a first language, they do so to oppose the oppression they have experienced and do not wish for their children. What is interesting to note is that such acceptance does not exclude the traditional language; rather it expands upon it. As a community, they strongly support bilingual education. Ruiz characterizes their linguistic choices as part of an ongoing African and Caribbean Indigenous tradition of resistance and agency.

Garifuna resistance is not a recent phenomenon. They have survived to the present through some 350 years of migration, diaspora, and change resulting from the expanding system of world capitalism. Survival has involved a flexible identity (Matthei and Smith 2008) rooted in Garifunadúü, the heart of which is found in the ancestral cult rite of healing, walagayu (in Nicaragua) and its variant dügü (in Belize). Each of these serve as physical and symbolic healings of disruptions in their respective contexts. Flores (2001, 128) asserts: "The space that created the struggle [dügü] has been the space that has empowered, given life, and generated creativity to resist oppressive powers."

The historical reconstructions in chapters 4 and 5 demonstrate that the Garinagu have a long history of correlating, linking, and coalescing elements of their diaspora. This history helps make sense of their past and informs their present. As agents the Garinagu examined here meet David Scott's (1991: 278-279) criteria for the cultivation of virtues across time and space, in this case, virtues drawn from and embodied by Garifunadúü. Such cultivation is exemplified in the primacy of St. Vincent/ Yurumein as the Garinagu homeland; attachments to their Central and North American contexts, their formation of various national and international structures (CABO/ONECA, NGC, ONEGUA,
GAHFU, etc.); their alignment with other organizations and with universities in Belize, Nicaragua, and the US, and their instructional efforts in language, dance, etc. These all serve as means and sites of simultaneous participation and contention. Further, their embrace of a multicultural and human rights-based doctrine as a matter of survival can have mutual benefits for diasporic groups and nations that likewise struggle with understanding their own suzerainty and diversity. The Garinagu's alignments have also produced new allies and have, at varying degrees, proven to yield successes in Nicaragua.

Yet their struggles continue amid challenging obstacles. Palacio (2005) indicates that since the 2001 UNESCO Proclamation, governments have done little to aid in the protections and advancement of the Garinagu. In 2005, the Nicaraguan President held a Garifuna Cumbre (convention) involving all the Central American nations that are home to Garifuna communities. My consultants throughout the isthmus suggested that the event served national economic development interests of Nicaraguan politicos and had little to do with the on-the-ground issues pertinent to the marginalized Garifuna and their communities.

Though I draw from diasporic contexts beyond Nicaragua, I have been careful not to privilege an ideal type per se. Much diversity exists across varying Garifuna diasporic contexts depending on regional, national and local arenas and therefore similarities and divergences across settlements must be understood as context dependent.

Differing political climates and militarily-backed domestic and international state interests in the various sites that make up a diaspora can significantly influence how freely local diasporans can assert cultural belonging and solidarity. For example, for over a decade Garinagu leaders in Honduras, who have been challenging national and
international encroachment upon title holders of Garifuna lands, have experienced reprisals ranging from death threats to themselves and their families (Shansky 2010) to false imprisonment (2008 "Garifuna Resistance…”) and murder (Rayan 2008). Resistance, even peaceful varieties, remains dangerous for these leaders in ways that are not found in Nicaragua or other points in the diaspora. Here a breach of culturally-informed reciprocal trust has resulted in refusals to sell land and illustrates a lack of faith in development schemes that rely on World Bank megaprojects, such as the Central America Free Trade Agreement (CAFTA), Plan Puebla Panama (PPP), the Mesoamerican Biological Corridor (MBC), and the Proyecto de Administracion de Tierras de Honduras. Many Garinagu see only the further marginalization being facilitated by such projects.

Although a full discussion is beyond the scope of this work, it is worth noting the manner in which another aspect of Garifunaduáü tied to the advance of global resistance has factored in Garinagu diasporic resistance and expression, namely, the reciprocal relation between the living and the environment referenced in Chapter Six. Miriam Miranda, Director of the Organización Fraternal Negra de Honduras (OFRANEH), has spoken critically about a US$25 million dollar World Bank-funded high-tech survey and land titling project called PATH (Proyecto de Administracion de Tierras de Honduras), which would affect communities in which Garifuna happen to reside. She has referred to the project as: "a way of individualizing property to include the entire country and allow open-pit mining, hydrocarbon exploitation, exploitive large scale agribusiness, and tourism," and as reflecting "a perpetual policy of aggression and internal colonialism that [has] existed, which resulted in the annihilation of ancestral lands and traditional culture." (2005 "Honduras' High Tech…").
Though this study focused on similarities in the diasporic positional resistance of the Garifuna in multicultural societies, there do exist local particularities/ variances in Garifuna diasporic sites. Nicaraguan Garinagu live on an autonomous coast of a Mestizo nation, while Belizean Garinagu live in an English-speaking Caribbean-postured nation with Spanish-speaking Central American immigrants. In the US, Garinagu live as part of minority majority urban centers existing within the larger context of a dominant Anglo majority culture of power and privilege. Despite these local particularities, through the diversity of the multisited approach taken in this study, I have found contemporary correlates in agency across these diasporic sites grounded in the positive appropriation of Garifunaduáü.

These sites do, however, evidence mutually informative relationships of resource support and cultural exchange which provide an example of global associations and international mechanisms for differing uses than domination and exploitation.

Future work would do well to examine cultural identity development of Garinagu youth in these contexts as well as other, emerging, Garifuna settlements in urban environments, directing attention to leadership development, modes of leadership, and the insertion of these groups into the national and international Garifuna networks that straddle local and diasporic identifications, for example, in Los Angeles (Palacio 1992, Macklin 1986) and New York City (Gonzalez 1979, England 2008, and Johnson 2006).

Looking ahead to the future, the place of language competency in particular, and its intersection with varying levels of community leadership, appears to be a significant area of development. The leadership in the Nicaraguan context, whether its village or city environs, are not Garifuna speakers. In the context of Belize, leadership comes from
native speakers. Certainly young people are continuing to grow up in each context without Garifuna as their first language. This reality raises questions as to the sustainability of current efforts into the future. Surely the group, by way of their ongoing legacy of resistance and new resistive strategies and sites of engagement, will endure – the question is how, in what forms, and through what mediums will Garifunaduääi, as conservative and dynamic as it is, be made manifest in the future.
This appendix provides supplemental ethnographic detail on the Garinagu diaspora in Nicaragua.

_Garinagu in Nicaragua_

Ethnographic research in Nicaragua focused on the Garifuna village of Orinoco, which endures today in poverty. Since the extractive industries left this area, many absentee parents and young adults have gone from Orinoco to Bluefields, or from Bluefields abroad for wages to sustain their families. Many local families are dependent on these transmittances and young people are increasingly attracted to outward migration for economic success (Lapoutre 1999). Those who remain endure the decreased availability of forty-six species of commercial fish resulting from over-exploitation of the lagoon (Christie et al. 2000).

Since the Contra war, many residents have abandoned subsistence farming for local commercial employment, which is sparse or nonexistent. According to consultants, these factors contribute to high incidence of teenage pregnancy, high dropout rates from school, and additionally high incidences of drug and alcohol use. Within this context, community members no longer share resources in the way their forebears had; these are now increasingly exchanged via cash payments (Christie et al 2000). The frequency of _walagayu_ (dügüü), the healing rite marked by ancestral veneration, spirit possession, and reciprocity, has also declined significantly. The last _walagayu_ recalled by consultants

Isabel Estrada: The Formation of the Organization of Afro-Garifuna of Nicaragua

In 1994, Isabel Estrada, a resident of the city of Bluefields at the time, attended an ONECA (Organización Negra Centroamericana) Conference in Belize as part of her capacities within the Center for Civil and Autonomous Rights, El Centro de Derechos Humanos Ciudadanos Autónomicos (CEDECA). There she was able to hear the Garifuna language, and see the culture through practices such as making bami (a form cassava bread) in Dangriga Town and Hopkins village.

In the following year, 1995, Mr. Reginald Nuñez, a Garifuna from Punta Gorda, Belize, came to Nicaragua and would become a leading figure in the local organizing of Garifuna. Nuñez after talking with Justina Solis, a Garifuna resident of Bluefields who was originally from La Fe, about the Garinagu in Belize suggested trying to organize the Garifuna people there in Bluefields. Ms. Justina conferred with Ms. Estrada, who verified that Garifuna in Belize:

are well organized and [are] doing things around themselves and we could do the same. So we should call up people, tell them about this and see what we could do. That's how we start. She [Ms. Justina] invite people and I invite people… we went out talking about this to see how we could get organized.

In those early days, Estrada, Solis, and Nuñez were joined by Julio Lopez, Victor Gonzalez, Mavis Estrada, Leela Choi, Ms. Mina Estrada, Ms. Beyuda Zenon, and Ms. Patricia Hansack, a number of Garifuna people residing in Bluefields. Arnoldo Hernández of Honduras participated on occasion, sometimes assisting with drumming when in attendance.
The OAGANIC group (since renamed AAGANIC, or Association of Afro-Garifuna of Nicaragua) was formed on September 25, 1995 (Obando 1999, 93) in Bluefields with Victor Gonzalez as the first president, and he quickly went about making initial plans. Mr. Nuñez suggested organizing a celebration on the 19th of November, the day that the Garinagu of Belize celebrate as Garifuna Settlement Day. The idea was to celebrate settlements in Nicaragua as part of an international Garifuna Settlement Day. As Ms Isabel explains:

We said well fine. We worked together and get a two panga [skiffs] and gas, and support from the University of the Autonomous Regions of the Caribbean Coast of Nicaragua (URACAAN). We had actually preferred to do a celebration on the day when the Garifunas people came down here to Nicaragua, but we go along with the Garifuna day in Belize because we had no idea what that day would be in Nicaraguan history. It’s not no problem because people will ask what this day is about because this is not the day when our people came out here [to Nicaragua] but well [we can say] it is a Garifunas day [in Belize] so let’s work on this same day.

From the very beginning the newly formed Bluefield based Garifuna organization recognized the significance of working with Orinoco, the largest Garifuna community in the Pearl Lagoon basin. The Bluefields commission was assisted by URACCAN in traveling to Orinoco where a local branch of OAGANIC was formed with participation of Mr. Edward "Eddie" Estrada of La Fe. This newly formed Orinoco commission through the means of a vote taken recognized Victor Gonzalez of the Bluefields commission as president of the overall OAGANIC structure.

