

2002

Performing Multiple Identities: Guillermo Gómez-Peña and His Dangerous Border Crossings

Juan Velasco

Santa Clara University, j1velasco@scu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarcommons.scu.edu/engl>

Part of the [English Language and Literature Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Velasco, J. (2002). Performing Multiple Identities: Guillermo Gómez-Peña and His Dangerous Border Crossings. In M. Habell-Pallán & M. Romero (Eds.), *Latino/a Popular Culture*. NYU Press.

Copyright © 2002 NYU Press. Reprinted with permission.

This Book Chapter is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Arts & Sciences at Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in English by an authorized administrator of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact rscroggin@scu.edu.

Performing Multiple Identities

Guillermo Gómez-Peña and His "Dangerous Border Crossings"

Juan Velasco

GUILLERMO GÓMEZ-PEÑA is one of the few Mexican performance artists who, since he came to the United States in 1978, has been able to create and explore the merging of visual language and text in the complexities of cross-cultural identities through controversial issues. Labeled by some as one of the most significant performance artists of the late twentieth century, he uses multiple media: video, performance, installation art, and bilingual poetry. In his "Performance Diaries" he explains the process of performance in his work as "a vast conceptual territory where my eclectic and ever-changing ideas and the ideas of my collaborators can be integrated into a coherent system and be put into practice. It's radical theory turned into praxis through movement, ritual, gesture, sound, light and spoken text" (Gómez-Peña 2000, 7).

His writings, like his performance work, point toward the dangers of commodification of indigenous and Latina/o identities into easily consumed pop culture products, and interrogate the redeeming potential of the poetics of hybridization in a world increasingly dominated by globalization. His best-known books include *Warrior for Gringostroika* (1993a), *The New World Border* (1996b), *Friendly Cannibals* (1996a), *Temple of Confessions* (Gómez-Peña and Sifuentes, 1997), and *Dangerous Border Crossers* (2000). Gómez-Peña's performance work has moved the term "border art" to the center, simultaneously exploring the complexities of the rich cultural and ethnic past of Latinas/os in the United States.

I will give special attention to the 1992 performance piece *Two Undiscovered Amerindians Visit . . .*, which became the video documentary (directed by Coco Fusco and Paula Heredia) *The Couple in the Cage* (1993), the performance and video documentary *Border Brujo* (1988, 1990), and his last book, *Dangerous Border Crossers* (2000). It is in these works that Gómez-Peña is able to link the very complex issues that make him controversial, going as far back as the colonial past when the notion of "Indian" was created as an empty signifier, a symbol of Otherness ready to be used for the Europeans' colonial ambitions, and fueled by the early development of capitalism. But the particularities of the performance work shape also the reenactments of the "modern" Other: "the dangerous border crossers." I will address Gómez-Peña's acts of interrogating the *mestizo's* otherness, the challenge to reflect on its multiple conditions, and its relationship with the indigenous past, especially through the more modern theoretical discourse of Xicanisma.

The Couple in the Cage, created in collaboration with Cuban American performance artist Coco Fusco, goes beyond criticism of the Quincentennial celebration of Columbus's voyage. Their successful tour through Europe and the United States translates the performance piece into "a critical intervention into the repertoire of displays and representations of 'the authentic Other'" (Kelly 1999, 125). Furthermore, Gómez-Peña and Fusco use the "Indian" as a beginning notion, a term that since the mid-sixteenth century is created as part of the discourse on the Other and the subsequent legitimization of its exploitation. More specifically, the performance piece is exposing the notion of "Indian" as linked to a "new world order."¹

As part of these critical interventions of the past, *Border Brujo* addresses the new Other of the modern world: the border crossers, the presence of Latina/o culture and its physical bodies as perceived by the imperialist gaze of the United States. If the film *The Couple in the Cage* interrogates indigenous identities today, *Border Brujo* addresses some of the complexities of the term "Latina/o," its multiplicity, and the possibilities of further creation of identities surrounding the term "Indian."

