

Between the Empires: Martí, Rizal and the Limits of Global Resistance

by

Koichi Hagimoto

B.A., Soka University of America, 2005

M.A., University of Pittsburgh, 2007

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
School of Arts and Sciences in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

University of Pittsburgh

2010

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH
SCHOOL OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

This dissertation was presented

by

Koichi Hagimoto

It was defended on

April 21, 2010

and approved by

Juan Duchesne-Winter, Professor, Hispanic Languages and Literatures

Daniel Balderston, Professor, Hispanic Languages and Literatures

Alejandro de la Fuente, Professor, History

Dissertation Advisor:

Joshua Lund, Associate Professor, Hispanic Languages and Literatures

Copyright © by Koichi Hagimoto

2010

Between the Empires: Martí, Rizal and the Limits of Global Resistance

Koichi Hagimoto, PhD

University of Pittsburgh, 2010

This dissertation aims to compare and contrast an aspect of the *fin-de-siècle* literature and history of anti-imperialism in Cuba and the Philippines. I focus my study on what may be the most prominent authors of the two contexts: José Martí (1853-1895) and José Rizal (1861-1896). Although scholars such as Benedict Anderson and Leopoldo Zea have already noted the obvious relations between Martí and Rizal, their anti-imperial texts have not been systematically compared. Caught between the two empires (Spain and the United States), their projects were equally overwhelming: while studying the history of the failed independence movement in their respective colonies, they attempted to transform the dilemmas of imperial culture into the building blocks for national liberation. Based on this historico-political premise, my study attempts to explore how Martí and Rizal employ different literary forms to articulate their discourse of protest and to what extent their political writings create the conditions of possibility for a transnational, inter-colonial form of resistance against imperial domination.

One of the central contentions of this dissertation is that the two writers' anti-imperial texts construct the conceptual framework for the idea of what I call "global resistance." By this, I mean to indicate the ways in which Cubans and Filipinos shared certain anti-colonial ideas and struggles against common opponents in the nineteenth century. Through literary analysis and historical study, I intend to examine both the possibilities and the limits of global resistance. The project involves diverse cultural points of reference, ranging from the Caribbean to Asia and seeking to participate in the ongoing debate within the field of Trans-Pacific Studies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	VII
INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.0 CUBA, THE PHILIPPINES AND GLOBAL RESISTANCE.....	17
1.1 HISTORY OF SPANISH IMPERIALISM IN CUBA AND THE PHILIPPINES.....	19
1.2 RECENT STUDIES ON THE CUBA-PHILIPPINES NEXUS	26
1.3 THE COMMUNICATION BETWEEN MARIANO PONCE AND JOSÉ ALBERTO IZQUIERDO	33
1.4 LA REPÚBLICA CUBANA AND LA SOLIDARIDAD	48
2.0 THEATRICAL PERFORMANCE IN THE MANIFESTO: COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF MARTÍ’S “MANIFIESTO DE MONTECRISTI” (1895) AND RIZAL’S “FILIPINAS DENTRO DE CIEN AÑOS” (1889-1890)	61
2.1 HISTORICAL BACKGROUND	65
2.2 THEATRICAL PERFORMANCE OF THE MANIFESTO FORM	70
2.3 MARTÍ AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF CUBAN “PEOPLE”	76
2.4 RIZAL AND THE FORMULATION OF FILIPINO “RACE”	87

3.0	WRITING THE MELODRAMA: GENDER RELATIONS AND THE DISCOURSE OF RESISTANCE IN NOLI ME TANGERE (1885) AND LUCÍA JEREZ (1887)	101
3.1	RIZAL, MARTÍ AND THE NARRATIVE OF MELODRAMA	102
3.2	THE (NON)NATIONAL ASPECT OF NOLI ME TANGERE	105
3.3	THE POSSIBILITY OF RESISTANCE IN DOÑA VICTORINA AND DOÑA CONSOLACIÓN	113
3.4	LUCÍA JEREZ AND LATIN AMERICAN <i>MODERNISMO</i>	123
3.5	LUCÍA'S IMPERIALISM AND ITS FAILURE	132
4.0	TIME FOR FILIBUSTEROS: RIZAL AND MARTÍ CONFRONT THE MODERN EMPIRE	146
4.1	THE NINETEENTH-CENTURY UNITED STATES	147
4.2	RIZAL'S "INDIOS BRAVOS"	151
4.3	THE FILIPINO FILIBUSTEROS	157
4.4	MARTÍ'S EMERSON AND THE IDEA OF NATURE	167
4.5	NATURE'S VIOLENCE IN "EL TERREMOTO DE CHARLESTON"	176
4.6	THE CREATION OF THE "HOMBRE NATURAL" IN "NUESTRA AMÉRICA"	180
	CONCLUSION	189
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	194