In preparation for the first Garifuna settlement celebration, more commonly referred to as Garifuna Day, Mr. Reginald and his wife Daisy taught the Bluefields-based Garinagu a Garifuna cultural dance called gunjei, which they ultimately presented at Orinoco as part of that first November celebration. They danced and had a drum, but were not able to sing Garifuna songs that first year. The Orinoco community presented
traditional local dances accompanied by song and guitar that were not described as "Garifuna" music, but were a part of the Garifuna of Nicaragua's folk repertoire. The first November 19th celebration was described as being "mostly by us and for 'ourselves'," although collective memories indicate that some lagoon people came in to observe it. Ms. Isabel Estrada, charter OAGANIC member stated:

We did a beautiful and touching arrival [reenactment of first Garifuna arrival]. Two to three dory went around the point, and then they came in with banana sucker, dasheen, cassava stick, and cane in the dory with the drum. All of us were on the bank edge to meet them. When they landed we each took up a plant [from out of the dory] and we marched up with those to the church. We get the blessing at the church and then marched with the drum down to where the activity would be on the cancha [basketball court] as the culture house was not yet built. There is where we gave speeches and made cultural presentations.

The speeches were described as personal reflections and testimonials about people's feelings and understanding towards and about their Garifuna identity and the event. The cast for this annual event had been set, but the event would become increasingly more elaborate through the years. After Reginald Nuñez returned to Belize, the group continued to develop, keeping up the meetings and preparing traditional foods as a draw to bring Garifuna in Bluefields together.

The second year of the annual event, OAGANIC carried out an excursion from Bluefields with a chartered boat named the 'Rio Escondido', but which was always referred to by consultants as the Express. Mr. Nunez had already returned to Belize by this time. One month prior, however, Purificación 'Popo' Arriola López, a Garifuna and Director of the Barauda Dance Troupe, 'Triunfo de la Cruz', from Honduras arrived to teach the Garifuna cultural drumming and dance in preparation for the Settlement Day celebration. According to Ms. Isabel: "It [the celebration] was something big because they had the real Garifuna dance then."
Ms. Isabel Estrada became president of OAGANIC in 1997. In that year the "Garifunas Day" celebration drew an even larger attendance than the previous year as a cultural group from the Pacific Coast (Managua) was brought in to participate as well as Garifuna performing artist Aurelio Martinez and his band *Lita Ariran*, who came down from Honduras. The following year (1998), however, the annual celebration did not include the excursion from Bluefields to Orinoco as a result of a late hour cancellation of the boat due to engine failure. The anticipated revenues that were to be generated from the excursion were going to be directed to hurricane relief efforts in Honduras, where many Garifuna communities had been devastated by Hurricane Mitch. Without the *Express*, only the OAGANIC commission members who could fit in a *panga* obtained with assistance from URACCAN were able to attend. Additional attendees of note were Garinagu from La Fe and both the Garinagu and Creole residents of Marshal Point (communities on the lagoon).

By the close of its fifth year, Pearl Lagoon and Marshal Point had each been organized with OAGANIC commissions. The Garifuna communities of La Fe and San Vicente were not yet organized, but plans were in the works to organize these communities as a single commission due to their small size and close proximity. OAGANIC had additionally hosted the Central American Black Organization (CABO/ONECA) Youth Encounter in August of 1997 in Bluefields. The youth conference drew participants from Guatemala, Honduras, Belize, Panama, and Costa Rica and offered presentations on topics such as drugs, AIDS, discrimination and other themes relevant to Black youth in Central America. Several young Garinagu in Nicaragua were turned on to the Garifuna culture by way of this event as Garifuna young people from
Belize, Guatemala, and Honduras were in attendance. At this conference, Kensy Sambola of Orinoco became the formal representative for CABO youth and young adults within the leadership of the international CABO structure.

OAGANIC also organized presentations of Garifuna drumming, song and dance at the annual Bluefields Mayo Ya! Celebration. At least three Garifuna groups participated in 1999, Orinoco and Bluefields groups under OAGANIC and an URACCAN student group comprised of Garifuna and Creole students led by Orinoco natives who studied Garifuna dancing years prior with Purificación 'Popo' Arriola López. OAGANIC additionally, co-hosted the 10th General Assembly of the Central American Black Organization, December, 1999, in Bluefields. CABO representatives throughout Central America discussed their local project needs and interests as they relate to the mission of CABO, what they have accomplished towards achieving those goals, and what can be done to improve methods and advance their collective work in meeting those objectives.

According to Ms. Isabel, speaking with me in a 1999 interview on the topic of their organizing and these early accomplishments:

We accept[ed] to organize and accept[ed] to move ahead and I believe that is a good step. [In this way] it is not hard for anybody who wants to help us set up [matters] the right way. It's [cooperation and support is] easy because we [OAGANIC] exist... One of the first things we want is the language to get this teacher to come down to help because if the children learn to talk we will have it more easier to move on because that is what identify you. We saying we are Garifuna because we born and know ourself as Garifuna but then we can’t talk and that is what we need to learn... [So] We are [currently] trying to bring teacher from Belize to teach at the school [in Orinoco].

Initial efforts in the immediacy of OAGANIC's founding were not limited to Garifuna adults. The youth became very involved with the hosting of the youth encounter in Bluefields. Young people took up the opportunity to continue cultural rescue of the drumming and dancing started by Popo Arriola López, but in his absence it was driven by
local young people such as Claribel Goff-Arana and later Jovell Bodden-St Claire, Vernon Ramos, Clarence Gonzalez and Kevin Sambola who each dedicated themselves to developing these forms of Garifuna-centered arts and taking lead in the choreography of presentations and performances, local and national, which continued to inspire many young adults and children to become engaged with these aspects of the Garifuna Rescue agenda under the OAGANIC leadership.  

Participation in the Maya Ya! by way of these OAGANIC initiatives is also significant. According to Isabel Estrada:

Maya Ya! is an Atlantic Coast expression we are invited also to participate in that…It is getting an opportunity [for us] to identify more ourselves so people could be more informed. People coming from the Pacific and all [around] can see what each ethnic group has [to offer culturally] about themselves.  

Another consultant expresses OAGANIC's importance as going beyond cultural presentations such as those organized and advanced by the government during the Sandinista years. This consultant critiques those early efforts. From her view, those efforts lacked concern for the cultural development that needed to occur by way of such arts within the Garifuna community itself. As such she views those walagayu cultural presentations organized by the government as exhibitions that offered little benefit to the Garifuna themselves. These activities did not formulate an in-house conversation amongst Garinagu themselves; no organizing of the people came of it because teaching

\[130\] To be clear, other artistic forms do exist amongst the Garifuna community in Nicaragua. Guitar music is a significant artistic form coming out of the La Fe community and carried on by the Sambola brothers, Robert and Clarence, and others. There are painters such as Norland Goff-Arana who painted murals country-wide for the FSLN in the 1980s, and whose walagayu mural in Orinoco community dons the cover of a text on that subject authored by Idiáquez (1997). His brother Jeffery Goff-Arana is also a distinguish painter. Also, there exists the rosewood carvings of Julio Lopez, a nurse by training, who generates income from the sale of his carvings from his home workshop in Bluefields.
the intricacies of the traditions on display within or beyond the community was not part of it. People were not being made conscious and, therefore, after the performers returned home from these exhibitions, nothing more came of it. Supporting evidence is that by the time of the organization's founding in 1995, many Garifuna were still "fearful" and "[a]shame[d] of identifying themselves as Garifuna. This was not solely because of their history of Sandinista affiliation in a post-Sandinista Atlantic Coast Nicaragua context, but most significantly because of the post-traumatic stress, to borrow from Leary, associated with their enduring oppression for being Garifuna. According to one consultant (2002):

Before then we were shame and [a]fraid to identify as Garifunas. Our ancestors did not want us the children to suffer. The way we [as a people] were treated was a crime… FSLN just took them for show… they didn't organize or teach them anything. They dance… that was all and make pageant of walagayu that finish [end] with Sandinista. People were still afraid afterwards. Conscious still needed to be raise? as the value [of Garifuna culture was still] not known.

The second president of OAGANIC corroborates this sentiment. She shared that at the time of the organization's founding many Garinagu experienced shame. The struggle she discusses to raise their consciousness remains up to the present. Isabel Estrada indicates that some of them are educated and could provide much needed support to the organizational development and cultural successes of OAGANIC, but do not do so. She describes their condition as having been "swallowed-up" by the Creoles:

Of all the ethnic group[s] out here, the Garifuna is one making a big step in life; rescuing our culture and trying to identify ourself and get more closer to who we are. That is why I want the people to get more conscious because we have several that I say are not conscious. Some of them when they come out [from the Garifuna villages] and they live in Bluefields for a while, like they don't want to pass [identify] as Garifuna. They get swallow up by the Creole… Right now, right now that is still happening. Like if they shame to come out. You notice this organization it's just a couple [of people]. And it's several people living here. Several… and some of them with very
good education that could give a good support to his organization. But it's just like [as if] nothing [is] happening. They just swallow up.\footnote{According to Obando (1999, 48) there still existed "shame" that made people reluctant to identify themselves as Garifuna during the decade that preceded URACCAN intervention with cultural rescue programming in Orinoco in 1995. Additionally, Zoe Towns (2006, 14), in an interview with a Garifuna bachelors-degree student at the Normal school in Bluefields, expressed her experience that Garifuna are still discriminated against being called: "Caribs [Keribs]… ugly and black and rough."}

Indeed, as we have discussed above, much was happening in terms of the Garifuna cultural revitalization [and what I see as operational resistance]. Much more was yet to come by way of the continued use of alliance-building efforts that extended beyond the local to developing international connections with those whom they saw had particular Garifuna talents, skills, and knowledge they deemed necessary components for the cultural survival and advancement of Garifuna culture in Nicaragua.

In the first decade of the new millennium, The National Garifuna Council (NGC) of Belize became deeply involved in the Garifuna rescue efforts of the Garifuna of Nicaragua by sending a Garifuna teacher to aid in their linguistic development (2000). This collaboration resulted from the relationships developed as a result of the ongoing interactions within the ONECA structure in which OAGANIC and the NGC were both active members. Teacher Linda Castillo, a retired primary school teacher from Dangriga, went to Orinoco to provide Garifuna language education to the Orinoco school children working closely with Victorina Lopez.\footnote{She also taught adult women how to sew Garifuna-centric wall decorations popular amongst Garinagu in Belize at the time and met two to three nights a week with a fluid group of adults who were also interested in learning the Garifuna language. In September 2000 and again in 2001, Garifuna...}
spirituality workshops in Orinoco were conducted by an NGC contingent consisting of my father (the late Buyei John Mariano), former NGC President Mr. Roy Cayetano (author of *A Peoples Garifuna Dictionary*, 1993, and *The Garifuna Understanding of Death*, 2002), and the Rev. Jerris Valentine. They were accompanied by NGC president and ONECA vice President, the late Mr. Agustin Flores. Each of these gentlemen was and remains well respected and well versed and are international figures and leaders on the topic of Garifuna Spirituality and Garifuna dualú.

**For the Garifuna, Two Sides to the Contra War**

During the Contra War, the defense force in Orinoco held guard twenty-four hours a day. At night they held "rondings" or rounds of the strategic points within the community. These points were areas where the Contra enemy could always penetrate and so a squad was always posted to cover these areas at night. A squad was comprised of ten men. Their posts were located by the creek (heading towards Justo Point), behind the school, and behind the remains of the Casa de Cultura. Each squad took six hour shifts; normally a 6 PM to 12 AM shift followed by a 12 AM to 6 AM shift. Defense of the Orinoco community was not left solely to the para-military force, but the total population was involved. All residents served as eyes and ears, reporting all unknown persons and unusual occurrences to the defense force's attention.

