

UC San Diego

UC San Diego Previously Published Works

Title

Bastards of the Unfinished Revolution: Bolívar's Ismael and Rizal's Martí at the Turn of the Twentieth Century

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/683299c2>

Journal

Radical History Review, 2004(89)

ISSN

0163-6545

Author

Blanco, John D

Publication Date

2004-05-01

DOI

10.1215/01636545-2004-89-92

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Peer reviewed

Bastards of the Unfinished Revolution: Bolívar's Ismael and Rizal's Martí at the Turn of the Nineteenth Century

John D. Blanco

University of California, San Diego

-- Acabarán como el padre --contestó Elías en voz baja--; cuando la desgracia ha marcado una vez una familia, todos los miembros tienen que perecer; cuando el rayo hiere un árbol, todo lo reduce a cenizas."

["They will end up like their father," Elías answered in a low voice. "Once misfortune has marked a family, all its members must perish; like a bolt of lightning that wounds a tree, reducing everything to ashes."]

- José Rizal, *Noli me tangere*

The title of my essay aims to highlight two important themes in the late colonial literature of Cuba and the Philippines at the end of the nineteenth century, embodied in the figure of a bastard son or daughter in various novels and poems. The first theme is the recovery of a lost legacy, patrimony, or the intimation of fate, which reconfigures the ethical and political decisions of the colonial subject on the eve of revolution. The second is the bastard's anomalous identity, which prefigures the colonial subject's abandonment by the society that engendered the colonial condition; but also gives her or him the relative freedom to break with the familial or paternalistic past by criticizing it, and announcing the advent historical self-assertion in the colonial world. Certainly, these themes frame the central tensions in the most important Cuban novel of the nineteenth century, *Cecilia Valdés* (1882); but they also provide the central metaphor to Cuban patriot and lawyer José Martí's early collection of poems *Ismaelillo* (1882), dedicated to

his son. Across the Atlantic Ocean, not many years afterward, colonial expatriate of the Philippine archipelago (and soon to be national martyr and hero) Dr. José Rizal produced his two novels *Noli me tangere* (Do Not Touch Me) and *El filibusterismo* (Will to Subversion), around a woman whose bastard origins catalyze the hero's unjust persecution and recourse to revolution against the Spanish colonial government.

In each of these instances, the tension between the necessary rediscovery of a lost patrimony and the necessary negation of that patrimony in order to take control of one's individual destiny under colonialism, frames a crucial confrontation in the geopolitics of the Americas. That was the confrontation between two contesting inheritors of the economic and political upheavals in Europe and Americas throughout the early nineteenth century: on the one hand, modern imperialism as an international policy; and on the other, the recuperation of Simón Bolívar's anti-colonial thought in the Spanish colonial world. One of the most dramatic manifestations of this confrontation at the end of the nineteenth century, the 1898 war with Spain, resulted in the U.S. occupation of Cuba, as well as the takeover of Puerto Rico, the Philippines, and Guam between 1898 and 1912. In doing so, the U.S. extended its territorial sovereignty by might across the Pacific and the Gulf of Mexico, and set an astonishing precedent for military invasions and interventions in other countries throughout the twentieth century.¹ Less known, however, is the way in which the discourse of late liberal, anti-colonial revolution continued to serve as a suppressed archive open to cultural elaboration and transformation in both countries up to the present.

Central to this archive are the works of José Rizal and José Martí. Indeed, one may go so far as to say that no conception or discussion of national consciousness in

the Philippines and Cuba is possible without somehow identifying their place in their respective countries, or citing the stirring words of their literary and political writings. Both shared a series of ghostly parallels. They were both colonial expatriate intellectuals born in two of Spain's last colonies to survive the Latin American wars of independence (the Philippines and Cuba); both began their careers optimistic with the future of Spanish republicanism, but grew disenchanted with the politics of colonial reform; both foresaw in their writings the demise of colonial rule but also the shadow of modern imperialism in their respective regions; and both died as national martyrs to the anti-colonial revolutionary movement, with Martí leading an expeditionary force in the 1895 Cuban war of independence, and Rizal being executed by firing squad for his alleged involvement in the 1896 Filipino revolution.² Both consorted at one time or another with the same Spanish political leaders advocating for an end to colonial rule; both also had occasion to witness and document the combination of economic power and economic inequality that put the United States in a position of contesting hegemony with the older European nations.³ Finally, the historical memory of both became an object of political debate in the construction of a national pedagogy for state consolidation in the 1940s and 50s era of postwar decolonization (and in Cuba's case, national revolution). Yet for all their overlaps and intersecting itineraries across Spain and the U.S. -- the soon to be past and soon to be present colonial empires at the end of the nineteenth century -- they never met, and virtually never mentioned one another in the entire corpus of their respective writings.

In the pages that follow, I account for the lost affinities between the Philippines and the Spanish Caribbean through an analysis of these two writers, particularly their

common search and questioning of intellectual patrimonies, which were buried or redirected by the advent of U.S. imperialism at the turn of the century. The specific case I treat at length is the common engagement of Rizal and Martí with the thought of Simón Bolívar, to the degree that both Rizal and Martí saw themselves as the problematic inheritors of an unfinished project that began with the Latin American Wars of Independence in 1810. By juxtaposing the different interpretations of both national heroes at the end of the nineteenth century, I arrive at a more general analysis of Rizal's novels and Martí's "Nuestra América" as narratives that do not so much assert the existence of an "imagined community" (to borrow a phrase from Benedict Anderson) as they ceaselessly announce their future possibility. In doing so, both elicit the task of critically reflecting on the specifically anti-colonial character of the late liberal or "romantic" revolutions in Cuba and the Philippines.

I believe that an understanding of such a task contributes to a larger investigation into the concept and literature of the Americas, characterized by the contradictory inheritance of European and American liberalism, the creation of new constituencies around the question of U.S. imperialism, and the imagination and investment of these constituencies in alternative visions of modernity. At present, as the U.S. overruns yet another country on the spurious claims of national security and territorial integrity, a recuperation of these visions for the subjects, taxpayers, and victims of that violence, seems both necessary and appropriate.

I.

In attempting to distinguish the late nineteenth century political revolutions from their predecessors, Eric Hobsbawm takes up the difficult task of isolating various features of nationalism that exercised some impact on most national movements between 1880 and 1914. These include the expansion of the understanding of nationhood as constituting "any body of people considering themselves a 'nation'...which, in the last instance, meant the right to a separate sovereign independent state for their territory," as well as an increasing reliance on ethnicity and language for the articulation of nationhood.⁴ For already established nation states in Europe, as well as the United States, Hobsbawm adds a third feature, "a sharp shift to the right of the nation and flag, for which the term 'nationalism' was actually invented in the last decade(s) of the nineteenth century."⁵

This somewhat schematic historization of "second-generation nationalisms" nevertheless provides us with an initial point of departure for inserting the theme of patrimony as a way of outlining the matrices of Martí and Rizal's works and their importance to us today. Yet in elaborating a criterion for what he would later identify as "the age of empire," Hobsbawm fails to highlight the *mutually determining* aspect of these three features: the degree to which the expression of nationhood, for example, was an anticipation and defense *against* the emergence of modern imperialism, or the way in which international legitimacy and right became a central issue between the imperialist powers and leaders like José Rizal and José Martí at the end of the nineteenth century. This mutually determining characteristic frames the particular angle toward the general historical problematic in which I want to situate the works of both thinkers. It also helps

to account for the invisibility of the Philippines and Latin America to one another in the twentieth century.