Two main issues arise in the discussion of the performance works as they relate to the narrative strategies employed by Gómez-Peña and Fusco: Gómez-Peña and Fusco's impulse to interrogate how identity is constructed, performed, and commodified in visual and written culture; and their examination of the indigenous and the Latina/o subjects

today as well as the dangers of erasure and recolonization implicit in some of its most recent projects of cultural representation.

THE INDIAN IN THE CAGE

Two Amerindians reminds us of the apocalyptic nightmare envisioned by Adorno when confronted with the prevalent rise of popular culture and the end of the modernist utopia. Guillermo Gómez-Peña and Coco Fusco take us to a world where the audiences' isolated consumerism of images and products cannot distinguish between artificial and real images of modern "Indians," especially when they are being transformed into spectacle and reduced to a cage. This move is a devastating critique of imperialism as the initial performance takes place in 1992, in Columbus Plaza, downtown Madrid. This is at its best a very significant year and area of Madrid, since it has been invested in the colonial imagination with a meaning assigned to its unique use of space. Looking from the Biblioteca Nacional (the National Library), the plaza is strategically situated. It is at the crossroads of two of the main arteries of downtown Madrid: Calle Serrano and Calle Colón. On the left side, walking from the library, you can see a statue of Columbus suspended in the air, so high you will almost miss it. On the right side of the plaza, gigantic monoliths of reddish stone with inscribed pre-Columbian symbols appear as América. Their presence is overpowering, but also alien to the European architecture that surrounds the plaza: Europe and pre-Columbian America, air and earth. If there was ever an intention of balance, their dialogue seems too strenuous, artificial, and difficult to situate. The meaning of the plaza escapes most walkers.

In 1992 Guillermo Gómez-Peña and his collaborator, Coco Fusco, crafted a performance, *Two Amerindians*, which was looking to bring new attention and meaning to this plaza in Spain. *The Couple in the Cage* constructs the "Indio" as a hybrid being; the elements of the performance emphasize and resemble the format of a turn-of-the-century freak show.

Presenting themselves as caged natives, as aboriginal inhabitants of an imaginary island in the Gulf of México, the performance artists reverse "traditional" tasks assigned to an "Indian" identity. In fact, the performance shows how Indian identity has been exploited, commodi-

fied, and exhibited over the last five hundred years throughout Europe and the United States. As explained in *Warrior for Gringostroika*,

Coco Fusco and Gómez-Peña lived for three days in a golden cage at Columbus Plaza in Madrid as "Amerindians from the (fictional) island of Guatinaui." They were taken to the bathroom on leashes and handed through the bars. Audience members could ask for "an authentic dance," a "story in Guatinaui," or a Polaroid. This piece was also performed at Covent Gardens, London; the Walker Art Center, Minneapolis; the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.; the Museum of Natural History, Sydney, Australia; the Field Museum, Chicago; the Whitney Museum of American Art, New York; and at other locations. (Gómez-Peña 1993a, 137)

Audiences all over the world contemplate the performers watching television, using the computer, or dancing, and "this performance piece staged the two in an ironic, reflexive gesture to the still widespread allure of native authenticity" (Kelly 1999, 114). The role of the audience becomes especially revealing since the "drama" of colonization is restaged in this encounter. The audience of modern times becomes part of the performance as they reproduce the role of the spectators in museums, circuses, world's fairs, and freak shows in Europe and the United States during the colonial and postcolonial periods: "The drama of discovery and display of native bodies—then and now—serves various functions. The indigenous bodies perform as a 'truth' factor; they 'prove' the material facticity of an 'other'" (Taylor 1998, 163).

As Indian identity becomes the physical embodiment of the Other, the scenarios envisioned by the colonizers become also part of a theatrical narrative that reveals how social, political, and racial hierarchies are justified. Moreover, both Fusco and Gómez-Peña disclose in this work the performative nature of identity, the "theatricality" of the encounters with different colonial powers, and "the aesthetic, political, and perspectival structures within which the characters are positioned and perform their prescribed roles" (Taylor 1998, 165).