---

132 Between 2002 and 2008 by way of the coordinated NGC of Belize and OAGANIC, Victorina Lopez would make two trips to Dangriga with Linda Castillo, of Belize, to further her studies and knowledge of the Garifuna language.

133 On a return visit to Orinoco in 2008, I saw that the Garifuna culture house structure was no longer there. Only its foundational cement blocks remained. I was told it was burnt down a few years back by youth (teens). It was unclear if it was intentional. The suspected individuals were known for frequent drug use and getting into altercations in the community.
According to Francisco Sambola, Garifuna elder and community leader, the Orinoco community's residents requested training and arms from the Sandinista government that Garinagu may themselves defend their hometown and way of life. He explained to me in 1999 that: "Historically, the Garifuna are warriors. This might be in our blood. Nobody came in and told us we could have guard our hometown if we want. We decided ourselves and ask[ed] the Sandinista government." The Sandinista government accepted the petition, and members from the community were brought to Bluefields and Juigalpa to train with the Sandinista forces (in time, other Garinagu went to Cuba to study weapons, forestry and social sciences). Upon completion of the training process these men returned to Orinoco to train other civilian volunteers in defense.

A Garifuna consultant from Orinoco (50 years of age, culturally mixed with Miskito and who could speak Miskito language and some Garifuna) who served as a guide for the Sandinista armed forces stationed in Orinoco shared an oral history with me that he was part of a mission to verify infiltration of Brown Bank community by contra fighters. His first hand experience gives account of one of several Contra war battles that occurred in and around Garifuna communities. He described a five hour shelling that occurred in La Fe between the Sandinista forces armed with fucilería (AK-47s) Russian/ Soviet, and the Contra rebel forces who were armed with mortars, grenades, R.P.G.s (bomb missile thrower), AK-47s (China), and machine guns. At the end of his account, the entire population of La Fe was forced to quit the community for safer grounds. Residents scattered to neighboring/ safer Garifuna sector communities such as Orinoco via dories while others made their way to Bluefields. The community of La Fe would remain abandoned for approximately three years.
A Garifuna male consultant in his late forties shared with me the following account of his losses in the community of Brown Bank as a result of the war. It opens with mention of Pedro Sambola a Garifuna man that was killed by the contra for his leadership in local Frente party organization in that community. As taken from my fieldnotes dated 1999:

The night that Pedro Sambola was taken by contras, persons came to warn this informant of the impending danger and possible attempt on his life. This consultant was armed only with his “so-su mama” rifle, which contained one bullet. He hid himself up in the rafters of his “board” [wooden] home until which time the Contra rebels forcefully entered his home placing his wife at gunpoint. As they searched the house for him, she insisted he was not at home. Fortunately the soldiers did not look upward. The contra soldiers came across five gallons of rum which they took for themselves. After they left, my consultant collected himself and went to hide in the church. He eventually made his way out of Brown Bank to Bluefields. En route and while heavily disguised, he saw when the mangled body of Pedro Sambola being brought back to the [Brown Bank] community. This consultant left his wife and ten children behind; leaving with only the clothes on his back.

He sent a chartered boat three days later to claim his family but lost all possessions including the following:

- Kitchen was burned to the ground
- "Pila" (cement clothes washing stand) smashed to pieces
- House was shot up
- 5 head of cow killed
- 4 head of bull killed
- 52 manzana of coco and coconut burned to almost nothing
- 5 manzana of pine burned to nothing
- 110 head of fowl gone/disappeared
- 5 large hogs destroyed
- 2 horses destroyed
- 2 manzana dasheen destroyed
- 3 manzana rice destroyed
- 3 ½ manzana banana destroyed
- Store/ shop destroyed
- Children remained out of school for 2 - 3 years until which time it was safe

To this day, consultant still sees those men who forcefully entered his home. He knows the three main intruders by name and recalled they were from the communities of Rytipura, Kakabila, and Tasbapauni, all of which are on the lagoon.

The objectives of military forces were to destroy their political/ ideological enemies. This, however, was a complicated matter. Though Orinoco took up arms as a means to defend themselves and became closely associated with the Sandinistas, there were other Garinagu who were either kidnapped into the Contra and indoctrinated into the Contra ideology, or who joined in and followed the platform and ideological stance of the rebels. Far fewer Garifuna numbers are attributed to the latter, the majority being grabbed or kidnapped according to the histories collected. Consultants referred to them as "Garifuna boys" in the bush. Women were abducted too; stories of their abduction and rape are not uncommon.

One Contra consultant described his process for becoming a bushman. The Contras first abducted his sister into their ranks. The family took her for dead. Then he himself was abducted but as a battle was taking place at the time, he was able to get away for a short time and was later recaptured at Brown Bank. He knew many of his captors. He was transported to one of their bases at which location he was "reunited" with his sister. They contemplated escape by dory, but as his sister was just too afraid remained in the camp. He was first assigned to serve as a cook where he prepared wari (wild pig) meat and dasheen (taro root, arrowroot or malanga). Later he was taken for training at places like "Tasa Creek in the Yari River," "Big Bight," and "Pinewood Creek." As he explains his
experience and transformation in the bush in an informal interview with the author dated April 10, 1999:

Plane came and drop aid from US army, food gun clothes and complete uniforms. Guns included G-3, AKA-China [AK-47], M-14, complete equipment. American jungle boots, regular ponchos and ponchos for rainy weather… after we get these implements then the fly stop [can’t] bite us. Things were better and we get more the feeling to fight against Frente Sandinista. I used to fight a lot. Not one or two times, a lot. The last one was at Brown Bank where we lose three soldiers… I know the Lord touch me in that internal[ly] because it was hard to see my old lady. I came out. I was moving up in rank. I was to be sub-comandante. But I was not fight[ing] for position [rank/title] I was fighting to free the country as it was. We believe the country should be free. Well really that is what we fighting for, I believe in that.

As this personal history illustrates, sometimes the abductees took on the ideals of the contra abductors. Sandinistas beyond Orinoco, take Bluefields for example, were criticized for also abducting potential soldiers even taking children fifteen years of age and sending them fight Contras as part of Sandinista army. Many families’ young boys and men went missing in this manner during this time.

We see also in this account that Sandinista presence in a village was not enough to terminate communication between Garinagu families and their Garifuna boys who were part of the rebel forces in the bush. Fighting in the Pearl Lagoon basin, their own lawns and backyards, enabled mothers to send messages and at times bring Sandinista issued food and rations to their contra sons in the bush. These rebel youths visited their parents or other family members whenever the opportunity presented a brief moment for them to "safely" and quickly meet. It is for this reason that when the Sandinistas sought to get the "bushmen" back into civilian life, they did so by appealing to their families. Civilians were asked to encourage their boys in the bush to come out and turn their contra uniforms over to the Sandinista forces. If they complied they were assured they would go unmolested by Sandinista reprisals. According to my consultants from both sides of the
conflict, many feared coming out because they did not trust the Sandinistas; they opted to go to Honduras instead. The Contra consultant (above) came out of the bush after three years and six months because of family, and additionally stayed local because of family. Once out of the bush, he was, interestingly enough, rearmed by the Sandinistas to participate in the local defense of his hometown.\textsuperscript{134}

Not one battle, however, took place in Orinoco itself. Many consultants shared with me that this was because their "old people" [ancestors] had Orinoco "well protect" and "fix up."\textsuperscript{135} In 1987, however (during the Multi-Ethnic Assembly held in Puerto Cabeza), shots were fired into Orinoco from the area of the creek. One woman was struck in the arm with the spraying of shrapnel from a mortar bomb that was launched as part of this contra water attack. The defense force fired back and repelled the contra soldiers. That was the only semblance of penetration of that community by the Contra. On a calm night, many consultants explained, you could hear the echo of the heavy weapons pounding in the distance. As one Orinoco resident, a former Orinoco civil defense serviceman, explained:

\begin{quote}
This whole Atlantic Coast, north to south, was totally contaminated by the counter revolutionary that people never able to sleep happy in their bed. A day like today, many days, you gonna eat
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{134} Many consultants provided the example of the Garifuna community of La Fe as an illustrative example of the "boys" coming out of the bush and rejoicing civilian life. After nearly three years of abandonment, Constantino Solis led the effort to re-settle his hometown of La Fe. This could not be done without certain protections provided by the Auto Defense force at Orinoco as the war was still on. At that time, he worked with residents to bring the "Garifuna boys" out of the bush and back into the civilian life of that community.

\textsuperscript{135} Local terms indicating that, whether by prayers of protection or the watching over of Orinoco by ancestors, their forebears placed a guard of protection that endures and protects Orinoco from outside harm. Many of the old heads were known to have the knowledge necessary to have insured such protection, as consultants suggest they brought these capabilities along with them from Honduras.
Pearl Lagoon communities such as La Fe and Brown Bank were completely taken over by the Contra and were subsequently dismantled as a result of the war. As stated earlier, La Fe residents quit the community altogether, moving to Bluefields and Orinoco because war made life there impossible. Many children missed as much as two or more years of education due to the war. Additionally, many lagoon communities including La Fe, Brown Bank, San Vicente, Wawashan River, Tasbapauni, Karawala, Kara, Sandy Bay, Jualpa, Tortugeru, and La Cruz de Rio Grande suffered great losses of possessions including homes, farms, boats, and livestock at the hands of either faction of military personnel. Both the Sandinista and the Contra forces entered these communities and demanded residents' assistance with whatever the armed soldiers determined they needed. In actuality, to deny either group of fighters food, drink, livestock, transport, and anything else they demanded was to reveal oneself as the "other", the "enemy" and to endanger one's own life as well as their families,' even if you were aligned with neither group. A resident of La Fe recalled for me spending many nights in the church building while Contra's tore through the village in search of Sandinistas:

where could you go? If you is not Sandinista, they say you is Contra. And the Contra is gonna get you if they know you is not with them. They are going to kill you. If the Sandinista know you is not with them, you are going to get killed too. You were sandwiched.

Because of the fear and uncertainties of life associated with war, Garifuna consultants also described relations with the Frente Sandinista as often precarious at best; even with

136 Personal communication, Mr. Francisco Sambola in Orinoco in 1999. Mr. Sambola was the grandson of founder John Sambola, and was also the lead civilian in the Orinoco Sandinista force during
the many benefits Sandinista association offered the Orinoco community there was a recognition of rising death tolls according to one Garifuna consultant who was a native of the Garifuna village of St. Vicente. He indicated that for the Garifuna "their faces were Sandinista but their hearts were liberal" (informal interview with consultant Fitez Sambola). Many Garifuna were involved in the war effort from both sides and deaths from Garifuna communities, according to the local histories offered by consultants, included: Delbert Flores from Orinoco who died at La Fe, Pedro Sambola from Orinoco who died at Brown Bank, Albert Johnson from Marshal Point, Beverly Johnson from Marshal Point, Linton Johnson from Orinoco, Hendry Taylor-Sambola from Orinoco, Vincent Aguillar, Henry Bradigam, and a fellow named "Ligia." The daily fear associated with the possibility of more deaths alienated many Garinagu from the Sandinista program, especially those beyond Orinoco.