Latin America's intellectuals have always maintained a respectful distance from the Philippines, for both obvious and less obvious reasons. After Mexico gained its independence from Spain in 1821, the jurisdiction of Spanish sovereignty over the Pacific archipelago transferred from Mexico to Madrid. The colonial archipelago thenceforth became part of a floating constellation that included Cuba and Puerto Rico, although the latter two shone more brightly in the eyes of Spain for the profits both islands reaped from the sugar plantations and the slave trade.⁶ Other factors responsible for the invisibility of Filipinas in Latin American studies may include geographical distance, our own ambivalence toward the study of Filipino literature in Spanish, and most notably the fact that the Philippines was seized by the United States between 1898 and 1912 in the midst of its national revolution against Spain.

The U.S. intervention in Spain's former colonies reoriented the cultural reception and understandings of the revolutions in Cuba and the Philippines in subtle but significant ways. For one thing, it cut short any developing relations between Filipino and Spanish Caribbean intellectuals and revolutionaries, particularly during the latter half of the nineteenth century and particularly the 1896 Filipino revolution. Throughout the 1880s, Filipino *ilustrados*, or European educated intellectuals, had lobbied with Cuban expatriates in Spanish political parties and Masonic lodges to abolish colonial rule.⁷ At the close of the first phase of the Filipino revolution (1896-1897), the revolutionary government in exile corresponded with Puerto Rican statesman Ramón Emeterio Betances for the purpose of developing mutual ties of solidarity and support for the

liberation of both archipelagoes of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. Beyond the foreclosure of this conversation, however, was the sudden reorientation of both revolutionary movements to confront the U.S., a country whose imperialist designs seemed both self-contradictory and ambivalent. For Cuba, formal independence belied *de facto* U.S. military and economic rule. Across the Pacific, the compromises of various elite *ilustrados* and the drastic casualties of the Philippine-American War (between 500,000 and 1 million) together facilitated the U.S. takeover of the Philippines, with the proviso that national independence would succeed a brief transition period of "colonial tutelage."

The historical emphasis of the 1898 U.S. war with Spain over the independence movements in both countries has thus served to obscure a proper analysis of the late colonial condition in Cuba and the Philippines, as well as a larger understanding of the Philippines in the context of the anti-colonial revolutionary movements in Latin America, in at least two ways. In the U.S. historiography of the period, the Philippines and the Spanish Caribbean became quickly absorbed into a larger narrative of U.S. expansion beginning with the decimation of the Native American population and the seizure of Mexican land in 1846, and culminating in the creation of a trans-Pacific "Island Empire" at the turn of the century. In an early statement advocating such a project, Charles Morris writes in 1899: "We have primitive populations to civilize, indolent populations to stimulate, hostile populations to pacify, ignorant populations to educate, oppressed populations to lift into manhood and teach the principles of liberty and the art of self-government."⁸

Yet even Latin American responses to 1898 also served to excise the Philippines from an understanding of its own modernity, built around either the question of a southern continental republic (Simón Bolívar); a nascent Western hemispheric "Americanism" that would succeed the barbarism of old Europe (Domingo F. Sarmiento); the linguistic and cultural affiliation with Spain (Andrés Bello and Rubén Darío); or the threat of a growing U.S. interest in territorial and economic expansion (José Martí and José Enrique Rodó).⁹ Particularly after the U.S. seizure of northern Mexico in 1846, projections of national and regional modernity became characterized by a simultaneous comparison and differentiation from North America. The career of Cuban abolitionist José Antonio Saco, for example, illustrated a decisive shift in the almost unconditional emulation of U.S. modernity by thinkers such as Sarmiento in the early nineteenth century, to a reconsideration of the unfulfilled possibility of constitutional republicanism in Cuba.¹⁰ Another example is Chilean writer and journalist Francisco Bilbao's reflections on the Mexican American War, in which he portrays the North / South division in the Americas along a series of oppositions, with Latin America prioritizing the "social to the individual, beauty to wealth, justice to power, art to commerce, poetry to industry, philosophy to texts, pure spirit to measurement, duty to interest."¹¹ These oppositions certainly impacted José Martí's observations on the rise of U.S. imperialism, captured in his famous essay "Nuestra América" (in 1893).¹² They also provided the basis for José Enrique Rodó's Latin American cultural aesthetic or *Arielismo*, and Rubén Darío's critique of North American "calibanismo" in their respective essays *Ariel* and "El triunfo de Calibán" (both published in 1900).

Both the adulation and dismissal of North American modernity, however, still tied many Latin American intellectuals to a negative project of conceiving a future Latin America in the eyes of its "other," i.e. either along the lines of the European metropolis or in response to the U.S. expansion of its hegemony across the western hemisphere and the Pacific Ocean. As Angel Rama has pointed out, the emergence of the modern intellectual or "letrado" in Latin America nevertheless failed to address the colonial relationship between city and province, metropolis and colony, lettered and unlettered: divisions that resulted in the further isolation of the masses from political life and representation.¹³ Speaking generally, one of the driving forces behind the political fashioning of Latin American modernity for the writers of the late nineteenth century -- rationalization in the Weberian sense, but also the assertion of national sovereignty, the art of good government, the implantation of an enlightened pedagogy, etc. -- consisted in a differentiating operation that distinguished "our" Latin America from either Europe or the America of the North, as a way of specifying the challenges of supervening the destructive force of advanced capitalism and a corresponding modern U.S. hegemony. "Nuestra América" thus served not only to assert a cultural claim to the territory against the history of U.S. aggression and aggrandizement of the South, "from the Bravo to the Magallanes!" in Martí's words,. It also served to call for a re-evaluation of the constitutional experiments that had resulted in almost a century of internecine warfare and the rise of tyranny among the new Latin American republics; and the acceleration or intensification of colonial dichotomies in an avowedly post-colonial order.¹⁴

The preceding summary of responses to the onset of U.S. imperialism in Latin America and the Caribbean at the turn of the century does not pretend to be exhaustive.

It merely serves to highlight the marginal place of Rizal, the Philippines, and in many ways the polyglot Caribbean archipelago as well, with respect the formation of modern Latin American thought, posed in the terms of the North/South axis. As Cuba's invisible twin, the Philippines fought a war of independence against a weak colonial empire, only to be overrun by the interests of modern U.S. And like Puerto Rico, the Philippines became what was known as an unincorporated territory of the U.S. – pieces of property recognized by the powerful nations as belonging to the U.S., whose inhabitants were nevertheless deprived of constitutional representation, land ownership on the mainland, even basic civil rights.¹⁵ Yet set apart from both political representation in the U.S. and cultural representation in the projections of both U.S. and Latin American modernity, the social and cultural affinities between the Philippines and the Spanish Caribbean, known to the nineteenth century colonial expatriates from the Philippines, Puerto Rico, and Cuba in Spain, are overshadowed by the discourses of Pan-Americanism and Latin Americanism, which crystallized in the luminous pages of Martí's "Nuestra América."

In the analysis that follows, I want to rescue Rizal's imagined patrimony with the fate of Latin American republics in the age of European and U.S. colonial empires. Second, I want to use this analysis to raise a series of reflections on the role of the aesthetic in the development of anti-imperial Filipino insular nationalism after Rizal's death on the one hand, and the affirmation of a Latin Americanism founded on the success of the Cuban revolution, on the other. If a figure like José Martí comes down to us as a cultural inheritor of what he identified as the "Hispano-American enigma" that began with the wars of independence under Simón Bolívar, in what way does Rizal become akin to Bolívar's Ismael – a lost and illegitimate bastard of a problem defined

specifically as "American?" How does this legacy inform Rizal's aesthetic project through the figure of Simoun – a kind of cynical parody of Cuba's Martí in Rizal's *El filibusterismo*? Finally, what are the implications of this project for revisiting the ambivalent bases of Martí's own Latin Americanism?