To the film audience (to us), *The Couple in the Cage* is a metaphor to describe the Europeans' and Americans' inability to deal with the Indian's "difference." To the audience of the performance the Indians in the cage resemble the puzzling encounter with the Other because they do not know they are the audience, and they are unaware it is a

performance. The voice of the narrator in the film speculates about the Western attempts to categorize and define the "differences" observed by Europeans and Americans as they analyze the native bodies, and how these attempts are conceptually mapping modern discourses on race.

Colonial discourse, created as an undeniable binary of "fixed" oppositional cultural identities, justifies the exploitation of the colonized, but it also reassures the cultural apparatus ultimately destined to maintain the superiority of the colonizers. As this radical separation is established, at least at the beginning, in the colonizers' mind the "Indio" is the savage, the inhabitant of a myth, and becomes a part of the discourse of the invention of America. And as such it develops as an empty signifier, a conceptual space ready to be employed as discourse on the legitimization of exploitation.

The Couple in the Cage then interrogates further the notion of "Native" as defined by colonial narratives, its moral integrity, and the modern responses of the audience to the contemporary dimensions of its definition. In doing this, Fusco and Gómez-Peña's theatrical "discovery" of the native bodies is also addressing the realm of cultural identity, and especially its performative nature. Showing caged natives as a legitimate spectacle in the twentieth century, and in the most "civilized" cities around the world, takes us also into the realm of the present-day notion of the "Indio." As I see it, Fusco and Gómez-Peña show us that in 1992, as in 1492, the Subject is still unable to understand indigenous nations as separate (from the Subject) cultural and social entities. In fact, this performance turns the ironic gaze inward, as we understand in this context that the notion of the "Indio," as the product of a colonial intervention (it takes the form of a nightmare or a dream), is still the result of a drastic separation between colonizers and colonized.

For Fusco and Gómez-Peña, the politics of identity should be translated and understood within the colonial context in which they were created. Thus, for the colonizers, law and order depend on the practices that reinforce this difference. For the colonized, survival depends on not recognizing this discourse, and the formation and continuation of their identity need to be understood in the context of an increasing fluidity and diversification that allow multiple forms of resistance. In physically reenacting this, Gómez-Peña and Fusco's notion of "performance of identity" very closely resembles the practices of agency and social identity exercised by indigenous groups. I see an identification between

their work's continuous reenactments, its fluidity and positionality, and the practical reality of the creation of an "indigenous" consciousness since the colonial period.

THE PUEBLO'S MANY PRACTICES OF IDENTITY

What seemed from the point of view of imperial discourse a binary opposition becomes in the reality of the colonized a negotiated and interdependent practice, as illustrated by the formation of Pueblan identity after the Pueblo Revolt of 1680. This historical moment is crucial for the creation of an "indigenous" consciousness because it validates the indigenous claims to resist the invaders and the ability to redefine the patterns of construction of the Indians' multiple identities (Jemez, Hopi, Taos, and so on).

The 1680 revolt, then, is significant for two reasons: mainly because it is the first triumphant indigenous sedition within the modern territory of the United States, but also because it created a precedent for "indigenous" practices of resistance. Though Popé was considered by many the leader of the revolt, the actions were carefully planned between decentralized communities.

Cooperation and defiance resulted in the first Indian war of independence. For twelve years, Pueblans' freedom and autonomy also reinforced linguistic and cultural differences between nations. Yet the period was critical for the survival of their unified identity since it created the boundaries between "Hispanic" and "Pueblan" consciousness, between accommodation and resistance.

As the new situation developed, the multiple choices made by the different nations indicated that the boundaries were also flexible within the Pueblan community. In 1691 some representatives were petitioning for a Spanish return; others embraced a more syncretic Kiva religious practice (Sando 1991, 69). The "negotiated" Pueblan identity allowed them to re-create an energetic but flexible response to European aggression.

Identity became then a blueprint that was testing the limits of the impossible, given the new colonial situation, and the available forms of resistance. As such, the response to the new situation is always in transition and refuses to be defined within the boundaries of the colonial binary structure of identity. The performative nature of the process of

deterritorialization of identity is understood and assigned different meanings depending on the historical actors (Gutiérrez 1991, 69). Looking at the agreements of 1706, Joe Sando reports that to what colonial forces considered a pact, some of the indigenous nations responded with the celebration of victory dances (1991, 80).