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This dissertation would not have been possible without the support of innumerable individuals. First I would like to thank my adviser, Joshua Lund, whose critical insights and emotional support have always encouraged me to work hard and to follow my interest in the relationship between Latin America and Asia. I am also fortunate to have great scholars and colleagues in my committee. Juan Duchesne-Winter and Alejandro de la Fuente have provided me with the necessary background of Caribbean history and culture. Through many discussions in and outside of the classroom, I was able to deepen my understanding of Cuba and thus to analyze Martí's writings. When Daniel Balderston came to Pittsburgh in 2008, he kindly accepted my request to be the last member of the committee. Dan was always supportive and gave me important feedback in numerous occasions. Moreover, I must also thank Jody Blanco from the University of California-San Diego who reviewed the earlier version of this project and helped me become familiar with Filipino literature and history.

At the University of Pittsburgh, I was fortunate to have received two kinds of financial support. The travel grant provided by the University Center for International Studies allowed me to conduct archival research at the National Library of the Philippines during the summer of 2009, while the Andrew Mellon Pre-Doctoral Fellowship gave me the necessary time to focus on this dissertation during my last year in the Department of Hispanic Languages and Literatures. I am also thankful to the department's staff members—Deborah Truhan, Connie Tomko and Lucy

DiStazio—for helping me survive the intense years of graduate studies from the beginning to the end.

I owe a great debt of gratitude to many others who have given me tremendous emotional support over the past five years. Here, I would like to acknowledge my special thanks to Alaina Farabaugh, Betina González, Jorge Azcárate, and Jungwon Park. In addition, I am deeply grateful to my family for their constant support and encouragement. Without really understanding the significance of my project or my passion for Latin America, they have always stood by my side. Lastly, I would like to express my enormous gratitude to my mentor, Daisaku Ikeda, for teaching me about Martí and Rizal in the first place and for always having faith in me. To him I dedicate this dissertation.

INTRODUCTION

The 1898 Spanish-American War represented one of the most drastic changes in modern world history: an old empire was replaced by a new one, indicating not only the end of a historical phase led by Europe, but also the coming of an entirely new, modern era. A central aspect of this historical shift was a surprising link between two geographically remote countries. As a result of the war, Cuba and the Philippines almost simultaneously achieved their “independence” from Spain, though they were at once converted into targets of an ascendant U.S. expansionism. Caught between the two empires, Cubans and Filipinos shared similar experiences of colonial injustice as well as struggles for national independence. Equally notable is the presence of a transoceanic circuit of ideas that would juxtapose both colonies under the same sphere of anti-imperial resistance. These ideas are articulated by various writers and political actors from the Caribbean and Southeast Asia, symbolizing a particular cultural politics of trans-Pacific networks.

This dissertation aims to compare and contrast an aspect of the *fin-de-siècle* literature and history of anti-imperialism in Cuba and the Philippines. I focus my study on what may be the most prominent nationalist authors of the two contexts: José Martí (1853-1895) and José Rizal (1861-1896). Although scholars such as Benedict Anderson (1998; 2005) and Leopoldo Zea (1981) have already noted the obvious relations between Martí and Rizal, their anti-imperial texts have not been systematically compared. It is easy to see how overwhelming the two

writers' projects were: while studying the history of the failed independence movement in their respective contexts, they attempted to transform the dilemmas of imperial culture into the building blocks for national liberation. Grounding my study in this historico-political premise, I ask: What is the relationship between the political writings of Martí and Rizal? How do they reconcile, or combine, anti-imperialism and nationalism? How do they employ literary and political writings to articulate their discourse of protest, and what are the limits of such discursive practices? What are the implications of their shared ideology in a larger historical framework of nineteenth-century Latin America? And lastly, to what extent do they create the conditions of possibility for a cross-cultural, globalized form of resistance against imperial domination?