II.

The title of Rizal's second (and more ideologically explicit) novel *El filibusterismo* references a strange word, *filibustero*, first used in Dutch and English to refer to banditry in the late sixteenth century, before entering Spanish in the seventeenth century as the word for pirate, particularly in the Caribbean and Philippine Islands. The *Diccionario de Lengua Castellana* ascribes the word to the French *flibustier*; the *Dictionnaire de l'Academie Francais* in turn refers to the English *flibutor*, which in turn derives from the Dutch *vrijbuitter*, literally "celui qui fait du butin librement" (one who makes free use of the boot). The Oxford English Dictionary records the politicization of the word filibuster in the late nineteenth century, when it began to connote the "violation of international law, for the purpose of revolutionizing certain states in Central America and the Spanish West Indies" (2.b.), particularly Cuba and Puerto Rico. In Spanish, *filibusterismo* became synonymous with sedition, a crime that was punishable by imprisonment and deportation without any recourse to due process of law. Particularly in the decade following the 1872 uprising in Cavite province of the Philippines, such arbitrary proceedings relied on the license of the colonial government to perpetuate a state of exception in the Philippines, founded on the administration of *Leyes Especiales* (Special Laws) distinct from those of the Spanish metropolis.¹⁶

For Rizal, the arbitrary exposure of any colonial subject accused of being a *filibustero* to the force of law under colonial sovereignty became a case symptom of tyrannical rule: "all those, in a word, who among normal civilized people are considered good citizens, friends of progress and enlightenment, in the Philippines are *filibusteros*, enemies of order, and, like lightning rods, attract on stormy days wrath and calamities."¹⁷ Yet the incongruity of the word's immediate investiture with the force of law in the colony, in which the presumption of guilt might befall any given member of the colonial population simply by public accusation, became the germinal seed of Rizal's first novel *Noli me tangere*. In a stirring monologue, protagonist Crisóstomo Ibarra diagnoses the "social cancer" of colonial society, in which a perpetual disavowal of the due process of law effectively forces the colonial subject to resort to the very sedition s/he is presumed to propagate:

¡Ellos me han abierto los ojos, me han hecho ver la llaga y me fuerzan a ser criminal! Y pues que lo han querido, seré filibustero, pero verdadero filibustero; llamaré a todos los desgraciados, a todos los que dentro del pecho sienten latir un corazón.... Nosotros, durante tres siglos, les tendemos la mano, les pedimos amor, ansiamos llamarlos nuestros hermanos. ¿Cómo nos contestan? Con el insulto y la burla, negándonos hasta la cualidad de seres humanos. ¡No hay Dios, no hay esperanzas, no hay humanidad; no hay más que el derecho de la fuerza!¹⁸

[T]hey have opened my eyes, made me see the cancer and they force me to be a criminal! And since they want it thus, I *will* be a filibustero, but a true filibustero; I will call on all the disenfranchised, all those who feel within their breasts a

beating heart.... For three centuries, we have extended our hand, asked from them love, longed to call them our brothers. How do they answer us? With insults and mockery, denying us even the status of human beings. There is no God, no hope, no humanity; nothing more than the right of force!

Rizal extends this train of thought in *El filibusterismo* by establishing a sinister connection between the secret return of Crisóstomo Ibarra to the archipelago after thirteen years of exile, and his adventures in the Americas (particularly Cuba) as both a freebooter and financier of sedition and counter-sedition. Under the significant pseudonym Simoun, Ibarra succeeds in raising the money, the arms, and the spirit of vengeance against Spain: all of which would impel and sustain a revolutionary movement long enough to wipe out the traces of colonial oppression and build a constitutional order.

Filipino writer and national artist Nick Joaquin calls attention to Ibarra's pseudonym Simoun, to render explicit Rizal's reference to the history of the Latin American revolutions.¹⁹ He begins with the following question: if Rizal himself was considered to belong to the social status or caste of native subaltern or *indio* in colonial society, why did he make the agent of historical change in his two novels (Simoun) a Creole? Joaquin's answer becomes one of the main theses of his work: according to Joaquin, from the history of struggles in Latin America led by Creoles in the early nineteenth century, Rizal looked to the figure of the Creole for the emergence of Filipino politics. For Joaquin, Rizal "knew that Spain was overthrown in America by the various uprisings of the Creoles there (Bolívar, San Martín, Iturbide).... During Rizal's youth, it looked as if what had happened in America would happen in the Philippines.... So, when

Rizal wrote his novels, he was writing about an actual movement, and writing to animate it.... He was chronicling the Creole revolution in the Philippines” (73-74). Joaquin recounts various episodes in nineteenth-century Philippine history in order to substantiate his thesis: the advocacy for native rights by the self-styled "Conde Filipino" during the early years of the Spanish Constitution (1812-1814 and 1820-1823), the attempted coup of the colonial government by the Novales brothers in 1822, one of whom proclaimed himself the "Emperor" (after Iturbide) for a day; and the Creole leadership of Father José Burgos in the defense of native secular priests against the accusations of the Spanish friars. For the colonial expatriates of Rizal's time, the Latin American wars of independence remained a living legacy for Spain's remaining colonies, even as Rizal's compatriots lobbied for the eradication of colonial Special Laws and granting of various civil liberties to the colonial population.

Simoun's connection to the Americas, however, extends beyond the identification with the Creole legacy. When the character is first introduced in Rizal's novel, he speaks "with a strange accent, a mixture of English and South American." One of Simoun's new acquaintances balks at the ruthless audacity of the protagonist's opinions, which become labeled as "Yankee": "he [Simoun] doubtless believes that [the native Filipinos] we are dealing with [are] redskins" (6, 8). The mixed association of Simoun with freebooters, Yankee frontiersmen, and Latin American Creoles, in any event, cues the reader to examine the colonial question in the Philippines through the lens of the Americas, particularly the frontier between its privileged and disenfranchised sectors. The latter, in Rizal's mind, are composed of the natives, criminals, and failed leaders of the past generation whose decimation or defeat left a lesson for Simoun to study and resolve.

While the overlap may seem incongruous from a strict historical interpretation of the dichotomy between elite and native groups during the Latin American wars of Independence, Simoun projects their partial identification as a way of distinguishing the present revolution from the past:

Pedís igualdad de derechos, españolizacion de vuestras costumbres y no veís que lo que pedís es la muerte, la destruccion de vuestra nacionalidad, la aniquilacion de vuestra patria, la consagracion de la tiranía!... Pedís españolizacion y no palideceis de vergüenza cuando os la niegan! Y aunque os la concedieran ¿qué quereis? Qué vais á ganar? Cuando más feliz, país de pronunciamientos, país de guerras civiles república de rapaces y descontentos como algunas repúblicas de la América de Sur!