As the Pueblans were in the process of resisting the invasion, they also entered the process of reinventing and modeling multiple forms of identity that changed according to the different needs of the communities. Pueblan events of 1680 show the resistance to the invasion but also the flexibility and mobility by which the different nations viewed themselves. What is certain is that they never allied themselves with the dichotomy posited by the colonial's discourse of the Other, and Pueblan identity sought to challenge the advance of Western colonial ambitions with the display of its fixed binary notion of identity.

Fusco and Gómez-Peña's engagement in a counterhegemonic redeployment of norms in clearly significative ways shows us the changing notions of cultural identity and "the popular," and the strategies by which contemporary colonized groups can subvert the binary established by colonial powers. In this context I see Fusco and Gómez-Peña's notion of "performance of identity" as a crucial one. The notion of performance of identities in their work exposes the many layers by which we produce "the 'savage' body, and it historicized the practice by highlighting its citational character" (Taylor 1998, 5). Gómez-Peña's work is increasingly ambitious as his process of destabilizing meanings addresses also the *mestizo* experience, especially through *Border Brujo* and *Dangerous Border Crossers*.

BORDER BRUJO: INTERROGATING MESTIZO'S OTHERNESS

The same way *The Couple* exposes the discourse of exploitation and simultaneously interrogates indigenous identities, *Border Brujo* also interrogates and exposes the prejudice exercised on the "modern" Other:

the so called "Border Crossers." *Border Brujo* is a performance piece that shows the multiple experiences and forms of Latina/o identity. As expressed in *Warrior for Gringostroika*, *Border Brujo* is a ritual, linguistics-

tic, and performative journey across the United States/México border. . . . *Border Brujo* puts a mirror between the two countries and then breaks it in front of the audience. (Gómez-Peña 1993a, 75)

We should see these works as complementary since they interrogate two of the most significant cultural signs in terms of the representation of the Latina/o experience: the "Indian" and the "border." The redeployment and simultaneous disruption of their liberatory potential beyond the binary "cage" make these pieces (both performances and textual narratives) some of the most relevant artistic contributions to discussions on representation and identity.

Simultaneously, the development of the notion of "borderlands" not only displaces notions of "border" connected to fixed constructions of sexuality and race, but also brings into the center of the American unconscious the cultural and biological hybrid. As stated by Claire F. Fox, "Gómez-Peña transforms himself into fifteen different personas to exorcize the demons of dominant cultures. In English, Spanish, Spanglish, Inglenol and Náhuatl-bicameral" (1996, 232).

The metaphorical power of the crossing of geographical, spiritual, cultural, and sexual borders is clearly demonstrated by Gloria Anzaldúa's autobiography, *Borderlands/La Frontera* (1987). For Anzaldúa's narrative, the border is the central element in the process of self-configuration of her identity. In fact, Anzaldúa rewrites the territory of the border as multidimensional and uses the different levels of her experience to reflect and explore its ideological layers. Anzaldúa's *Borderlands/La Frontera* not only redefines the space of the Borderland as a more inclusive utopia, but also reinvents a different hero, the new *mestiza*:

That focal point or fulcrum, that juncture where the mestiza stands, is where phenomena tend to collide. It is where the possibility of uniting all that is separate occurs. . . . In attempting to work out a synthesis, the self has added a third element which is greater than the sum of its severed parts. That third element is a new consciousness—a mestiza consciousness. (79)

In comparing both works and their reconstruction of the border trope, we see that what is truly remarkable is their unwillingness to

sustain the notion of "place" as the embodiment of cohesive and unified experiences of culture. Anzaldúa recuperates the border trope as a space in which experience (as opposed to the "frontier," the site of separation) can transcend individual "difference" to be reconstructed as a site of collective practice. The performance *Border Brujo* embodies and complements Anzaldúa's articulation of a new notion of "border" based on theories of syncretism and *mestizaje*. In both works, the artist assumes whiteness as a basis for "American" identity, and includes their cultural production within the Latin American tradition of *mestizaje* for empowerment and resistance.