Even at a basic, biographical level, we can recognize numerous parallels in the life of Martí and Rizal.¹ Zea examines their similarly patriotic, anti-imperial ideas and, somewhat hyperbolically, regards the Filipino writer as the Cuban's "hermano gemelo" (175).² Though the two writers came from different backgrounds (Martí was a son of *criollo* family, whereas Rizal was a *mestizo*, mixture of *indio*-Chinese-Spanish),³ they equally spent important years in the Spanish metropolis and even studied at the same university.⁴ Both pointed out the problem of

¹ For their biographies, I rely on the two canonical texts: Jorge Mañach's José Martí: El apóstol and León Ma. Guerrero's The First Filipino: A Biography of José Rizal.

² Zea writes that "[Rizal] puede y debe estar al lado de los grandes hispanoamericanos, al lado de los libertadores y maestros de nuestra América. Al lado de Bolívar, Morelos, Juárez, Mora y Justo Sierra; al lado de José Martí su hermano gemelo, al lado de América; al lado de Bilbao, Lastrarria, Montalvo, González Prada y tantos otros que hicieron del español instrumento de liberación" (175). While Zea's comparison points to a necessarily expansive Latinoamericanism which seeks to include the Philippines, it ultimately eschews the complex historical context of each figure.

³ The term "indio" was used differently in the Philippines than in Spanish America. In the Philippines, "indios" referred to the people of indigenous ancestry who were 'inside' Catholic evangelization and 'unmixed' in blood, representing the masses of lowland peoples (Kramer 39). It is also important to note that during the colonial period the category of "Filipinos" did not have the contemporary connotation that we associate today with native Filipinos. From the sixteenth century to the nineteenth century, "Filipinos" meant the Spaniards born in the Philippines: they were known as *insulares* or *criollos* and distinguished from *peninsulares* (the Spaniards born in Spain).

⁴ Martí studied Law and Philosophy in Madrid and Zaragoza between 1871 and 1874, and Rizal studied Medicine

importing foreign models and underlined the significance of the art of “good governance” in order to establish a new, free republic. Although one advocated more explicitly the idea of independence than the other, they similarly discovered in literature significant tools to construct a unified national identity *vis-à-vis* an imperial power.⁵ As a result of their efforts to advocate freedom, the two revolutionaries fell into the hands of the Spaniards only within seventeen months of each other: Martí was killed in the battlefield, while Rizal was accused of instigating a rebellion he did not support and was executed without an official trial. Since their martyrdom, they have become iconic figures of nationalism and anti-imperial resistance in their respective countries. Today both Martí and Rizal remain at the epicenter of Cuban and Filipino national hagiography, regarded by many as the “apostles” both inside and outside the countries, though more critical scholarship tends to be produced abroad.⁶

John Blanco calls these connections between the two lives “a series of ghostly parallels” (2004, 93). The characterization of their similarities as “ghostly” seems appropriate in three related aspects. First, despite the overlaps in their biographies, they never actually met face-to-face, and there is an almost implausible silence about each other in their voluminous writings. Second, their relationship can be understood as “ghostly” because, even after their untimely deaths at the end of the nineteenth century, Martí and Rizal’s political thoughts had considerable

and Philosophy in Madrid from 1882 to 1885, both enrolled in the Universidad Central de Madrid.

⁵ Whereas Martí’s *independentista* stance accepted neither autonomy nor assimilation as an alternative to Cuba’s freedom, Rizal was a *reformista* interested in the possibility of his country’s socio-political reforms rather than a radical independence from the Spanish empire. Rizal’s anti-imperial politics were therefore twofold. On the one hand, as a Filipino intellectual concerned about the future of his *patria*, he certainly desired an independent nationhood. Nonetheless, his cultural affiliation with Spain led him to conclude that the best option for his countrymen was assimilation, which meant the country’s greater political participation in the Spanish Parliament, its juridical representation in the Cortes to expose the colonizers’ abuses in public, and more religious involvement in the creation of secular institutions. Rizal’s ambiguous position in terms of his involvement in the Filipino revolution continues to be a polemical theme. See, for instance, Ocampo (1990) and Delmendo (1998).