You ask for equal rights, Hispanization of your customs and you don't see that what you are asking for is death, the destruction of your nationality, the annihilation of your native land, the consecration of tyranny! ...You ask for Hispanization and you don't cringe with shame when they deny it to you! And even if they did, what do you want? What will you gain? At its best, a country of executive decrees, a country of civil wars, a republic of looters and wretches like some republics of South America?²⁰

On the surface, Simoun's cynicism seems to go entirely against the libertarian ideals of his namesake – Simón Bolívar, who dedicated his life and work to the success of Latin American independence from Spain. Yet the Filipino Creole Simoun who turns

against the legacy of his historical agency in the cycle of American revolutions nevertheless retraces a suppressed chapter in the narrative of North and Latin American independence: the fate of its indigenous populations. It was this division between an increasingly restless Hispanized Creole and mestizo elite minority on the one hand, and a large population of native subalterns whose opinion on national liberation was either nonexistent or entirely unknown, that both elicited and foreclosed any favorable analogy between the American wars of independence and the imminent Filipino revolution. To borrow a phrase from W.E.B. deBois, Rizal was burdened with the “double-consciousness” of an educated member belonging to a marginalized and historically oppressed caste – the *indios*.²¹ Perhaps it should come as no surprise that Rizal was capable of both radicalizing the movement for colonial reforms based in Spain, led predominantly by Creoles and Spanish-Chinese *mestizos*; and towards the end of his life opposing the emergence of national revolution -- a movement that he himself inspired.²²

Curiously, Rizal’s Simoun, who represented the author’s utter disenchantment with the romantic ideal of republican revolution, unwittingly resurrects the oftentimes forgotten reflections of Simón Bolívar on the future of an independent Latin America. After all, it was Bolívar who first ruled out the possibility of instituting a constitutional republic on a continent that had spent three centuries under Spanish colonial sovereignty. In Bolívar’s letters written from Jamaica in 1815, the Supreme Commander poses the question that Rizal would confront almost a century later: “¿Se puede concebir que un pueblo recientemente desencadenado se lance a la esfera de la libertad, sin que, como a Icaro, se le deshagan las alas y recaiga en el abismo?” (Can one conceive a recently unshackled people capable of launching itself into the sphere of freedom, without its

wings falling apart, like Icarus, only to fall again into the abyss?).²³ Behind this powerful question lies the source of Bolívar's legacy as an intellectual forbear of the 1896 Filipino Revolution, as well as the Cuban War of Independence: for Bolívar had to summon the courage and probity to reflect on and criticize the wars of Independence in the very momentum of their trajectory.

Rizal's interpretation of Bolívar's question thus anticipates a central theme of the literature and historiography of decolonization, from the work of Frantz Fanon, Albert Memmi, and C.L.R. James to the Subaltern Studies Collective. How does the early post-colonial subject go beyond a momentary negation or reversal of the colonial order if the only basis for a national community is a common outrage against a common oppressor?²⁴ And should the attempt to institute the principles of natural law and democracy in Latin America's new republics fail (as Rizal would believe), what would occupy their place? What symbol could stand in the face of such disenchantment? Readers of Rizal's *El filibusterismo* will hear these same concerns echoed in one of the final soliloquies of the novel: "¿A qué la independencia si los esclavos de hoy serán los tiranos de mañana? Y lo serán sin duda porque ama la tiranía quien se somete á ella!" (What is the point of independence if the slaves of today will be the tyrants of tomorrow? And they will be, without a doubt, because he who submits himself to tyranny desires it!).²⁵

If we follow this thread as a guide into the labyrinth of Rizal's indictment of liberal revolution at the end of the nineteenth century, the novel *El filibusterismo* undelines the abyss separating the Latin American (and Spanish) project of enlightened republicanism in the earlier part of the century, from its disenchantment as it lapsed into the hypocrisy of late colonial rule. If Rizal had set out in his first novel to fashion an

aesthetic ideal and foundational fiction for the origins of an emergent Filipino nation, he ends his second novel with a profoundly anti-aesthetic gesture. That was the failure of the liberal American revolutions to definitively guarantee a model of self-government that would improve the state of the colony. Rizal's abandonment of this ideal in the short-term bore bitter fruit: for barely a generation after Rizal's death, Filipinos had already forgotten they were once a part of Latin America. As a fitting emblem of this distance, Rizal's novels are no longer read in Spanish.²⁶

III.

He ahí el germen del complejo terrible del americano: creer que su expresión no es forma alcanzada, sino problematismo, cosa a resolver.

We have here the germ of the American's terrible complex: believing that her or his expression is not formally complete, but problematic, something to be resolved.

-- José Lezama Lima, *La expresión americana*

If we isolate Rizal's analysis and critique of the Bolivarian legacy, we see how a comparison and contrast with Martí's vision in "Nuestra América" will prove fruitful for distinguishing the specificity of the anti-colonial movements in the Philippines and Cuba at the end of the nineteenth century. Similar to Rizal, from the outset Martí's projection of the Cuban revolution (now known as the war of Independence) took as its point of departure a reflection on the legacies of romantic revolution as the means to modern self-assertion and historical agency -- the rights of the individual, the agency of the will, the universal legitimacy of the national republic as state. As Martí said elsewhere, "This is

not the revolution of anger. It is the revolution of reflection."²⁷ Both questioned the possibility of "importing" a model for democratic republicanism from outside the country, whether it meant Hispanization or Americanization for Rizal's character Simoun, or the European and U.S. revolutions for Martí. These objections notwithstanding, however, both also recognized that disenchantment with both liberal and radical doctrines of revolution and democracy did not diminish the emancipatory potential of constituting a people who would possess the knowledge and legitimacy to govern themselves and no other.

Yet within this general frame of reference, certain differences in the interpretation of modern revolution between both writers also become clear. It is significant, for instance, that both drew upon the figure of the native American -- and with it, the question of the American frontier -- as the anti-colonial, true revolutionary point of departure for developing their evaluations for the futures of their respective countries. Yet while Rizal's characterization of the native led him to ultimately reiterate Bolívar's pessimism regarding the future of the post-colonial republic, Martí positions the native to question our very assumptions of the nation-state and constitutional republicanism. In contrast to the model of the romantic revolution set forth by writers like Benedict Anderson -- a revolution in which a national community is "imagined as limited and sovereign -- Martí's idea of the Americas was predicated on the opposite: that is, the critique and historization of the Spanish and Anglo-Saxon "imagination" of unlimited expansion and the resulting conflicts among claims to national and cultural sovereignty.

Benedict Anderson's well-known reflections on the spread of modern nationalism in the Americas may serve as a point of departure for analyzing the peculiar character of

Martí's Cuban nationalism and Latin Americanism , if only because their misapplication to the late nineteenth-century Americas inadvertently underlines the conceptual foundations of Martí's America.²⁸ Focusing on the early cosmopolitanism of the North and South American Creoles as the basis for national movements, Anderson isolates the decisive influences in the shaping of the American revolutions. In doing so, he downplays the Spanish revolution against Napoleon in 1812 and the influence of enlightenment ideas, and chooses to emphasize instead the negatively derived, "shared fatality of trans-Atlantic birth" that engendered a Creole consciousness (57-58, 63). In Anderson's account, the Creole -- caught between his exclusion from the metropole and the fear of subaltern mobilization -- drew from his bureaucratization under Spanish absolutism, along with the rise of newspapers, as opportunities to develop his consciousness of a common connectedness with other Creole pioneers. In contrast, the "general development of capitalism and technology in the late eighteenth century and the 'local' backwardness of Spanish capitalism" led to the failure of Latin Americanism to construct a continental nation-state (or federation) in the nineteenth century (63).