The difference between both projects, though, should be attributed to the nature of the "heroes" who inhabit these borderlands. Following the Latin American tradition established by José Vasconcelos (in his analysis of America's heterogeneous cultural roots as essential characteristics of Latin American culture), Anzaldúa (1987) argues in "Towards a New Consciousness" that "From this racial, ideological, cultural and biological cross-pollinization, an 'alien' consciousness is presently in the making—a new 'mestiza' consciousness" (77). The *brujo* created in *Border Brujo*, on the other hand, seems uneasy about taking a role once it has taken over the space of the border. According to Claire F. Fox,

The Brujo incarnates a mosaic of parodic characters including a *mojado*, a *cholo*, a Texas redneck, and a transvestite, who are differentiated from one another by variations in costume, body movement, and speech. The idea of alternation among personae, spaces, and languages is in fact so integral to the performance that it raises the issue whether Gómez-Peña would really like to see borders eliminated, or whether his work is indeed dependent upon borders to uphold the oppositions that he critiques. (1996, 233)

I would argue that the performative value of both his sole-authored and collaborative work is to destabilize the very specific idea of creating a new identity. In the light of *The Couple*, the performance becomes a rewritten space that underlines identity as a continual interrogation, rejecting all types of monolithic or fixed thought by dissolving its multiple meanings. Borrowing Garcia Canclini's 1995 critique of a depoliticized notion of hybrid cultures, Gómez-Peña seems skeptical of *Border Brujo* as a positive model of cultural hybridity, especially in the context

of American culture and politics, "precisely because its elasticity and open nature . . . can be appropriated by anyone to mean practically anything" (Gómez-Peña 1993b, 62).

It is his positionality as a "dangerous border crosser" that characterizes the *brujo's* multiple Latina/o identities. The performance emphasizes the need constantly to reterritorialize the space, and calls for a constant interrogation of the conventional disguises of identity.

The performative value of these projects and the project's experimentation with new notions of identity should also be framed as the avant-garde of new works that examine *mestizo*-indigenous relationships. Among others, cultural critics had worried that the discourse of multiculturalism, as a progressive reappropriation of *mestizaje* by official discourse (under the new "multiracial" category), displaces the fluidity of Latina/o identities, eliminating the racial difference on which social justice is based.

Gómez-Peña's reconstruction of the border and its consecutive emphasis of Amerindian culture carries forward not only the importance of decentering privileged Eurocentric assumptions about nation and identity, but also the need to initiate the conditions for a critical form of Latina/o performativity that alternates between sincerity and subversion, irony and compliance. Gómez-Peña is not alone in this project, as other Latina/o cultural critics in the last few years have responded to the progressive reappropriation of the discourse of hybridity by the state with the notion of Xicanisma: a call for a return to the Amerindian roots of most Latinos as well as a call for a strategic alliance to give agency to Native American groups.

Roberto Rodríguez's *X in La Raza* (1996) includes three chapters: "Who Declared War on the Word 'Chicano'?" "The Missing X in the Treaty of Guadalupe," and "The X in Xicano." In "A Continuation of Indian Removal," Rodríguez states that "Mexicanos—independent of the statistical and ideological manipulations of burrocrats—are Indians" (40). Implicit in the "X" of more recent configurations of "Xicano" and "Xicanisma" is a criticism not only of the term "Hispanic" but of the racial poetics of the "multiracial" within Mexican and American culture.

As the United States progressively reappropriates the multiracial (or *mestizo*) identity as part of the "popular," the multiracial-multicultural discourse is no longer Eurocentric. In many ways, *The Couple* and *Border Brujo* ally themselves with the new Xicanistas.