⁶ Critical studies on Martí and Rizal’s writings are extensive. Some of the most important scholarships on Martí include, for example, Ramos (1989), Belnap and Fernández (1999), Rotker (2000), and Montero (2004). For Rizal, see Anderson (1983, 2005), Rafael (1988, 2005), and Blanco (2004).

influence on the formation of Cuban and Filipino identities throughout the twentieth century. While Fidel Castro famously referred to Martí as “the intellectual author” of the Moncada attack in 1953, the legacy of Rizal in the twentieth-century Philippines was perhaps best described by Claro Recto’s 1962 statement that “A True Filipino is a Rizalist” (Delmendo 35).

Moreover, we can also see how the two figures continue to haunt Cuba and the Philippines in our present day. Their names are celebrated in streets, parks, buildings, stamps, post cards, and currency. In Manila, Rizal’s image silently permeates the public space: his statue, placed in “Rizal Park” and always guarded by soldiers, marks the focal destination for anyone visiting the city and represents the object of devotion for a certain group of people who worship him as a saint. The day he was executed by the colonizers (December 30th) is celebrated annually as a national holiday, known as “Rizal Day.” His picture is placed in every classroom, and Filipino children, to this day, are required to take a course on his life and work. If we turn our attention to Cuba, Martí’s monument also quietly watches over people’s lives in the center of Havana, together with the José Martí Memorial. The statue occupies the Plaza de la Revolución where Fidel Castro has delivered many of his lengthy discourses. Martí’s revolutionary ideas continue to represent ideological weapons for the new generations of Cubans in the country as well as those in Miami’s exiled community.⁷ In addition, his literary work, especially his poetry, is part of the basic national literary curriculum for Cuban school children living both on and off the island. Considering the two figures’ spectral presence and preeminent positions in their respective national pantheons, it is easy to understand why the cultural and socio-political realities of Cuba and the Philippines cannot be discussed without mentioning these two “heroes.”

⁷ Alfred J. López studies different ways in which people in Havana and Miami attempt to define national identities through their own interpretations of Martí’s political texts. See José Martí and the Future of Cuban Nationalisms (2006), especially chapters 1 and 2.

In this sense, my dissertation grapples with, on the one hand, the unavoidable task of confronting the phantoms of Martí and Rizal in their historical contexts and, on the other hand, an attempt to disperse those images through a critical reading of their texts.

Most importantly for this project, the parallels between the two lives are reflected in Martí and Rizal's shared ideas of anti-imperialism directed toward both Spain and the United States. Through different literary forms, Martí and Rizal not only criticize the Spanish colonial project but also foreshadow the threatening emergence of modern U.S. imperialism. Referring to the old empire, Martí already states in 1873 that “[d]erecho de opresión y de explotación vergonzosa y de persecución encarnizada ha usado España perpetuamente sobre Cuba” (Obras completas de José Martí [O.C.]: vol. 1, 91). For his part, Rizal writes his first anti-colonial novel, Noli me tangere, with the explicit purpose of unmasking the hypocrisy of the Spanish colonial authority in the Philippines. Later, both writers equally predict the imminent danger of the new empire, although Martí studies this potential menace more thoroughly than Rizal: his vision goes beyond a call for Cuba's national independence and entails the project of liberating the entire continent. In 1894, Martí alerts Latin America that “es preciso que se sepa en nuestra América la verdad de los Estados Unidos,” (O.C.: vol. 20, 290), attempting to prevent “que se extiendan por las Antillas los Estados Unidos y caigan, con esa fuerza más, sobre nuestras tierras de América” (O.C.: vol. 20, 161). Likewise, the Filipino author perceives the rise of U.S. hegemony in 1890: “Acaso la gran República Americana, cuyos intereses se encuentran en el Pacífico y que no tienen participación en los despojos de África, piense un día en posesiones ultramarinas” (“Filipinas dentro de cien años”: IV, 48). Arguing that “[l]a América del Norte sería una rival demasiado molesta, si una vez practica el oficio,” Rizal settles on the idea that the U.S. may attempt to dominate the Philippines when the current phase of the Age of European

Imperialism comes to an end (IV, 48). In diverse ways, the practice of writing provides both authors with a means to express their nationalist ideologies in relation to the two imperial projects that concern the future of Cuba, the Philippines and Latin America.