The Garinagu, unlike the Miskito and Creole, do not have a history that includes periodic dominance in Nicaragua or any of the Central American States to which they belong. They emerged from the coastal processes occurring in the Nicaraguan nineteen-eighties context in a place of cultural resurgence that was directly related to their interests and agency in taking up arms to protect their lands and homes. Perry (1991, 123) suggests that Garifuna identity may have "had little meaning to the people externally categorized as Garifuna," which runs contrary to the politicized ethnicities of the Miskito.
and Creole at that time. My reading of the situation, at yet another layer of significance some twenty years removed, is that the latent knowledge and capabilities of the elders at that time were only beginning to be revealed as the context became ripe for resurgence; a process Garinagu of Nicaragua were only beginning in the eighties. More than self-armed functionaries of the Sandinista, they became motivated and driven by their interpretation of the benefits to be obtained under the Sandinista agenda, and the subsequent 1987 Autonomy Law. Much like my contra consultant suggested, things were in place for them to act. As resources and support became available to bushmen, they became more empowered to be agents for what they viewed as coastal freedom. Garinagu used space created by the coastal conflict too. Some linked Garifuna involvement to the experiences of their St. Vincent/ Yurumein ancestors fighting to protect their land and culture. And they linked their participation to the leadership of ancestor John Sambola, the founder of the Orinoco community, as a means to interpreting and transitioning their wartime involvements for the protection of the physical community to a platform for ethnic rights they had been long denied.

Political Elections & Enduring Memories Of War

Ms. Lupita Agosta (2008) shared with me more on the topic of Ms Isabel Estrada's candidacy for the Vice Alcalde position in the City of Bluefields. Ms. Isabel is the daughter of Edward Estrada and is originally from La Fe and was running on the Sandinista ticket. This discussion came up outside a Ruguma dance group practice in Bluefields that Ms. Agosta and I attended. She informed me that some Garifuna she knew said "yes" they would support the Garifuna candidate. Others, however, said "no" they do
not intend to support her candidacy. When I asked if she knew why, she explained the situation as follows:

Well, they say that... most of them say that the Sandinista government... they don't trust the Sandinista government. They are afraid... and em many of them say Ms Isabel shouldn't get into that and, em, because em, they don't want to be in problem again.

The memories she continued on to share on the veranda that afternoon reveal her own involvements and, again, reveals the contradictions in postures and attitudes amongst the Garinagu regarding the Sandinista/Contra conflict as well as their involvements on both sides of the struggle. Though some twenty five to thirty years removed, her story reveals the continuity of contentions some Garifuna hold towards Sandinista politics and why though many Garinagu are part of the Frente party. She was clear to conclude with her support of the Garifuna political candidate as an opportunity for Garifuna community to develop and advance. Additional text from her commentary as captured in my 2008 field recording follows:

**LA:** The rest of the community [villages around Pearl Lagoon] has people who fight against the Sandinista [referring to War on the Coast]. The United States Government was paying the rest of community to fight against the Sandinista people, who dedicate [themselves] to the Sandinista people to kill them. So the Orinoco people them... the Sandinista give all their support to the Orinoco community and well the people was agreed to defend their community because they didn't want the next party to come in there and destroy the community. So the people them... we, because I had my arms too, and we defend our community.

**BMSM:** As Sandinista

**LA:** As Sandinista. The Contra never come in there and fight... never yet... All the people in Orinoco was for Sandinista.

**BMSM:** Were the people in Orinoco and La Fe united or divided during this time?

**LA:** They had was to be divided because em, through those people in San Vicente the majority was with the Contra and em, in La Fe you had people who was Sandinista too and was with the Contra... yes... so em, the people who was in La Fe and they was em, with the contra. They take they arms and went in the bush... the Sandinista people staying La Fe... but they had fight there. They destroy there. The destroy the community a lot. They [unrecognized text] kill people [in] fight between contra and Sandinista. The have big fight and mash [destroy] it.
BMSM: So now the people them move back La Fe?

LA: Well, La Fe people come back up because em, Ms Justa bredda [brother] Tino Solis. He say he is going back La Fe to open up back La Fe because it’s his family home. Grass did grow di mountain… him going back him alone and build up his house and he going clean the place and see that La Fe people come back into the community and well him care [carry, take] some men and big cow and animal to help clean up the place and he went in and open back La Fe and people went back and live and fix their house and that is how La Fe come back to La Fe as now. This was after the war. The war destroy La Fe and Tino went and open it up. Its not like before the war, not even half [the residents] is there. Most of the people in Bluefields or other country…

BMSM: Why is that?

LA: Well people is afraid of getting back inna problem they tell me, plenty of the children die in those times in the fight so they is against contra, they is against Sandinista that they never say they is against the Contra… they say is through them the war come. They no say through the next part. After Tino gone back there, well all the support is through the Sandinista to build back La Fe.

And well, we just hope that she [Ms Isabel] win something [the position] that she could help the Garifuna community.

Collaborative Efforts Between Community and University

Difficulties notwithstanding between the two, the University and the community of Orinoco have been able to collaborate through the production of a Wamalali Garifuna [Garifuna Voice] radio program in the Pearl Lagoon basin, with the intentional continuation of the name used during the mid to late 1990s. Presently, they are looking to incorporate news and materials from the Garifuna diaspora. Clarence Gonzalez, URACCAN faculty and Director of Spirit Dancers, is investigating use of the internet to obtain recordings from the diaspora to air as part of the local radio program.

Another collaborative initiative is what they are referring to as the Garifuna Language Nest, which is a bilingual preschool in Orinoco. Arja Koskinen, Ph.D., explains the vision and goal of this new initiative:

The model (began with the Maori people in New Zealand in the 80s) but basically it is revitalizing a language with the few speakers that are still left in a community, get them involved with the children in a natural way, talking about daily life things and so on, in a preschool environment -
that is, communicating in the language, moving beyond teaching isolated words (as they do now for instance in Orinoco). I saw this opportunity when I heard that in Orinoco forty-five preschool aged children stayed outside of the system because FADCANIC cannot finance the community preschool anymore. We asked for permission from IBIS to make some little changes in the budget and they agreed. Now, I am going to Orinoco on Monday to see about the practical things and identify who of the elders could be involved in it. I have the names of Miss Polina, Mr. Daadi Velasquez and Mr. Moro as the strongest speakers…

Personal communication. — 03/06/09.

In a subsequent communication, I learned that the report on the program was very positive:

Mr. Daadi and Mr. Moro are attending the preschool punctually every day… They are "language assistants" at the second level preschool, and using Garifuna in all the activities that the children are doing… I am so happy to see that the children are actually saying things [imitating] after them and - also very important - that the two speakers feel good when they see that the children are learning and WANT to learn; that is the real Wamasa Garifuna! [Garifuna Nest!] And as they obtain a "salary" to do it, they can feel that knowing the language is actually also [being] rewarded.

— 5/5/09.

URACCAN – Instituto para la Promoción e Investigación Lingüística y Rescate Cultural (IPILIC) – also sponsored a course in Garifuna Language and Culture:

We concluded the Diploma course with 25 graduates (some weaker, some stronger, but everybody equally motivated!). The pasantia [referring to language students who studied abroad] to Belize was very nice and the teachers and the three children had a lot to tell when they came back. Miss Phyllis took such a good care of them. We also managed to finish the programs and textbooks for preschool and 1-3 grades for the teaching of language and culture; we are just waiting for the final edits from Honduras with regards to orthography portion, and they can then be put into use… We have another Diploma course in the proposal - level II for the same students that took the first one - and also textbooks for 4-6 grade. And a pasantia to Honduras of one month…"

— 02/11/10.

Victorina Lopez (the Garifuna teacher in Orinoco) was one of those traveling and studying with Mrs Phyliss Cayetano at the Gulisi School in Dangriga Belize. Via URACCAN, Ms. Lopez also obtained a scholarship for participation in a Diplomatura en Revitalización Lingüística y Cultural with the Universidad Indígena Intercultural, to take place in Peru.
As of October 2010, the collaborative University and Community venture allowed Ms. Lopez, accompanied by fellow Orinoco primary school teacher Rosita Davis and two schoolchildren, to spend the month in a Honduran Garifuna village to further their linguistic development in the Garifuna Language.

Fr. Colindrez on the Garifuna Movement and the Garifuna Way

After a Garifuna day planning meeting in the community of Orinoco, I had the opportunity to speak at length with Fr. Colindrez, of the Anglican Church, himself a Garifuna, about his participation and interest in the Garifuna Cultural Rescue project.

It can be done… it [the Garifuna culture] can survive… here everybody feel themselves as a Garifuna. Not just by feeling but by trying to implement what Garifuna really implement in their life. For instance now the language is very difficult to be rescued. Now a person that suggest well that is not necessary [to rescue, revitalize the culture] or that it is already lost [to us] that person is not really identifying themselves as a Garifuna… I know that the language is almost gone but the interest that I have because I identify myself willingly, not only here [in Nicaragua] but when I go to Belize, Guatemala, and Honduras or wherever I go and meet any Garifuna people, I can converse with them. It’s a sad situation to listen to a Garifuna song and elders talking and me a Garifuna man can’t say something. Why I am so interested in rescuing back the language? The town, neighbors, do not have too much interest. [So] we must start by point A: Buiti Binafi [meaning good morning] to greet our neighbors. It will catch on from there.

If a person does not have the sufficient feeling for the rescuing, I don’t know them as a leader. You have to have that feeling and know that the blood is there to move and want to rescue what is yours. Like you lost a diamond and you say I reach here and find back that diamond for myself. We must fight against [unrecognizable text] and try get back it […] back again.

Bami, singing, dancing, drumming… these are part of it… these things need to go further on because language is what we are struggling on. All these things are part [but] anyone can come from around and do bami, drum, make hudatu and dance but when the language is there that really going to identify who we are.

Father Colindrez is talking about developing competencies in a collaborative leadership and in the Garifuna culture… seeking and learning language through the available opportunities is primary in his vision of rescue and revitalization because he sees language as the primary marker. His understanding of the Garifuna way therefore extends beyond drumming, song and dance food. In this regard, his dialogue is in accord
with many Garinagu in diaspora, some of whom are recorded in this dissertation. He goes on to talk about the importance of unity in diversity within the Garifuna projects being orchestrated and between the varying church denominations that serve Garifuna communities, stressing they must work collaboratively with Garifuna and amongst themselves.