In "The 'X' in Race and Gender," I argued that if we compare racial theories of "Mexicanness" from classics such as José Vasconcelos and Alfonso Reyes to the recast of the ethnic self produced by contemporary Xicano texts in the United States, we find a new emphasis on the "X" as signifier of race (1996, 221). While for Reyes and Vasconcelos the project for racial and cultural *mestizaje* would fully develop the construction of a homogeneous, *mestizo* national identity, for the Xicanistas, Reyes and Vasconcelos's project becomes a theoretical and integrationist mechanism formulated to negate the "Indian" through conformity and nationalism.² For these new Xicanistas, the "X" is associated not with the politics of *mestizaje* but with the recuperation of the racial and cultural Indian self: "'X' could have the same value to Raza as it does to African Americans—representing the indigenous names, the language and our history that was taken from us" (Rodríguez 1996, 86).

Likewise I would like to emphasize the role of the indigenous figure in Ana Castillo's *Massacre of the Dreamers: Essays on Xicanisma* (1994). While avoiding the elitist theories of Me(x)icanness developed by Vasconcelos, this literature redefines the "X" as the signifier of race in a significant way. In *Massacre of the Dreamers* Castillo states that the core of her Latina identity is found when "I stand firm that I am that Mexic Amerindian woman's consciousness" (17). Furthermore, Castillo uses the metaphor of the *tapiz* to further develop her concept of "Mexic Amerindian woman" and Xicanisma. The "X" of what Castillo calls the "conscienticized poetics" of the Xicanista corresponds with a new notion of color and identity that involves a revision of theories of *mestizaje* to reevaluate the Indian woman as the very core of the racial identity. In the same line, the work of Gómez-Peña calls for a more complex and situational *mestizo* subject.

Returning to the performance *The Couple in the Cage*, I would argue that the title more accurately refers to the dichotomy that the two symbols of the Columbus Plaza in Madrid are trying to encapsulate. The small statue of Columbus suspended in the air as symbol of the Subject and the heavier, gigantic, pre-Columbian rocks on the plaza as a symbol of the Other have become the couple that have been condemned to constantly redefine each other since 1492, trapped in the cage set up by colonial ambitions. Fusco and Gómez-Peña's performance piece also aims at escaping the binary structure provided by colonial discourse in recasting cultural and racial differences of *mestizo* people in terms of positionality. The redefinition allows the audience to dismantle the notion

of the Other, to open a new space from which to claim the historicized experience of Latinas/os from a position of "border crossing," and to act accordingly.

This rhetorical operation as applied to culture constitutes itself as a new subject within the paradigm of a dynamic and fluid identity in constant motion. The *brujo* (ultimately Gómez-Peña) becomes the representation of the "dangerous border crosser." Continued analysis of these performances together with the many books produced by Gómez-Peña offers multiple layers of complexity. The diverse meanings behind the notion of the Other in his work also seem to change as the context of the political circumstances changes. As his work becomes an invitation to keep questioning in the final and dangerous act of border crossing, I would ask if Fusco and Gómez-Peña are manipulating the image of the *Indio* in *The Couple in the Cage* in order to help them reconcile their own particular raw feelings of the *mestizo's* Otherness in Europe and the United States. Or perhaps they are looking at the "Indianness" of the performance in *indigenista* terms, using the signifier of colonial times to shock the audience, creating a chronicle of our collective responsibility for the erasure of the Indian in the present?

NOTES

1. Coco Fusco further explores this link in her performance collaboration with Nao Bustamante called "Stuff" (1997).
2. For some references to a critique of Chicanos' use of Indigenous images, see "An Open letter to Chicanas: On Power and Politics of Origin," by Hernández-Ávila (1992).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aldama, Frederick Luis. "The New Millennial Xicano: An Interview with Guillermo Gómez-Peña." *Xcp: Cross-Cultural Poetics* 5 (1999): 7-11.
- Anzaldúa, Gloria. *Borderlands/La Frontera*. San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books, 1987.
- Castillo, Ana. *Massacre of the Dreamers: Essays on Xicanisma*. New York: Plume/Penguin, 1994.
- Cohen, Sarah R. "Performing Identity in the Hard Nut: Stereotype, Modeling, and the Inventive Body." *Yale Journal of Criticism: Interpretation in the Humanities* 11, no. 2 (1998): 485-505.