One of the contentions of this dissertation is that the two writers' anti-imperial texts participate in the construction of the conceptual framework for the idea of what I call "global resistance." By the term "global resistance," I mean to indicate the ways in which Cubans and Filipinos shared certain anti-colonial ideas and struggles against common opponents in the nineteenth century. This collaboration, even if unstable, is notable in the history of decolonization for historical, geographical and political reasons. Historically, coming at the cusp of the twentieth century, the Cuban and Filipino independence movements are at the beginning of a new stage of anti-imperial collaboration that will reach its climax with the Bandung Conference of non-aligned nations in 1955 and the consolidation of what is today often called the "Global South." Geographically, the mere fact of the trans-oceanic distance between the two island countries speaks to new possibilities of global collaboration. Politically, both movements are liberal in nature, but with an edge of social protest that speaks to the expansion of capitalism in the form of modern imperialism. Ideologically, Martí and Rizal were at the center of this particular history. It is through a basic framework of early global resistance that I propose to read their anti-imperialist writings.

Moreover, my invocation of "global resistance" owes an important debt to Benedict Anderson's recent book, Under Three Flags: Anarchism and Anti-Colonial Imagination (2005). In the book, he suggests that some nineteenth-century texts in Cuba and the Philippines may reveal how the two countries shared the same objective of national independence from the Spanish empire. According to the author,

Natives of the last important remnants of the fabled Spanish global empire, Cubans (as well as Puerto Ricans and Dominicans) and Filipinos did not merely read about each other, but had crucial personal connections and, up to a point, coordinated their actions—the first time in world history that such transglobal coordination became possible. (2)

Despite this rather scanty reference to what he calls “early globalization” (3), Anderson never fully discusses or expands the concept throughout his book. Besides the minor influence that some Filipino exiles in Europe might have received from Cuban revolutionaries, he does not present a compelling argument concerning the trans-oceanic connections. As Sunil Amrith rightfully points out, “at no point does Anderson show reciprocal influence, from the Philippines back to Cuba” and therefore “[t]he links in Anderson’s global chain often seem in danger of coming apart” (230).

Anderson’s lack of attention to the historical links between Cuba and the Philippines can be partly explained by his emphasis on the global circulation of European anarchist inspirations. For him, the linkage between the two former Spanish colonies is significant only because it constitutes a hub of anarchist movements in the late nineteenth century. The book’s introduction makes clear that the author’s goal is to “map the gravitational force of anarchism between militant nationalism on opposite sides of the planet” (2). In other words, the colonized subject and its resistance to imperial power can be situated only within the system of this “gravitational force of anarchism” produced in Europe. Such configuration unavoidably presents Cuban and Filipino actors as marginal subjects whose literary productions are determined exclusively in terms of Western ideologies. What Anderson seems to overlook is the possibility for the colonies to create their *own* political agenda that is separate from a larger anarchist project. Rather than viewing the Cuba-Philippines nexus through a European lens, my study of global resistance aims to highlight the anti-imperial concepts that emanate from the colonies themselves. One of the purposes of this project is, therefore, to examine the potential agency

capable of constructing a collaborative force against Empire and/or Imperialism (as categories that subsume both Spain and the U.S.).

At the same time, both my discussion regarding the globalized form of resistance and my comparative approach to the histories of the Caribbean and Southeast Asia point to a particular terrain whose characteristic is *trans-Pacific*. That is, my study reveals the cultural politics of the trans-Pacific circuit that involves Latin America and Asia. The so-called “Trans-Pacific studies” that seek to examine the cultural as well as historical relationships between the two regions have only begun to attract critics’ serious attention in recent years.⁸ For scholars of Latin American literary and cultural studies, one of the most pressing issues lies in the examination of Filipino literature whose extensive history of Spanish colonialism produced texts written in the imperial language.⁹ Nevertheless, as Adam Lifshey has recently noted, “[m]yriad transpacific analyses that set Spanish-language Filipino literature alongside its Latin American counterparts are still to be formulated” (1441). The study of Filipino culture and literature in comparison with other Spanish colonies requires the reconsideration of the traditional category of “Latin America,” which is too often reduced to the terms of apparent geographical boundaries. The Philippines do not constitute part of “Latin America” from the conventional Area Studies model, but the juxtaposition of the Asian archipelago and the Caribbean island illuminates that they equally belong to the Hispanic imperialist trajectory. As we shall see in Chapter 1, the Philippines were as important as Cuba was for Spain’s project of reconstructing its imperial power during the nineteenth century. In the same way, the U.S. saw a potential source of economic profits and political exploitation in both countries when the war of 1898 was provoked. From this perspective, we can argue that the Philippines played (and still continue to play in some respects)