Doubtless this dialectical account of the coming to consciousness of Europe's "others" as the basis for a new identity, however idealized, applies when one regards a very general outline for Creole class consolidation (and its failure) in Bolívar's revolution. In the Philippines, too, one may argue a perceived "peninsular Spanish envy" on the part of the Philippine-born Creoles accounted for Spanish fears of revolution throughout the nineteenth century.²⁹ Still, the implicit Hegelianism in Anderson's account omits a different model for understanding the national project in the Americas *after* the initial consolidation of the thirteen colonies in the United States, which Martí's "Nuestra

América" identifies as its genealogical forbear. It would be difficult to characterize this American "nation" in the terms Anderson sets forth -- "imagined as limited and sovereign" -- insofar as it is predicated on the imagination of unlimited expansion and the resulting deadlock between conflicting claims to national and cultural sovereignty. A cursory glance at the novels of James Fenimore Cooper, or Frederick Jackson Turner's "Significance of the American Frontier" in 1893 bears this thesis out. In these texts, one sees not a negatively derived conception of "shared fatality of trans-Atlantic birth," nor the abstract recognition of "homogeneous empty time" fostered by the newspaper industry, the realist novel, increased travel and communications, and other agents of the secularizing process. In contrast, these texts dwell almost entirely upon the sustained contact, negotiation, and conflict with that element designated as the frontier:

Now, the frontier is the line of most rapid and effective Americanization. The wilderness masters the colonist. It finds him a European in dress, industries, tools, modes of travel, and thought. It takes him from the railroad car and puts him in the birch canoe. It strips off the garments of civilization and arrays him in the hunting shirt and the moccasin. It puts him in the log cabin of the Cherokee and Iroquois and runs an Indian palisade around him. Before long he has gone to planting Indian corn and plowing with a sharp stick; he shouts the war cry and takes the scalp in orthodox Indian fashion. In short, at the frontier the environment is at first too strong for the man. He must accept the conditions which it furnishes or perish, and so he fits himself into the Indian clearings and follows the Indian trails.

Little by little he transforms the wilderness, but the outcome is not the old Europe, not simply the development of Germanic germs, anymore than the first phenomenon was a case of reversion to the Germanic mark. The fact is, that here is a new product that is American.³⁰

The frontier mutually and reciprocally redefines, sustains, and reconstitutes the conflicts and complicities between the agents of "civilization" and "barbarism" at the heart of any national imagining in the nineteenth century, whether such a nation extends from the conception of tribe, literate public sphere, civil society, confederation, or other form.

Turner's frontier thesis of course became instrumental to the ideology of U.S. imperialism under president Theodore Roosevelt. Yet in Martí's essay, the author invokes the idea of the frontier not in order to anticipate its inevitable closing, but rather reiterate, reinterpret, and reinvigorate the unfinished character of modern revolution in Latin America -- even to the point of defying U.S. expansion -- as an unfinished project of national and Latin American interstate consolidation. Despite their differences, both Turner and Martí emphasize how the constitution of a people in the Americas exceeds and oftentimes opposes its representation in the state: if anything, the American frontier demands an ongoing practice of responding to the *absence* of a "limited and sovereign" community. Dependent to a large degree upon the flows of immigration and slavery, the individuation of capital accumulation made possible by the expanding American frontier, and the counter-assertion of autochthonous claims to territory and human dignity along the frontier or contact zone, any such assertion of national community always begins by

unraveling at the seams.³¹ Turner's later essay, "The Problem of the West," poses the problem this way: if the United States upholds any sense of nationhood or national community in the nineteenth century, it stems neither from the U.S. Constitution or the culture of the Thirteen colonies that penned it. Rather, Americanism arises out of the ebb and flow of two opposing forces: the projection of "infinite" expansion westward, with its ad hoc creation of rough democracy, lynch law, and practical sense of securing one's immediate welfare on the frontier; and a corresponding amplification and reinsertion of those values developed in the west, into the eastern cities and into the very heart of the U.S. Constitution.³² As Turner makes clear, the men of the Western frontier even reach a point of challenging and usurping or transforming the Europeanized respect for the law and traditional institutions that define the early democratic republicanism of the United States. Not surprisingly, his shining examples are Andrew Jackson and Abraham Lincoln -- men of the west who redefined the East by internalizing the experience of the frontier at the highest seat of the executive power.

And in what may be considered the foundational text in the project to conceive a specifically Latin American literature, Domingo F. Sarmiento's *Facundo* -- significantly subtitled *Civilización y barbarie* (Civilization and Barbarism) (1841) -- Sarmiento makes a similar claim regarding the demise of the Argentine republic under the provincialism of its gaucho *caudillo* or boss leaders. Sarmiento's compelling narrative, which predates and anticipates Turner's own in many ways, describes the outlaw culture engendered by the Argentine *pampa*, embodied in ruthless figures like Facundo Quiroga, which gradually penetrates the institutions of the early republic to occupy the very seat of power under populist dictator Juan Manuel Rosas (1835-1852). Of course, Sarmiento's own

reflections on the "barbarization of civilization" led him to disavow Latin American politics altogether. The point, rather, is to illustrate Sarmiento and Turner's admiration for and fascination with the transculturation and negotiation of cultural and colonial difference, which comprised the central element in the concept of the Americas. While both Sarmiento and Turner's Americanism, like nationalism, undertook the task of constituting a people, both showed how "the people" was from the beginning itself a liminal concept, embodied in figures like Facundo, Natty Bumpo, the pioneering Yankee. These bastards of civilization create their respective nations through their contact with the frontier: a liminal experience that pushes the frontier back even as it incorporates or interiorizes its "barbaric" other in the reconstruction of the self.³³

This detour into an admittedly general comparative sketch of an Americanism that José Martí's "Nuestra América" attempts to historicize, serves to highlight at least two aspects of Martí's unique approach to the anticipated revolution for independence in Cuba.³⁴ The first is that, unlike his contemporary, José Rizal, Martí predicated the liberal revolution on not only the singular constitution of a Cuban people, but also the singular modern history of *attempting* to constitute a people in the Americas; and a corresponding redemption of its failures in *both* North and South America. This is why (and this is the second point), whereas Rizal sees the exhaustion of an historical process without resolution or redemption, Martí understands the lack of resolution to be constitutive of the very concept of Our America. The failed transcendence of Rizal's Simoun, then, must give way to an immanent reflection and modification of the idea of America, for the sake of America's very existence as an idea. Let us elaborate on each of these two points briefly.

1. One of the central questions posed by "Nuestra América" is the relationship between its two objects of critique. Martí devotes the greater part of his essay on the first, the collapse of Latin American republicanism, due to the inappropriate importation of foreign models of government for a singular Latin American nature and people:

La incapacidad no está en el país naciente, que pide formas que se le acomoden y grandeza útil, sino en los que quieren regir pueblos originales, de composición singular y violenta, con leyes heredadas de cuatro siglos de práctica libre en los Estados Unidos, de diecinueve siglos de monarquía en Francia.... El gobierno ha de nacer del país. El espíritu del gobierno ha de ser del país. La forma del gobierno ha de avenirse a la constitución propia del país.³⁵

The incapacity lies not in the emerging country, which demands forms that are appropriate to it and a greatness that is useful, but in the leaders who try to rule unique nations, of a singular and violent composition, with laws inherited from four centuries of free practice in the United States and nineteen centuries of monarchy in France.... The government must be born from the country. The spirit of the government must be the spirit of the country. The form of the government must be in harmony with the country's natural constitution.