_Griega Sambola interview on www.labuga.com_

As a result of the cultural resurgence contemporary Garinagu are leaving their coastal Nicaraguan villages and taking their culture with them. In this one example made available by the NYC based _Labuga.com_ internet radio program, which in addition to streaming Garifuna music twenty-four hours a day under the direction of DJ Labuga (based in Los Angeles), also offers interviews with key emerging and established Garifuna community leaders from throughout the diaspora. Interviews are conducted by Martin Bermudez (based in NYC), founder of and operator of _Labuga.com_. Available at the site is a recent interview with international college student Greiga Sambola of Orinoco. Griega is a student in Mt. Hood Community College's Natural Resources Technology program, made possible by way of scholarships provided by the Cooperative Association of States for Scholarships (CASS) program and the Indigenous and Afro Latino Scholarship (IALS) Program. The interview addressed Nicaragua's annual Garifuna Day celebrations organized by OAGANIC, correlates in local foods and Garifuna foods abroad, punta and other cultural dances, Garifuna language education in Orinoco school system, as well as the pride she takes in her Garifuna culture and the role her US education will play in her return to her community. Select text from the interview regarding Garifuna spirituality follows:
MB: Talk to me about the spiritual Garifuna.

GS: Sorry?

MB: Talk to me about the spirituality. What exactly you guys do in the spiritual sense.

GS: In the spiritual sense.

MB: Uh huh.

GS: Well, in my community we have Evangelic church, we have a Catholic church, we have an Anglican and we have an Adventist church. More Garifuna there are Evangelic so we go to that evangelic church it's called Revival Tabernacle Church.

MB: Interesting…

GS: We do like praise and worship… of course we believe in God and everything but sometimes when the old people get sick then this lady in my community she would get dreams from the ancestors, and she would just tell the people them what we have to do and the family have to be there to support this sick person. So we go and have a celebration for like three days. We have fowl (like chicken), hog, cow, fish, whatever the ancestors ask for she said and we have to get it. And so we go and we dance, we dance. On the last day in the morning we have egg punch, where everybody eat together and we have the final celebration. 139

Her commentary is instructive of the communication between living and the ancestors by way of buyei, though she did not use the term buyei (or sukia), her description demonstrates that persons do serve such or similar role in her hometown. She did identify the ritual as walagayu elsewhere in the interview as well as establish the importance of ereba which she translated as bami [a form cassava bread] that is a key symbol in amongst Dangriga Garinagu and others throughout the diaspora as well. The egg punch which she referred to is known as funsu in Dangriga. It is an egg based punch. As per my field notes of Thursday, August 17, 2000, the last day of a particular Dangriga diigii:

They [participants] use *rida* [hollowed and halved calabash gourds for drinking and dipping] and formed two lines leading to a *madudu* [table/alter] at the center of the *gayunari* [main vestibule of the *dabuyaba* [düğü temple] this time to collect a green frothy egg punch. As they did with the rum previously described, they will proceed with the rida of *funsu* into the *gulie* [buyei’s sanctuary] and present these to the heart of the *dabuyaba* [earthen mound, symbolic grave] and pray/ask for health, strength, etc. After this action, this *funsu* can be consumed as a drink or rubbed into any area of the body afflicted with pain or illness as was the rum before it.

Last, Griega’s message to all listener’s indicates more than diasporic similarities within the cultures practices and rituals; they demonstrate the pervasiveness of a Garifuna way that operates below the consciousness that is made apparent in ritual behavior. Her closing thoughts at the invitation of the interviewer further illustrates Garifuna pride as well as a subtle cultural politics that is an extension of cultural practices as her youthful example demonstrates how a historically oppressed community can and has re-emerged with a voice finding salience in the very socio economic and political institutions not only locally but abroad that advanced, if not abetted, a hegemony contributed to their very marginalization.

**GS:** …Just be proud of your culture, don’t try to hide it from anybody just be proud and open up and talk about Garifuna wherever you go because that is me wherever I go I don’t say I am from Nicaragua I try to be specific, I am from the Caribbean coast of Nicaragua, I’m a Garifuna…

**MB:** Heyyy Subusitali !!! [Hey, you know it!]…

**GS:** I always say that to people… I just try to be specific…

The work of the Garinagu elders past and present has impacted Griega Sambola’s outlook and with a college degree and her future transition from emerging leader to community leader will result in more like her that are taking their culture with them, sharing it with *garinagu waladei* [like ourselves] and non-Garifuna as a means to insuring its survival and a respected place in the larger society.
APPENDIX B:

ETHNOGRAPHIC SUPPLEMENT – GARINAGU DIASPORA IN BELIZE

This appendix provides supplemental ethnographic detail on the Garinagu diaspora in Belize.

Belize, Central America

The approximately 8,000 residents of Dangriga, Belize, endure a number of disadvantages, including poverty, remnants of a colonial educational system, absentee parents forced to search for gainful employment away from home, and the effects on youth of these conditions (Bonner 2001; Hernandez 2002; Palacio 2005; Luminais 2006; Stone 2007; Straughan 2007; and Wilcox 2008). My ethnographic fieldwork in Dangriga Town occurred during several visits in 1994 and 1995. I also resided in Dangriga from September 2001 to August 2003, and returned in June 2008. For this dissertation, I have extracted data from ritual and social actions such as work in volunteer associations, Adügürahani (dügü), and folklore/performance groups. I have included the efforts of the National Garifuna Council (NGC), which represents the Garifuna of Belize in national and international arenas and works for socio-economic development and cultural retention.

140 I have participated in a variety of Garifuna rituals during my 1995 fieldwork in Belize. This provided data for my 1996 Masters Project in Latin American and Caribbean Studies, The Wanaragua Rite of Passage: Ritual of Annual Renewal: Auto Interpretation for the Perseverance of the Garifuna Culture of Dangriga, Belize.

Ethnographic work in Belize revealed the committed work of several influential figures as detailed in this appendix.

**Ms. Linda Castillo Teaching Garifuna Language in the Diaspora**

At her Dangriga home in 2008, teacher Linda Castillo shared with me how she entered the teaching of Garifuna to beginners. What follows is taken from my fieldnotes dated June 25, 2008:

She started them off with a common children's song "so we could sing together."

*Buiti Binafi, Buiti Binafi* (Good Morning, Good Morning)

*Ida Bia?, Ida Bia?* (How are you, How are you)

*Magadietina, Magadietina* (Not Bad, Not Bad)

*Aba Le* (Same, Likewise)

From there we start to say[ing] the words without singing them.

To that vocabulary then, we add [the following vocabulary]

*Buiti amidi* (good midday day, good day)

*Buiti Rabonweyu* (good afternoon)

And they learn and I encourage them to use them amongst themselves and with everybody beyond the classroom. The vocabulary words continue with, for example, house ('muna'), door ('bena'), window ('funedera'), stove ('gabusu'), pot ('sódieru), and so on like that. Then Friday we will play games breaking the class up into two teams. Games based on identification and of Garifuna words best suited to complete a sentence.

Teacher Linda indicates that she gestures to the object or a picture of the object she wants students to identify using Garifuna.

She explains… I point to a [picture of a] house and say:

**LC:** This is a…

**Students:** 'Muna'
Pointing to the classroom door

**LC:** It has a…

**Students:** 'Bena'

Pointing to the windows

**LC:** With a…

Students: 'Funederu'

Pointing to picture of cooking pots

**LC:** I cook with a…

Students: 'sódieru'

**LC:** On a…

Students: 'gabusu'

Early on students get days of the week, numbers to count, and we start to have small conversations using: *Ka Biri* (What is your name)? *Haliabadibu* (where are you going)? *Haliabaganawa* (where do you live)? So that when I ask one question we can follow up with three or four other relevant points of interest. So then we practice in class and use these to converse when we meet one another outside of class too.

**Student Salutation:** 'Buiti Binafi' Teacher Linda

(Good Morning Teacher Linda).

**LC:** 'Buiti Binafi, Ida bia numada? Haliabadibu' ?

(Good morning, how are you friend? Where are you going?)

**Student Response:** 'Neibuga leskuela' (I am going to school).
I teach them to say like home (‘águyu’), shop (‘shapu’) and like that so they have more than one [option for an] answer.

After her six month stay in Nicaragua, teacher Linda returned to Belize. When I arrived at Bluefields and Orinoco for the November the 19th celebrations in 2000, the important impact of her work with the small children was evident. On the cancha, sweets and treats were being handed out to the children, who volunteered themselves to identify days of the week, recite poems, and count (some counting up to 50 and beyond). Their excitement was truly contagious. I was personally moved because, reflecting upon my own experiences growing up, I was not able to do what these primary schoolers were now capable of doing, though I was aware of my Garifuna identity. With such intervention and a Garifuna-centered vision, teacher Linda Castillo models Garifuna resistance in diaspora. She informed me a representative of St. Vincent, who had come to Belize to identify a Garifuna teacher to provide Garifuna language instruction at the pre-school, primary school and high school levels, visited her. At the recommendation of the NGC, the following year she spent three months in Sandy Bay, Yurumein/ St. Vincent teaching Garifuna within the formal educational system. The teaching reached non-Garifuna-speaking descendants of the Garinagu – students, and teachers alike.

142 Other efforts related to Garifuna language instruction and pedagogy addressed by longtime Los Angeles, California resident Mr. Clifford Palacio (2010: 6-7), who shares memories from his formal education (1949-1953) at St. John’s College, a secondary school in Belize City. Ten Garifuna students, including himself, from rural communities in southern Belize, were trained to become Catholic school teachers there in Belize at that time. Palacio took advantage of a new program whereby formal education was paid for out of salary from subsequent teaching at locations where the church determined there was a need. As a student in the Carib Language Group that was organized to study Garifuna history and language, the St. John’s College students produced Lebeneri Sielu: Furiegi Lidan Garifuna [Heaven’s door: Prayer in Garifuna] (1951) and subsequently Palacio offered classes in his hometown of Seine Bight Village to introduce the material for community use. With the support of their advisor, John Stochl, S.J., the students also wrote the first known English-Carib Dictionary in the British Honduras (2010: 9-10). An English-Spanish-Garifuna dictionary is currently available on the world wide web via The Garifuna
Mr. Roy Cayetano: Garifunadaúü and Spirituality

In June of 2008, I had a chance to talk with Roy Cayetano in his Dangriga home. Cayetano characterized the Drums of Our Fathers monument, including Garifuna drums and sísira (maracas), as: "...a call to war... to improve the quality of our lives." My interest in speaking with him was to obtain his perspective about the significance of Garifuna spirituality workshops that he and the contingent provided to the people of Orinoco. I was becoming more aware that this was a key component to Garifuna diasporic cultural resistance in diasporic Garifuna communities:

Mr. Cayetano clearly stated that they had not ventured down to Nicaragua with the mindset that the Garinagu there had little or nothing to offer in return. Though the term heard at times is "rescue," the presenters did not view their work as conducted to save the Nicaraguan Garinagu. Nor was the intention to impose the Garinagu perspective or knowledge from Belize on them. The opportunity available was to share. It would be left up to the Nicaraguan community to take and use that which best assisted in meeting local goals and interests: "The exchange was not to replace what they already have but to enrich what they already have." While they taught participants some songs from the Belize context, they were very careful to provide opportunities for the Nicaraguan Garinagu to share the walagayu songs that they knew and normally used locally as a means to validating the culture that remains. As per Mr. Cayetano: "It isn't like everything is lost...we are very interested in seeing what has been retained. Respect, enriching, adding to... I believe that is the right approach."