- Fishman, Jenn. "Performing Identities: Female Cross-Dressing in She Ventures and He Wins." *Restoration: Studies in English Literary Culture, 1600–1700* 20, no. 1 (1996): 36–51.
- Fox, Claire F. "Mass Media, Site Specificity, and the U.S.–México Border: Guillermo Gómez-Peña's *Border Brujo* (1988, 1990)." In *The Ethnic Eye: Latino Media Arts*, ed. Chon Noriega. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996.
- Fusco, Coco, and Nao Bustamante. "Stuff." *Drama Review* 41, no. 4 (winter 1997): 63–82.
- García Canclini, Néstor. *Hybrid Cultures: Strategies for Entering and Leaving Modernity*. Trans. Christopher L. Chiappari and Silvia L. López. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1995.
- Gil-Gómez, Ellen M. *Performing La Mestiza: Textual Representations of Lesbians of Color and the Negotiation of Identities*. New York: Garland, 2000.
- Gómez-Peña, Guillermo. *Warrior for Gringostroika: Essays, Performance Texts, and Poetry*. St. Paul, MN: Graywolf, 1993a.
- . "The Free Art Agreement/El Tratado de Libre Cultura." *High Performance* 63 (fall 1993b): 58–63.
- . *Friendly Cannibals*. San Francisco: Artspace, 1996a.
- . *The New World Border: Prophecies, Poems, and Loqueras for the End of the Century*. San Francisco: City Lights, 1996b.
- . *Dangerous Border Crossers: The Artist Talks Back*. New York: Routledge, 2000.
- Gómez-Peña, Guillermo, and Roberto Sifuentes, eds. *Temple of Confessions: Mexican Beasts and Living Santos*. New York: powerHouse Cultural Entertainment, 1997.
- Gutiérrez, Ramón. *When Jesus Came, the Corn Mothers Went Away: Marriage, Sexuality, and Power in New Mexico, 1500–1846*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1991.
- Hernández-Ávila, Inés. "An Open Letter to Chicanas: On Power and Politics of Origin." In *Without Discovery: A Native Response to Columbus*, ed. Ray González. Seattle: Broken Moon Press, 1992.
- Johnson, Anna. "Guillermo Gómez-Peña and Coco Fusco." *Bomb* 42 (1993): 36–39.
- Joseph, May. "New Hybrid Identities: Performing Race Gender Nation Sexuality." *Women and Performance: A Journal of Feminist Theory* 7–8, no. 2 (1995): 14–15.
- Kelly, Mary Kate. "Performing the Other: A Consideration of Two Cages." *College Literature* 26, no. 1 (1999): 113–36.
- Limón, José. "Selena: Sexuality, Performance, and the Problematic of Hegemony." In *Reflexiones 1997: New Directions in Mexican American Studies*, ed. Neil Foley. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1997.

- Neustadt, Robert. "(Con)fusing Cultures: Guillermo Gómez-Peña and the Transgression of Borders." *Mattoid* 3217 (1998): 65-79.
- Rodríguez, Roberto. *X in La Raza*. Albuquerque: Roberto Rodríguez, 1996.
- Sando, Joe S. *Pueblo Nations: Eight Centuries of Pueblo Indian History*. Santa Fe: Clear Light, 1991.
- Taylor, Diana. "A Savage Performance: Guillermo Gómez-Peña and Coco Fusco's 'Couple in the Cage.'" *Drama Review: A Journal of Performance Studies* 42, no. 2 (1998): 5, 160-75.
- Vasconcelos, José. *La Raza Cosmica/The Cosmic Race*. Los Angeles: Centro de Publicaciones, Department of Chicano Studies, Los Angeles, California State University, 1979.
- Velasco, Juan. "The 'X' in Race and Gender: Rethinking Chicano/a Cultural Production through the Paradigms of Xicanisma and Me(x)icanness." *Americas Review* 24, nos. 3-4 (1996): 218-30.
- Vercoe, Caroline. "Agency and Ambivalence: A Reading of Works by Coco Fusco." In *Body Politics and the Fictional Double*, ed. Debra Walker King. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2000.
- Wolford, Lisa. "Guillermo Gómez-Peña: An Introduction." *Theatre Topics* 9, no. 1 (1999): 89-91.