The second object of critique concerns the threat of U.S. economic and military expansion, which reappears in the Pan-American conferences to adjust the silver standard of currency in Latin America to the gold standard in the United States: "[E]s la hora próxima en que se le acerque, demandando relaciones íntimas, un pueblo emprendedor y

pujante que la desconoce y la desdeña" (The hour is near when [our America] will be approached by an enterprising and forceful nation that will demand intimate relations with her, and yet does not know her and disdains her). Martí disparages both the culture and government of the U.S. that supports and propagates the policy of U.S. expansionism a number of times throughout the essay. For example, the reference to "Los que, al amparo de una tradición criminal, cercenaron...la tierra del hermano vencido" (those who, under the protection of a criminal tradition, would tear the land asunder and wrest it from the defeated brother), has often been ascribed to the U.S. seizure of Mexican land in the 1848 Mexican-American War (15). Elsewhere, Martí openly indicts North America for drowning "en sangre a sus indios, y va de más a menos!" (its own Indians in blood and is going from more to less!), and later cites North America's *masas vengativas y sórdidas, la tradición de conquista* (vengeful and sordid masses, [and] its tradition of conquest) (16, 21).

Yet in recent scholarship, the careful pairing of "Nuestra América" with Martí's decades long career as a U.S. correspondent for newspapers in Mexico, Venezuela, Argentina, and other Latin American countries, illustrates that the two objects of critique are in fact one.³⁶ Point for point, the future of Latin America appears as the negative relief of the failures of democracy in North America. Where the latter has exterminated its Native American population, the former would have to depend on it: "Los gobernadores en las repúblicas de indios, aprenden indio" (The rulers of Indian republics are learning *how to be Indian*).³⁷ Whereas the U.S. South had built its economy on slavery and racial discrimination, Latin America would have to accept all races equally: "si la república no abre los brazos a todos y adelanta con todos, muere la república" (if

the republic does not open its arms to all and include all in its progress, it dies) (20). And where the prosperity of North America prevailed through its “unbridled passion and ambition,” Martí announces a confederation of Latin American nations that are bound by love: “Cansados del odio inútil, de la resistencia del libro contra la lanza, de la razón contra el cirial, de la ciudad contra el campo...se empieza, como sin saberlo, a probar el amor” (Weary of useless hatred, of the struggle of the book against the sword, reason against the altar candle, city against countryside...we are beginning, almost unknowingly, to try love) (20).

2. The insistent grammatical use of the present progressive in Martí’s text – “le está naciendo a América, en estos tiempos reales, el hombre real” or “se va salvando América” (there is being born in America, in these real times, the real man”; “America is being saved) – conveys a testamentary quality to “Nuestra América” whose relationship to the aesthetic imagination is ambiguous. One can almost imagine Martí as a TV correspondent uttering the words: “right here and right now, history is being made,” a history whose singularity defies aesthetic representation. On the one hand, then, instead of an “imagined community,” Martí never ceases to announce a community that has yet to be imagined; or that can’t be imagined except in the day-to-day practice of criticizing the myopia of older imagined communities and “creating” a form of government specific to the country’s “natural elements.” On the other hand, “Nuestra América”’s relentless devaluation of past attempts at political representation aims at establishing the immanent reinsertion of critique into any project of representation, political or aesthetic, as *precisely* the politics and aesthetics of Our America. Martí’s reflection on the history of Americanism, and his (anti-) aesthetic expressionism, are therefore of a piece. In both,

the emergent idea of Spanish-American republicanism and the creation of a pan-Latin American nation grows out of an ongoing reflection upon and affirmation of a form of knowledge that precedes and exceeds its representation. For it is in this affirmation of the outside that the flawed form of government breaks down, and makes certain, “impossible” forms of inclusion possible: in Martí’s words, las ideas absolutas, para no caer por un yerro de forma, han de ponerse en formas relativas (absolute ideas, in order not to collapse over an error of form, must be expressed in relative forms) (20).

The following example from "Nuestra América" illustrates the intersection between the republican legacy and the anti-aesthetic project:

Estos países se salvarán, porque... le está naciendo, en estos tiempos reales, el hombre real. Éramos una vision, con el pecho de atleta, las manos de petrimetre y la frente del niño. Éramos una máscara, con los calzones de Inglaterra, el chaleco parisiense, el chaquetón de Norte América y la montera de España. El indio, mudo, nos daba vueltas alrededor, y se iba al monte...a bautizar sus hijos. El negro, oteado, cantaba en la noche la música de su corazón, sólo y desconocido, entre las olas y las fieras. El campesino, el creador, se revolvía, ciego de indignación, contra la ciudad desdeñosa, contra su criatura.

[These countries will be saved, because... in these real times, there is being born in America the real man. We were a vision, with an athlete’s breast, a dandy’s hands and a child’s brow. We were dressed in costume, with shoes from England, a Parisian vest, a frock coat from North America and a bicorn from Spain. The indio, mute, gave us a once over, and fled to the mountain... to baptize his

children. The Negro, terrified, sang the music of his heart in the night, alone,
unknown to all, between the waves and the wild. The field hand, the creator,
turned his back, blind with indignation, on the disdainful city, on his creature.]
(20)

Modern aesthetic transformation here does not begin or end with the assertion of racial synthesis or cultural identity. On the contrary, it reproduces in narrative the time of regression ("*These countries will be saved... there is being born.... "We were..."*") and allegorizes the decomposition of identity (represented by the mix-and-match of clothes from different countries). But when the parti-colored, disjointed image reflects, folds back on itself, sees itself not as a movement from the future to the past but rather from the past to the future ("*We were..." "there is being born...." "These countries will be saved"*"), the clothes come off, so to speak, and the "real man" announced by Martí steps forth. "Real," in this instance, refers to an event whose existence can only be understood in the present, i.e. as a practice of subordinating the historical past and the aesthetic vision of the future to the needs and desires of a *possible* people, a possible community.

Walter Benjamin would call this image a dialectical one: it takes a variety of objects out of their original contexts and time periods and places them in sudden juxtaposition with one another. In a flash, the pageant of history is flattened into the "Now of its recognisability.... The redemption which can be carried out in this way and in no other is always to be won out of the perception of that which is being irretrievably lost."³⁸ For an instant, moving backwards and forwards in time become identical. It is here that the remembrance of Bolívar's campaign, the melancholy contemplation of

failed or perverted revolutions, and the future of Cuba coincide. And the fatal aspect of Martí's intellectual patrimony, the patrimony of what Martí calls "nuestras repúblicas dolorosas de América" (our sorrowful Latin American republics), becomes transformed into the critical practice of transforming the terms of patrimony itself.³⁹

It is here that the question of Cuba's future caps the reversals of North and Latin American republicanism, and serves as the keystone to a new politics and aesthetics. Indeed, one may go so far as to say that in order for questions of racial difference, the threat of U.S. annexation, and the history of past revolutions, to be resolved in Martí's Cuba, Cuba *itself* would have to become the aesthetic answer to racial difference, U.S. imperialism, and Bolívar's legacy. In other words, the question of Cuba's political future became for Martí the aesthetic answer to the future of Latin America. The elusive aspect of Martí's Cuban nationalism is that the investment in its necessity does not come from Cuba itself, but rather "Our America" as it *might* or *ought to be*. How else can one explain the otherwise delirious statement of Martí's toward the end of his life, penned the same day he signed the famous "Montechristi Manifesto" for Cuban independence: "The free Antilles will save the independence of our America and the presently compromised and deplorable honor of Anglo-Saxon America, and perhaps accelerate and fix the equilibrium of the world"?⁴⁰ If there was a future to democratic thought in the Americas, Martí saw the aesthetics of Cuban independence as the condition of its possibility. This aesthetic proceeds by ceaselessly performing its death in order to make possible the birth of politics.

IV.