Institute: Mr. Palacio continues to be active in the promotion of the Garifuna language as an educator in
During my loosely structured interview with Mr. Cayetano, he explicated the very important link that exists between the concept of Garifunaduáü and the values it contains for Garifuna communities throughout the diaspora. In his description of the spirituality workshop and a recap of varying general elements of the diigü ritual, he demonstrated the connection as follows:

No matter where the mali is [enacted], regardless of where you are [whether] Belize, Honduras, Guatemala, Nicaragua, the main mali song is "Nagutu Bamalihonya, Iyayawo Bamalihoya Iyayawo ahh aye, Nagutu Bamalihonya, Iyayawo Bamalihonya" and so on and so I think the central idea is "Aura buni iyayawou, amurnuni, Aura buni iyayawou, amurnuni (I for you my grandmother and you for me)." I think of grandmother in a collective spirit of those who have gone before and in a way it is a great spirit in the sense that God to whom we believe the spirit goes anyway. "I for you and you for me." I think that is the very essence of Garifunaduáü because if we are aware of that, and we let that guide the way we live our life, our relationships with one another there will not be a problem. There will be harmony, there will not be separation, the discord that brings about evil things. Sickness and unwellness will not have an opportunity to flourish. If you look at the way we have lived our lives in the old days before we were overtaken by the wage economy, before we got hooked into urbanization the way we lived our lives was a dramatization of that idea.

Aü bun amürü nu then is at the very heart of being and must be understood as a key component of Garifunaness. This cultural value is prominent and present not only in song text, which represents but one level of interpretive analysis, but that which is acted out which represents another layer for interpretation. The mali is the Garifuna worldview performed. By way of ritual symbolism, the three drums representative of past, present, and future generations, shaman, and God's presence in the figure of the buyei with sísira in hand bringing time and space into one focal point, Mr. Cayetano explicates the úarani (togetherness) as the quintessential component in Aü bun, amürü nu and therefore Garifunaness. As he describes it: "The drums start in the west, move to the center, then back. Then moves to the south, to center and then back. To the east, to the center and back… everytime they go to the center, aba lariengu garawoun luma múa (the earth and
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the drums communicate) in a process mediated by the *buyei* with the *sisira*… I think that tells us something about Garifunaduáü and of the wish of the *ahari* for us."

Garinagu believe that the ancestors do not accept the ritual unless unity prevails. A work is pleasing to the ancestors and brings about a healing, both physically and within the community, which regains harmony. As Mr. Cayetano puts it, "A oneness." The ritual is demonstrative, then, of a central tenet of what Garinagu themselves expect as the proper way to be and therefore, the proper way forward as a community; sharing and working collectively to the benefit all. The ritual, then, serves to counteract the tendency for separation. As he put it elsewhere in this informal interview: "Abowa buguchu [we hit a wall] when we come across "angina [stinginess, meanness] and michahubati [stingy, one who does not share]" because these are manifestations of capitalist culture marked by commodity fetishism and individualism, while sharing resources is at the root of the Garifuna culture via *Aü bun amürü nu* that guides the rite and *Garifunaduáü*. Its imbedded codes, or transcripts, suggest an alternative to the values of individualism, self-profit and personal gain associated with wage-labor capitalist societies in which the Garinagu now live.

Enacting Garifunaduáü, by Mr. Cayetano’s account, means going deeper than the wearing of Garifuna outfits, attending Garifuna-centered holidays and activities such as the November 19th Celebrations in Belize, Nicaragua and similar such events elsewhere in the diaspora. It also means something beyond Garifuna foods, songs, and dance, all of which are symbols operating at the surface level. In his description, the outward symbols need to be tethered to an inward understanding and outward application of the "Me for
you, You for me" value system that grounds Garifunaness and thereby establishes the very essence of Garifunaduáü as resistance.

**Mr. Roysus Bregal: Culture Man**

I have been engaged in a dialogue with Mr. Roysus Bregal of Dangriga, Belize, for what is now approaching two decades. In the mid nineties and at the turn of the new century, I became very interested in Garifuna drumming and songs and whenever I was in Dangriga, I would search him and others out for assistance and tutelage in these areas. He was a part of the famed *Waribagabaga* (Butterfly) Dance group that performed locally and internationally, one such venue being the 1976 Caribbean Festival of Creative Arts (Carifesta) at Jamaica. From 2001 to 2003 he ran drumming workshops assisted by master-drummer Joshua Arana in Belize City, Belmopan and Dangriga, sponsored by way of the Belize City House of Culture. Mr. Bregal is a well respected "culture man" in Dangriga; his talents range from *wanaragua* dancer to choreographer and he is often sought out to assist in the organizing of Garifuna youth performance groups. At his Dangriga residence, in 2008, I spoke with him as a trusted consultant about his thoughts regarding the significance of the Garifuna dance groups to the survival of Garifuna culture. An interesting discussion ensued that relates to the topic of Garifunaduáü and the spirit of cultural resistance in Dangriga. It is important in that it concisely brings to the fore historical parallels in the history of Belize and Nicaragua in terms of persecution and the contributions of song and dance as a space for resistance and Garifunaduáü. The social memory that Mr. Bregal shared with me that evening is as follows:

Damn important. It plays a heavy role because when you have a set dance group my brother, you feel that love and that spiritual-ness [spirit] set in [comes over you], you [start] to think different. Really! And plus if you understand what you are doing, what it is that song tells you about… it
relax your mind from the stress of this life before you do something out of the way… songs give you words of advice behind your head [like your conscience] Madugabei le, wreebatı katei leera (don't do this, that's bad).

This spirit (or, as he explained spiritual-ness) operates at a deeper level than just knowing a song. He is referring to the hidden transcripts which can and do guide behavior and educate people on the very things to avoid and embrace. As I indicated above, he views this value laden informal education as part of a larger complex viewed negatively in the formal educational system. He explained that while he did not go far up in school, the following account characterizes his experience with the attitudes of formal education in Dangriga at the time, their role in undermining or trying to "knock-off" Garifuna culture and continued participation in cultural forms as an act of resistance.

"Resistance" is my term, not his, but it flows from the collective action described in what remains of his personal account:

Most all of my Garifuna come from dancing groups, not from the school, because in those days… you are asking me about myself I will tell you about myself, OK… I went to Catholic school and the Jesuit priest, the father, they don't agree with drums and things like that because they say it's devil work. [As a] matter of fact, one of my first experience[s] with them [was] during the Christmas. I was a young boy that like to dance charikanari too [In addition to wanaragua (jan kanú, in Creole English)]. After the Christmas holiday they [the priests] have their CIA [a]round who identify all those who dance charikanari and they call us to make a line by the princip’al’s office and we get we ass wop [beat]! Period… serious thing [I'm not joking]… Sacred Heart school. They played an important role in trying to knock-off our culture from us. That is not encouragement to us because [as] we are [becoming] afraid [of their disapproval and punishment] we will stop [with the culture and traditions]. But my brother, we had a crowd of us every Christmas we dance and when school open we make our own line there… we will take the whipping because nobody will stop us from dance charikanari until after[wards] they let us alone.

Perhaps Mr. Bregal's continued interest in the promotion of Garifuna performance arts remains an aspect of his resistance to the cultural hegemony that dismissed aspects of Garifunduáü. Certainly, the education outside the classroom of his youth continues to inspire his actions. At the close of the drumming workshop in Danigriga, parents of participants shared with me that more such programming is needed for youth.
Mr. Peter Ciego of the National Garifuna Council

I was able to catch up with longtime NGC leader Mr. Peter Ciego at the Gulisi Garifuna Museum in Dangriga Town, Belize, where he was Curator and was overseeing operations one Saturday morning, June 28, 2008. As we talked and walked through the museum's exhibits, I became interested to know how we might interpret all the NGC's significant Garifuna-centered efforts at present within the context of two centuries of marginalization endured within the capitalist structure. Mr. Ciego engaged me and my inquiry with the following, which I have extracted from my field notes:

We will accept globalization; I mean, we can't fight it. At the same time, we will not give up, we will not lose ourself. We will take our heritage and try now to get that [our culture] into this globalization because we will not let that go.

Recalling that at present most Garifuna youth do not speak Garifuna fluently, and much is not understood in terms of the dügü and Garifuna spirituality, I followed up inquiring if these contemporary efforts are manifestations of Garifuna resistance to the harmful effects globalization has had on features of Garifunaduáü and Garifuna-centered sensibilities. He replied that what he sees is not a resisting, but a merging: "We are trying to merge the two." He continued on, his point of departure being the role of the Catholic school teachers whose mission was to "drive out the devil in us." He followed up with the prohibition on the speaking the Garifuna language in school, which they indicated was not a language and would take them nowhere. What follows are Mr. Ciego's interpretation of local Garifuna history, culture loss, and the recent accomplishments of the NGC in the context of engaging this increasingly globalized world with the tools its education has afforded as a means of incorporating and appropriating Garifuna-ness with in it. In this view, education is seen as a means of merging the two differing ideologies:
Those who spoke Garifuna at school were whipped mercilessly in the school. Their parents did not want their children subjected to this humiliation. so they no longer speak Garifuna to the children because teacher don't like it and the Father [priest] don't approve of it. These people are authorities. You look up to them. So you start talk it less and less to your children. We had to be humble because we were in school and you have to learn because you don’t want to de doing what you or I am doing [says your parent]. Your people work hard. You can do something better you don't have to do this. With our parents having good intentions, sending us to school, we were being forced to accept the order that was being imposed on us at the expense of our own… people don't work the land anymore, but in those days we lived off the land, we learned to go to school so we could buy our food. Because of that harsh punishment in school, we start speak it [Garifuna] less but now we have a lot of activity. Now we have gotten their education because now we are PhDs, doctors, lawyers, any profession you list there is a Garifuna. So we don’t have to be humble anymore. We have already got it. Now we are proud. Now we raise our hand and say "I am a Garifuna.” We are encouraging students to go back to learning Garifuna language.

Merging the two ideologies, Garifunaduáü and Western Capitalist, is possible in this scenario because many Garifuna have gotten the education of the oppressor and can influence and bring about the necessary changes in which Garifuna can move from surviving to thriving. Having been humbled within the academic apparatus has had an effect not only on the youth, but also on the parents who have wanted to offer children protections. In this regard we find similarities to the Nicaraguan context; where suppression is used as a means to survival.

The educational system also affects the lifestyle associated with living off the land, which was traditionally harmonious and reciprocal, unlike the over-exploitation characteristic of capitalist industrial societies. In order for the educated to effect change, a consciousness must remain of traditional texts, local actions, and other latent symbolic indicators that, when ready, can be unpacked, channeled, and utilized in an effort to somehow "merge the two" ideologies. Linda Castillo indicated that she teaches Garifuna language, but herself struggles with abeimahani (women's gestured song unaccompanied by music). She said she does not know how to abeimaha. To become proficient she stays after at memorial masses, arisuruni [novenas or nine days of prayer]; these she attends and takes advantages of the opportunities there to learn the genre. She notices that many
people struggle with dügü songs as well. She says these are getting out of style. She hopes to invest in a workshop or produce a CD that will provide opportunity to reactivate interest in abeimahani and dügü songs. "By having these things on CD it would come back… it's our culture and we shouldn't let it go."

Somewhat similarly, Roy Cayetano indicated that because his father was a teacher and spent a significant amount of time away from his home village of Barranco, he did not learn to dance wanaragua as a child and had not seen a dügü until he moved to Dangriga. He has, however, dedicated himself to the discovery of these aspects he has missed out on in varying ways including investigation, inquiry and interpretation. These were sources and stimuli available in the Garifuna communities that once available to him, turned him on to these cultural aspects that he had little exposure to as a young person. Today his time and knowledge on these matters are sought nationally and internationally.

Both Castillo and R. Cayetano, actors in the preservation and advancement of Garifunaduáü, are presently retired from education, but their ongoing efforts correspond to Mr. Ciego’s assessment, as they have used their education in ways that have provided benefits to the Garinagu both on-stage (public) and off-stage (private, amongst Garinagu) settings. Additionally, we have seen how those with less formal education can and do contribute to a developing counter-hegemony, whether self-defined as such, or not, by their getting involved and making spaces for traditional knowledge forms. The contributions of these and other actors in the process of cultural revitalization both within the Belize context and certainly beyond, as we have seen in Nicaragua, require a healthy working relationship between those with formal education and those bearers of traditional
knowledge. Mr. Bregal has on occasion referred to these communities as *gapencili* [literate or formally schooled] and *mapencili* [illiterate], respectively. Such internal (and externally postured) cooperation provides the best options for advancing Garifunaduáü.

The working, collaborative spirit they advance models Garifunaduáü for Garinagu and others within the context of globalizing processes, demonstrating, as Mr. Ciego indicates, that "we [Garinagu]," not 'I' but 'we,' will not let it [Garifunaduáü] go."
This appendix provides supplemental ethnographic detail on the Garinagu diaspora in the United States.

**North American Diasporic Context**

Garifuna identity and the maintenance and promotion of their Garifuna ways emerge as agency in contexts that span the United States. In the U.S., the Garinagu live in inner-city environments that often lack sufficient socio-economic investment, as crime, drugs and blight are common. One of the major questions of this decade is the "war" on undocumented immigrants and bilingual education in schools. Increasingly over the last five decades, however, it is within these global cities such as New York (Gonzalez 1979, England 2008) and Los Angeles (Palacio 1992, Mattei and Smith 1998, DeFay 2004) that Garinagu seek the promise of improved socio-economic futures while holding onto and increasingly advancing Garifuna culture as viable means to do so.

**The Garifuna American Heritage Foundation United, Inc. in Los Angeles**

The Los Angeles based Garifuna American Heritage Foundation United, Inc. (GAHFU) is a positionally defined site of cultural resistance. GAHFU has tax exempt status under section 501 (c) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code and is dedicated to "the preservation and dissemination of the Garifuna culture" inclusive of its history, language,
music, arts and crafts and values. They strive to accomplish these goals by working closely with the Garifuna community and friends not only in Los Angeles, but throughout the diaspora "to nurture, promote, practice, retrieve and document Garifunaduáü in due time before it is lost." According to a recent flyer made available to the public via the internet, GAHFU seeks to achieve these endeavors through educational programs, and through music and the arts.

In 2006, GAHFU organized a boycott of the Walt Disney film "Pirates of the Caribbean: Dead Man's Chest" at its world premiere in Anaheim, California's Disneyland. The film contained stereotyped images of the Kalinagu (so-called Caribs) as cannibals. Tainos, in particular, and Indigenous communities, in general, were invited to attend the protest. Interested parties were encouraged to bring: "sticks, drums, shakers or anything that could be used as a weapon to the event. Also, teenagers are encouraged to come with their parents to join us for this peaceful protest." Here, traditional musical instrumentation is being associated with weaponry to be used in a planned peaceful engagement of the more socially and economically powerful Disney Corporation. This peaceful act of resistance to persistent worldwide dissemination of harmful stereotype images of native savagery is significant. Such images have historically been used to justify enslavement, and profit maximization, and have resulted in generations of youths ashamed of their cultural heritage. Protesters sought to prevent further exploitation and

144 Taken from Garifuna Culture and Language Academy GOALS, goal #2 and #4, n.d. obtained via personal communication with Cheryl Noralez, dated June 1, 2010.
save current and future generations from similar fate. Other international objections were lodged to Disney executives by Chief Charles Williams of the Carib community in Dominica, Chief Ricardo Bharath of the Carib community at Arima in Trinidad, and Michael Polonio, President of the National Garifuna Council of Belize representing Kalinagu descendants in diaspora.

As a means to meeting its educational and community intended outcomes, the Garifuna American Heritage Foundation United, Inc. has, over the years, also organized five international community forums, three in Los Angeles and two in New York City. I attended both the 2007 and 2008 forums in New York which, like their counterparts on the west coast, featured university professors from across the country; local, national and international Garifuna community elders, leaders, and political aspirants and activists, a host of folk performing groups from cities that spanned the U.S., families and children. In 2007, Garifuna recording artists from varying us cities were recognized with commendations from the great state of New York, and in the 2008 forum participants were encouraged to recognize the importance of participating in the upcoming 2010 U.S. Census.


Later in 2007, GAHFU hosted a fundraiser in Los Angeles to benefit the NGC's Gulisi School in Dangriga. The month long fundraising effort opened with a concert that featured Garifuna performing artist Andy Palacio and the Garifuna Collective.\textsuperscript{148}

Weekly, GAHFU offers Garifuna classes at The Blazer Learning Center in Los Angeles. The Garifuna Culture & Language Academy is partly funded by a grant from The Alliance for California Traditional Arts. Garifuna language classes are streamed and video archived online at such Garifuna internet sites as Garinet.com, Labuga.com and the GAHFU website as well as their channel on youtube. Both long-time residents and occasional instructors from Central America provide instruction. Language is not the only educational offering at the academy. Drumming classes also run weekly, songs are taught and traditional dances are learned and practiced there. Recently, GAHFU sponsored a Spirituality workshop featuring buyeinu [plural of singular buyei] from varying diasporic Garifuna communities and contributes yearly to the annual celebration of November 19\textsuperscript{th} in California though such events are led by two differing settlement day associations.

GAHFU has recently initiated programming around November 26\textsuperscript{th}, Guatemalan Garinagu's celebration day, as a support to and in keeping with Garifuna unity across national differences.\textsuperscript{149}

\textit{Garifuna Coalition USA, Inc. in New York City}

Founded in 1998, The Garifuna Coalition USA, Inc. is a nonprofit, nonpartisan, 501(c) (3) tax-exempt organization in New York City. The Coalition serves as a resource, 

\hspace{1cm}
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a forum, advocate group for Garinagu and an ally to other Garifuna entities and organizations as they promote a unified Garifuna community. In 2007, I learned of the Coalition when they began campaigning to co-name Dawson Street, between Longwood and Intervale avenues in the South Bronx, known as Waporu (ship) in Garifuna, in honor of Garifuna Chief of Chiefs Joseph Chatoyer, and to claim the space for the estimated 100,000 Garifuna residents of the Bronx --- many of whom frequent the park situated there with family and friends for informal weekend gatherings or the annual Punta Rock Festival.\(^{150}\) In May of that year, I drove down to my old neighborhood in the South Bronx to attend the community board meeting where the proposed co-naming was up for discussion, and met with Thomas Avila and Jerry Castro, leaders of the Coalition.

In 2009, the Coalition opened the Garifuna Advocacy Center, which works in collaboration with the Phipps Community Development Corporation, a 35-year-old multi-service provider of educational, vocational and community development programs. The coalition also spearheaded the Vincy Homecoming, July 18 – 23, 2009, in which Garinagu in diaspora returned to Yurumein/ St. Vincent and established a Memorandum of Understanding laying out future intentions for cooperation in the promotion of:

"Garifuna Heritage and Culture in all parts of the Garifuna Diaspora and that we will seek

\(^{149}\) Personal communication with Cheryl Noralez, CEO and Founder, GAHFU, Inc. September, 2010.

\(^{150}\) *Request of Support for Co-naming of Dawson Street in honor of Joseph Chatoyer: A Turning Point for Our City and Garifunas have a Key Role to Play*, Submitted to Bronx Community Board # 2 – Economic Development/Municipal Services Committee by Garifuna Coalition USA, Inc., June 18th, 2007 http://garifunacoalition.org/yahoo_site_admin/assets/docs/GC_StName.358130328.pdf. [Accessed August 1, 2010].
to work together with all our indigenous brothers and sisters."\textsuperscript{151} Earlier this year, I attended the Coalition sponsored International Garifuna Awards Night, which was part of their Garifuna Heritage Month activities. The month opened with the issuance of a proclamation of March 11\textsuperscript{th} – April 12\textsuperscript{th} as Garifuna Heritage Month in the Borough of the Bronx by Ruben Diaz, Jr., the Bronx Borough President. Additionally, Garifuna elders and community leaders from throughout the diaspora were recognized for their stalwart efforts at cultural survival at an awards event held at the City University of New York’s Hostos Community College. Mr. Roy Cayetano of Belize, Ms. Kensy Sambola of Nicaragua, and Mr. David Williams of St. Vincent/\textit{Yurumein} were amongst the international delegation of activist awardees.

In an article charting Garifuna cultural resurgence successes inclusive of community summits, punta rock music, printed and online Garifuna dictionaries and language classes on both the US West Coast and East Coast (offered by organizations GAFU, Inc. and Casa \textit{Yurumein} respectively), Jose Francisco Avila, the Executive Director of the Garifuna Coalition USA, Inc. indicates that the Garifuna culture will not only survive but prosper thru self respect, unity and collective responsibility guided by a globally informed posture and leadership:

\begin{quote}
It is now our collective responsibility to put the pieces of ourselves back together. We must help resurrect the Garifuna culture in the image of its past glory by reclaiming our history for the sake of our future. It is our responsibility to work to reassemble Chatoyer’s people…
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
It is time for us to center ourselves in our own self-definition rather than allow ourselves to be defined by others whose self-interest is different from, and often diametrically opposed to, our
\end{quote}

own. Most importantly, we must define ourselves within a global context rather than in the narrow confines of our scattered nationalities.

Doing so requires neither imagination nor myth making, as our detractors contend. It requires only an accurate awareness of our natural ties, in spite of efforts to destroy them, with Yurumein and with other people of Garifuna descent… Although we still suffer from problems that are logical results of a history of oppression, we have indeed proved our ability not only to participate, but also to become outstanding leaders in many areas of society as demonstrated by the likes of Dr. Cadrin Gill, Pat Frazier, and Cornelius Sam, from St Vincent; Joseph Palacio, Norman Chavez, and Roy Cayetano, from Belize; Guillermina Guity, Jorge Bernardez, and Salvador Suazo; from Honduras; Carlos Gamboa, Josefina Gregorio, and Gerardo Ellington, from Guatemala and Francisco Sambola, from Nicaragua.