In contrasting Rizal and Martí's frames for evaluating Bolívar's republicanism, one can see that while Rizal emphasizes the need to acknowledge the closing of an historical epoch and its impossible application to the Philippines, Martí begins with the opposite premise: how can Cuba insert itself into a past of which it played no part, so as to transform that past into an ongoing redemptive narrative? "Nuestra América" was his solution. Cuba's most remarkable characteristic was thus not its past, but its futurity: a virtual nation that would provide the opportunity to substantiate the lie Martí explicitly relates in "Nuestra América": "No hay conflicto entre las razas porque no hay razas" (There is no conflict between races, because there are no races).⁴¹

How specifically does this aesthetic anticipate a concrete political program? Such a question will continue to be a source of speculation and at times disaffection for readers of Rizal and Martí as the Philippines and Cuba entered a new era under the sway of U.S. domination. It is interesting to note, for example, that scholars in both Philippine and Latin American studies remain deeply divided on the use and abuse of Rizal and Martí as names and bodies of writing used to legitimate sometimes opposed ideologies.⁴² One may argue, of course, that such ambiguities inhere in every act of interpretation, particularly when it comes to the relationship between the aesthetics and politics of all nineteenth century nationalism. Yet the comparative instance of these two thinkers shows something else, which I believe to be central to any understanding of "second-generation nationalism" beyond the Western, and perhaps ultimately Eurocentric, model of the nation as an imagined community. By the time Rizal and Martí each confronted the legacy of republican revolution in the tropics, and had to measure that legacy against the synchronization of global forms of capital and the concomitant rise of modern

imperialism, it was no longer sufficient to imagine a community as limited and sovereign. One had to either break with the ultimate imperative *sine qua non* of state formation as the ultimate guarantor of collective freedom, welfare and prosperity: a break that entailed a rejection of what Michel Foucault has called "the blackmail of Enlightenment" in the age of empire, in which the nation-state represented the very foundation of modernity as a universal concept. Or, one had to re-imagine the entire historical world system in which the assertion of national independence was substantiated by an "equilibrium of the world": a passage from the universalizing claims of finality in the modern aesthetic, to a *final* political and social exit from colonial sovereignty. It is within this new imperative that the respective "nationalist" projects of Rizal and Martí invite the association of their political projects with anarchism and socialism (respectively) at the turn of the twentieth century.

When the Filipino national hero Rizal found the idea of romantic revolution at odds with the systematic task of teaching a heterogeneous and divided population how to foreclose the threat of post-revolutionary tyranny, he took the unpopular decision to turn against that aesthetic, condemning it as the mystification of a long-term problem. Perhaps it was this decision that contributed to the relegation of Rizal's novel to minor status as a Spanish and Latin American literary text. Minor literature is characterized not by the ethnic status of the writer, but rather the compromised autonomy of the aesthetic vision. In the end, the minor text must relinquish (one is tempted to say "defy") even its provisional (aesthetic) authority to transcend or surpass the historical circumstances that limit and define it, even as it embarks on a line of flight to ultimately sidestep or escape its negative interpellation.⁴³

This judgment can also be applied to Martí, with the exception that Martí succeeds in demonstrating the "failure" of the liberal political and aesthetic project as a necessary part of the project itself. Without this lens of critical history, the genealogy of Americanism would be incapable of mitigating the catastrophic effects of an unbridled North American modernization. As later Cuban writers such as Alejo Carpentier, José Lezama Lima, and Roberto Fernández Retamar were to reaffirm, the post-colonial bastard can only move forward in time by moving simultaneously back, recollecting the glass shards of its broken beauty into a mosaic that subordinates the unity of the aesthetic vision to the dignity of the heterogeneous fragment. Such were the reflections of a late nineteenth-century modernity from below, as the juggernaut cart of a triumphant U.S. imperialism quickly made its way across the Pacific Ocean and southward to Central America, the Caribbean, and the Panama Canal in the early years of the twentieth century.

¹ One can, of course, argue that the history of U.S. expansion across the continent itself set a precedent for overseas expansion. For a partial list of U.S. military interventions in other countries since 1890, see Zoltan Grossman's supplement to Z magazine online (Znet), "From Wounded Knee to Afghanistan: a century of U.S. interventions,"; insert following "www.zmag.org/list2.htm," (last revised October 8, 2001), <http://www.zmag.org/list2.htm>.

² For the best known biographies on each of the national heroes, see Jorge Mañach, *José Martí, el Apóstol* (Havana: Editorial de Ciencias Sociales, 1990: first published 1933) and León Ma. Guerrero, *The First Filipino: a Biography of José Rizal* (Manila: National Historical Institute, 1963).

³ The question of U.S. hegemony appears in a variety of José Martí's correspondence to Latin American newspapers throughout the 1880s and 90s, which fall under his proposed title for a collection of U.S. chronicles, *Escenas norteamericanas* (North American Scenes) see *Obras completas* (Complete Works) [hereafter OC], vol. 9-12 (Havana: Editorial de las Ciencias Sociales, 1975), as well as José Martí, "La Conferencia Monetaria de las Repúblicas de América. La Revista Ilustrada. Nueva York may 1891," in OC, 6 (1975): 157-172. For Rizal's reflections on the United States, see *Publicaciones de la Comisión Nacional del Centenario de José Rizal, Escritos de José Rizal*, vol. 1 (*Diarios y memorias*) [Diaries and Memoirs], (Manila: Comisión Nacional del Centenario de José Rizal, 1961), 226.

⁴ Eric Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780: Program, Myth, Reality* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 102.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ This was reflected in the representation of Cuba and Puerto Rico in the Spanish Cortes after 1871, while the Philippines would have to wait to be admitted until 1893. By then, Rizal had already been exiled to the island of Dapitan for two years, in which time the revolutionary society or *Katipunan*, led by Andres Bonifacio, had begun to attract members.

⁷ See John Schumacher, *The Propaganda Movement 1880-1895: the creators of a Filipino consciousness, the Makers of revolution* (Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, n.d. [1972]), 51-53 and 155.

⁸ Charles Morris, *Our Island Empire* (New York and Los Angeles: The R. H. Whitten Company, 1899), vi.

⁹ The point of departure for these observations is the work of Julio Ramos: see *Divergent Modernities of Latin America: Culture and Politics in the Nineteenth Century*, trans. John Blanco (Durham: Duke University Press, 2001). For a discussion of the impact of North American modernity as a point of departure for mapping out the future(s) of Latin American identity, see the discussions of Argentine writer and president of the republic Domingo Faustino Sarmiento, in Mary Louise Pratt, *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation* (London: Routledge, 1992), 189-193.

¹⁰ José Antonio Saco, *Contra la anexión*, ed. Fernando Ortiz (Havana: S.A. Cultural, 1928).

¹¹ Quoted in Ramos, *Divergent Modernities*, 150.

¹² The following quotations of this essay are taken from José Martí, OC, 6: 15-23 ("Nuestra América"). An English translation of this essay appears as an appendix to Julio Ramos, *Divergent Modernities*.

¹³ This is one of the main theses behind Angel Rama's sketch of the "politicized polis" at the turn of the nineteenth century: see *La ciudad letrada* (Hanover, NH: Ediciones del Norte, 1984), 105-133.

¹⁴ In juxtaposition to Martí's ethico-political concern over the question of national state consolidation in Cuba, José Enrique Rodó's *Ariel* and Darío's overtly political writings focused on the cultivation of a pan-Latinist cosmopolitan aesthetic, which saw the American continent as the very embodiment of the struggle between opposed linguistic and cultural identities. For Rodó, the Americas represented no less than the divergence between the inhumanity of gross materialism ("nordomanía") and the "impenetrable chamber" ("la estancia impenetrable") of aesthetic

subjectivity and integrity or wholeness: see *Ariel: Liberalismo y jacobinismo* (Mexico City: Editorial Porrúa, S.A., 1991 [orig. pub. 1900]), 15-16. With the triumph of the Mexican revolution in 1910, Mexican minister of culture José Vasconcelos would echo Rodó's emphasis on the contemplation of aesthetic finality or integrity, as both a defining characteristic of a redeemed "cosmic race" and the overcoming of contradictions brought about by Latin America's uneven reception of modern institutions: see *La raza cósmica* (Mexico City: Espasa-Calpe Mexicana, S.A. 1992 [orig. pub. 1948]), esp. 37-53 (part 3).