But it would be foolish for us to enter the twenty first century with a twentieth century world view, concerned only with being citizens of our respective countries. For the twenty first century, we must be prepared to define ourselves in the most global manner possible as Garinagu. And as citizens of the planet, we must assume the logical role to which our own history not someone else's, clearly assigns us.152

His words offer similar key elements contained in Garifunaduáü and extends them beyond national boundaries. As such, Mr. Avila indicates that the actions and attitudes needed to reconstitute Chatoyer's descendants, wherever they may be, will also contribute to the alleviation of contemporary social problems facing Garinagu, as well as larger societies in which they participate, and to which they make positive civic contributions.

**AfriGarifuna Ensemble of New York City**

I indicated elsewhere while discussing the achievements of the NGC that Garifuna from the diaspora were brought back home to conduct workshops on music, song, dance, and dramatic interpretations for youth of Belize. At the programs conclusion the participating young people performed at Belize, Dangriga and Punta Gorda. I was able to speak with Mr. James Lovell at a practice session of his youth group, the AfriGarifuna

---

Youth Ensemble in New York. James Lovell is an accomplished Garifuna recording artist, NY City schoolteacher, and founder/director of the Ensemble. The following text comes from a dialogue we had regarding the importance of folk/performing groups. The following excerpt is taken from my fieldnotes dated Saturday, January 6, 2007 and occurred at the Biko Transformation Center which serves the East Bushwick section of Brooklyn, New York; a poor, underserved inner-city environment. There were ten to twelve children, few more boys than girls, in this session. They ranged in age from five to twelve. On this cold winter afternoon, Lovell shared that the:

AfriGarifuna Youth Ensemble is a sanctuary for Garifuna Americans… they are born here [in the US] but they are Garifuna first. Ilagule [Roots, his former youth group] and the Ensemble allows [our] youth to mingle with their own [and] learn their roots.. it's a survival technique that helps us to maintain our culture resisting assimilation [and] acculturation… it’s a survival mechanism… we are defining who we are. We procure culture. [We are] not [here to] just entertain people… but fundraise. If the kids learn to be professional they can earn money. So this has multiple benefits; entertaining, educational and economic. We are using what we have so that we do not have to be out there gi/me gi/me. Organizing the kids is a means to a livelihood; a way to escape poverty.

In this excerpt, Lovell expresses that his folk/performance group offers children the opportunity to learn of their Garifuna history and culture in the context of American inner city poverty. He asserts that maintaining Garifuna culture via the folk/performing groups is a form of resistance to assimilating forces that encourage cultural loss. His awareness is informed by his role as a New York City public school music teacher. The curriculum he teaches is guided by city and state guidelines that omit the many subcultures represented by the students that sit in his classes and others like them across the city. Minority groups and women are often excluded from curriculums in an effort to provide students across the city with a standard education. So as per Lovell, the folk/performing group is another layer of education, making it more than just entertainment as children learn about their ethnic and cultural history, traditions and values. As a child growing up
in Belize, Lovell did not learn of his own Garifuna culture in the classroom. The youth in the Ensemble learn traditionally based Garifuna songs but also learn to play instruments such as the keyboard, guitar, and bass guitar alongside the Garifuna drums. Participants also learn to read music. These are skills that, if mastered, can be a means to generate incomes to purchase schoolbooks, winter clothes, etc., which will allow them to participate in society respectably, with self worth, pride, and on their own terms. This will prevent them from being people who wait around for handouts, or beg (referring to *gi’me, gi’me*). With the professionalism that comes with self discipline, practice, and proper mentoring these youth can use Garifuna music forms to alleviate or escape the poverty that they see and endure every day without assimilating out living bi-culturally by achieving socio-economic success via their culture, not in spite of it.

Mr. Lovell and his group of young singers are a staple at the annual Garifuna Mass in New York that is part of the commemoration of the Nov 19th Garifuna Settlement Day celebration. His efforts at cultural preservation within the metropolitan New York area were captured in a New York Times article and a video clip with him and the children practicing at the Transformation Center was posted on the newspaper's accompanying website of April 29, 2010.153

**Wagucha Garifuna and Wagiya Uganu in Boston**

Garinagu residents in the City of Boston, Massachusetts, also demonstrate the importance they place on the Garifuna way and its additional role in navigating homogenizing societal structures. In the Boston, *Wagiya Uganu* (Our News) television
program first aired in 1996 and ran for over six years on the Boston Neighborhood Network (BNN). Producers Omar Suazo and his wife Sendy used BNN's television studios, multimedia labs and other production resources available to Bostonians to create a non-commercialized Garifuna language, music, and news program that celebrates and perpetuates Garifuna culture. The program was available citywide to over two-thirds of Boston's households. The duo also hosted a Garifuna Radio program *Lumalali Garifuna*, on 1600 AM radio which served as co-sponsor for the radio show's annual Punta Explosion in Dorchester and provided listeners a trilingual listening experience that included Garifuna, Spanish and English music and community news.

Omar "Baba Kle" Suazo informally founded the *Wagucha* [Our roots, Our lineage] Garifuna Folklore Group in 1995 to educate Garifuna people about their own cultural history and to offer Garifuna cultural representation to the city. The group had solidified by 1997 and by that time had expanded to teaching Garifuna dance, songs, crafts and language. In 1998, Cultural Survival (CS) collaborated with *Wagucha* to introduce a three day Garifuna curriculum into local area high school language programs as a part of CS’s reclaiming native education initiative. I have been a proud member of *Wagucha* since 1998. Over the years, we have had the honor of presenting Garifuna history, song music and dance at the Cambridge Caribbean Carnival and many Northeast and New England colleges, including my own, from the Garifuna perspective, and guided by aspects of the

---
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Garifuna way. My father and brother joined us in presentations at the University at Albany and again at nearby College of St. Rose in 1998, providing a cultural space for family and friends when visiting and also assisting in educating college students about diversity and multiculturalism.\footnote{See also “Tribu Garifuna Viene a Wheaton,” \textit{Wheaton Wire}, Arts & Culture Section, November 1, 2006 as it pertains to a \textit{Wagucha} presentation we made at Wheaton College as part of Latino Heritage Month. http://media.www.thewheatonwire.com/media/storage/paper1134/news/2006/11/01/ArtsCulture/Tribu.Garifuna.Viene.A.Wheaton-2435822.shtml#5 [Accessed July 23, 2010].} An internationally traveled punta rock artist,\footnote{See Wagucha Garifuna website http://www.usdirectory.com/sl/49336454/press.htm?wr=1 [Accessed July 18, 2010].} \textit{Baba Kle} accompanied me on a return field trip to Nicaragua, in 2008, to learn more of and contribute to the cultural rescue process there. He has since then returned to Honduras to take up leadership in his hometown. As village “Presidente Patronato,” Suazo works closely and intently with community elders and residents on cultural matters and collaborates with government structures to identify avenues through which to alleviate social and economic concerns, including drugs, unemployment, child prostitution, and protection from land usurpation by outside commercial interests in defense of the Garifuna culture.\footnote{See also, Gari-TV interview with Omar Suazo on garinet.com at http://translate.google.com/translate?hl=en&sl=es&u=http://www.garitv.com/main.php%3Faction%3Dplay%26file%3Dgarifuna_edicion_baba_cle_1946511202.flv%26item_id%3D963%26module%3Dvideo_management%26name%3DEntrevista%2Bcon%2Bel%2BPresidente%2Bdel%2BPatronato%2BSambo%2BCreek%26node%3Dvideo_front%26start%23D21&ei=s2JcTJ23LozUtQPcj_zjDw&sa=X&oi=translate&ct=result&resnum=3&ved=0CCQQ7gEwAg&prev=/search%3Fq%3DPresidente%2BPatronato%2BSambo%2BCreek%26hl%3Den%26sa%3DG%26rls%3Dcom.microsoft:en-US [Accessed July 30, 2010].} I spoke with Suazo on July 18, 2010, at a Garifuna afternoon outdoor event at the Roxbury YMCA that involved a soccer game, Garifuna drumming, song and dance. He explained:

Kids are dealing up into drugs and underground prostitution types of behavior is growing. We want to create and promote jobs where people can work for earnings and for food to fix this. Taking care of our land is also important. People want to sell for money but we cannot sell it… people want to sell land for money but when the money is done they will remain without land and
left with nothing. Honduran government wants hydroelectric power and trying to work with different country to implement but this will bring sickness and lot of negative thing. They have been telling us we will give you this and do that for you, and [in the past] they never do. If they give us it's because there is something worst coming along with it. They will limit off areas with armed guards so we can't go there any longer, to that place. They give us job for short term… we need long term.

In asking about the importance of his efforts and those of his colleagues in the work for cultural survival Suazo responded:

When they [outside sources] give money… people [local leaders] spend it. $1000.00 for example goes to the town but really only one person benefits. $1000.00 worth of books come into town, someone is going to read and learn from them… I prefer the books. This is what I can do to help. Its time our community learn that money isn't everything. We need to learn to come back to how we used to be… we used to be a family. If I have something and you don't you can use mine. I share a plate of food with you if that's all I have. Now we [are] not family anymore. I prefer throw away from my food if I don't use it all than to give it to you.

We need it because all this is culture… and outside stuff coming in to try stop it. Kids are talking mostly in Spanish… you come to Sambo from Belize and talk to them in Garifuna and they answering in Spanish…. This is not Garifuna… parents need to speak more Garifuna with them… When we come out [move beyond the village] and we have something to say and don't want people to know, what we do? We speak in Garifuna, and nobody understands what we saying… development is coming [in] but we have to concentrate our kids in our culture.

The school is teaching in Garifuna now. They have classes and the kids have to take it and they have to pass it like other class. When I was little they never do that… they say "you don't need Garifuna" in school.

We are trying to give a consciousness to the people who come out [emigrate] also. We need them to come back and give back using what they learned from outside. That is what I am trying to do in coming back and involving myself in these things.

Omar spoke more of this family way when reflecting on his experiences amongst the Garifuna in Nicaragua which he captured in a song Ayo Ayo ("Goodbye"). He explained that though the people there have changed culturally and particularly in the loss of language, "we see how the Garifuna were before, you can recognize them as Garifuna because they still do some of what we used to do in the past. So nagiribuduba (I will return [to Nicaragua]), they treated me good, like a family."
Omar and his wife, Sendy, continue to work collaboratively to keep the culture alive by way of collaborating with local Boston organizations that have wide reaching resources that can aid in the cultural survival of Garinagu in Boston as well as in Honduras. They have been offering weekly Garifuna dance classes at the Roxbury YMCA over the past year. This collaboration contributes significantly to creating awareness but also to developing a culturally validating space, as did the television and radio show in years prior, for the Garinagu of Boston.159
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