¹⁵ See Efrén Rivera Ramos, "The Legal Construction of American Colonialism: The Insular Cases (1901-1922)" in *Revista Jurídica Universidad de Puerto Rico* 65:2 (1996), especially 240-261.

¹⁶ See John Schumacher, *Propaganda Movement*, 40-42.

¹⁷ Quoted in Schumacher, 42.

¹⁸ José Rizal, *Noli me tangere* (1886; Madrid: Ediciones de Cultura Hispánica, 1992), 555. Unless otherwise noted, all translations from the Spanish are mine.

¹⁹ Nick Joaquin, *A Question of Heroes* (Manila: National Bookstore, 1981, c1977), 78.

²⁰ José Rizal, *El filibusterismo* (1891; Manila: National Historical Society, 1993), 47 (my translation).

²¹ W.E.B. duBois, *The Souls of Black Folk* (New York: Signet Classic, 1995; orig. pub. 1903), p. 3.

²² A recent contribution to the debate on Rizal's position vis-à-vis the revolution is Floro Quibuyen's *A Nation Aborted: Rizal, American hegemony, and Philippine nationalism* (Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, c1999).

²³ Simón Bolívar: *Escritos políticos* (Madrid: Alianza Editorial, S.A., 1979), 76.

²⁴ See, for example, Ranajit Guha, *Elementary Aspects of the Peasant Insurgency in Colonial India* (Delhi: Oxford University Press India, 1983).

²⁵ Rizal, *El filibusterismo*, 284.

²⁶ See Benedict Anderson, "Hard To Imagine?" in *The Spectre of Comparisons* (London: Verso Books, 1998), 235-261. Since the passing of the Rizal Bill in 1946, Rizal's novels are mandatory reading in secondary education. In accordance with the dual lingua franca of English and "Filipino" promulgated in the post-Commonwealth (1936) constitution, the novels are taught in English and Tagalog. For a summary of the lingua franca in the Philippines, see Romeo V. Cruz, "Ang Nasyonalismo at Wika" in *Mga Piling Diskurso sa Wika at Lipunan*, eds. Pamela C. Constantino and Monico M. Atienza (Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press, 1996), 3-9.

²⁷ José Martí, OC, 21: 107.

²⁸ Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, especially 47-65 and 80-82.

²⁹ Two important examples of this thought can be found in Manuel Pizarro's account of the state of the colony in 1812 (see "State of the Philippines in 1810," in Emma Blair and James Robertson [eds.], *The Philippine Islands*, v. 51, Cleveland: The Arthur Clarke Company, 1907), and Sinibaldo de Mas, *Report on the Conditions of the Philippines in 1842* (pt. 3), trans. Dr. Carlos Botor (Manila: National Historical Conservation Society, 1963).

³⁰ Frederick Jackson Turner, *The Frontier in American History* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1921), quoted in hypertext version of the same edition by the University of Virginia Department of English (xroads.virginia.edu/~HYPER/TURNER/), last modified Tuesday, 30 September 1997. The first essay, "The Significance of the American Frontier," was originally delivered at the American Historical Association Meeting held at the 1893 World's Columbian Exhibition in Chicago (the Chicago World's Fair) on June 12, 1893.

³¹ Indeed, one may extend this critique to all countries with a colonial history. In different ways, Homi Bhaba, Partha Chatterjee, and Carol Hau have underlined this perpetually "unfinished" character of the nation: see Homi Bhaba, "DissemiNation: time, narrative, etc.," in *Nation and Narration*, ed. Homi K. Bhaba (London: Routledge, 1990), 290-322; Partha Chatterjee, "Whose Imagined Community?" in *The Nation and Its Fragments* (Princeton: Princeton University Press,

1993), 3-13; Carol Hau, *Necessary Fictions: Philippine Literature and the Nation, 1946-1980* (Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 2000).

³² Turner, *The Frontier in American History* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1921), quoted in hypertext version by the University of Virginia Department of English (xroads.virginia.edu/~HYPER/TURNER/), last modified Tuesday, 30 September 1997. One may argue that the highly interpretive, perhaps "Western" (re)reading of the Constitution allowed for hybrid categories, such as the doctrine of Territorial Incorporation, to reconcile and account for the contradictions between imperial conquest and the prohibition against "taxation without representation."

³³ See Ricardo Piglia, "Notas sobre Facundo" in *Punto de Vista* 3, no. 8 (1980): 12-20. A partial translation of this article appears under the title "Sarmiento's Vision," in *Sarmiento and His Argentina*, ed. Joseph Criscenti (Boulder, CO: L. Rienner Publishers, 1993), 71-76.

³⁴ It would be important to highlight the continental stretch of Martí's reading public: in his career as a journalist, he wrote in English and Spanish for both North and South American newspapers, oftentimes underlining his liminal position with respect to both reading publics in order to authenticate his unique interpretation of events. For a discussion of this strategy, see Julio Ramos's analysis of Martí's chronicle "Coney Island" in *Divergent Modernities*, 210-213. An English translation of Martí's essay appears as Appendix 3 to the volume.

³⁵ Martí, OC, 6: 16-17..

³⁶ See Susanna Rotker, *The American chronicles of José Martí : journalism and modernity in Spanish America*, trans. Jennifer French and Katherine Semler (Hanover, NH : University Press of New England, 2000).

³⁷ Martí, OC, 6: 21.

³⁸ Walter Benjamin, "Central Park" in *New German Critique* 34 (Winter 1985): 49. Like Benjamin, Martí's allegorical impulse reflected his perception of modernity as a perpetual state of emergency or exception, which undermined the very possibility of democratic republicanism on the one hand, and aesthetic representation, on the other. The signature essay that reflects Martí's recourse to allegory as a self-effacing, self-dismantling aesthetic is his "Prólogo al Poema del Niágara" (translated as "Prologue to the *Poema del Niágara*" in Ramos, *Divergent Modernities*, appendix 2).

³⁹ Martí, OC, 6: 18.

⁴⁰ José Martí, *Sus mejores páginas* (Mexico City: Editorial Porrúa, S.A., 1985), 74 ("Carta a Federico Martínez Carvajal").

⁴¹ Martí, OC, 6:22.

⁴² In the case of Rizal, Renato Constantino's critique of Rizal as a useful tool for U.S. imperialism at the turn of the century still generates controversy in present scholarship: see "Veneration Without Understanding" in *Dissent and Counter-Consciousness* (Manila: Renato Constantino, 1970), 125-145; and Floro Quibuyen (*supra* note 20). In the case of Martí, Cuban president Fidel Castro's invocation of Martí as the father of the Cuban revolution is well known; less known is Angel Rama's critique of Latin Americanism as an ideology that served to further marginalize oppressed and unrepresented sectors of the continent's population from political life. See Fidel Castro, quoted in Ramón Eduardo Ruíz, *Cuba: The Making of a Revolution* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1970), 58; and Angel Rama, *La ciudad letrada*, 125.

⁴³ The basis for these reflections is Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari's discussion of "major" and "minor" uses of language in *A Thousand Plateaus" Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, trans. Brian Massumi (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1982), 105-6.