⁸ See, for example, López-Calvo (2007) and Pierce and Otsuka (2009).

⁹ See, for example, Fradera (2005) and Schmidt-Nowara (2006).

a vital role in the formation of Latin America's colonial history. My dissertation, by its very nature, seeks to expand the canon of "Latin American" literature and history to include the cultural production of the Spanish colony in Asia.

The dissertation consists of four chapters: the first chapter focuses on a historical analysis that discusses *direct* contact between Cuba and the Philippines under Spanish colonialism, while the remaining chapters involve literary analyses which intend to examine an *indirect* relationship between the two colonies through a comparison of Martí and Rizal's anti-imperial writings. Chapter 1 studies the historical exchange represented by various Cubans and Filipinos between 1896 and 1898, that is, subsequent to Martí and Rizal's deaths. My purpose of beginning this project with a historical study of the post-1896 period lies in exploring some tangible communications between the two Spanish colonies. Even though Martí and Rizal never met or mentioned each other during their lives, those who were influenced by their national and anti-imperial visions would later interact with one another through the form of correspondence and journal articles. For example, the letter exchanges between the Filipino Mariano Ponce and the Cuban José Alberto Izquierdo show that they not only shared similar anti-colonial ideologies but also manifested reciprocal support for each other's struggle for independence. Ponce's Cartas sobre la revolución (1897-1900) broaches the possibility of global resistance in terms of the historical interplay between political actors from diverse colonial contexts.

Moreover, another form of the trans-Pacific link emerges through the journals in which Cuban and Filipino writers expressed mutual support for their respective independence movements. My analysis of La República Cubana (1896-1897) and La Solidaridad (1889-1895) aims to show that people from different corners of the globe were aware of each other's fight against the common enemy, the Spanish empire. The possibility of global resistance appears in

these journals because they represent an instrument through which Cuban revolutionaries encourage their “allies” in Asia and vice versa. For instance, an article in La República Cubana maintains that Cuba will energetically support the Philippines with the slogan “¡Viva Filipinas Libre!” while another text in La Solidaridad claims that the Caribbean island should have the right to achieve freedom. In the nineteenth century, these articles were produced while thinking about the “other” colonized subject: the Cuban periodical was studied by Filipinos in Hong Kong and the Philippines, and the Filipino newspaper was sent to the Cubans residing in the United States. That is to say, the editorial offered a particular space of print community in which writers from the two regions came to interact with one another, creating the essential condition for a Caribbean-Asia communication.

However, further reading of Ponce’s letters and various journal articles reveals some limits of the idea of global resistance. In order to discuss this point, I rely on Susan Buck-Morss’s discourse on the problematic metaphor of “slavery” in her well-known essay, “Hegel and Haiti.” Buck-Morss convincingly argues that many thinkers of the Enlightenment period (e.g. Locke, Rousseau and Kant) employed the symbol of “slavery” in their conceptualization of Western political philosophy, often disregarding real slavery in the colonies governed by European imperial powers. By depicting “slavery” as a conceptual category, Buck-Morss argues, these theorists failed to articulate the material and historical significance of actually-existing slavery. The same application of the “slavery” metaphor appears in Cartas sobre la revolución and La República Cubana, both of which refer to the term “slavery” on several occasions but never point to the legacy of slavery as a historical practice. These references do not represent slavery as an authentic historical event but rather as an all-embracing metaphor that embodies colonial violence in general. To refer to slavery as a metaphor and not a reality—

especially within the context of an island completely overdetermined by it—seems problematic, because it shows how the concept of transnational network exists only in an ideological sphere. In other words, the collective anti-imperial project proposed by Ponce and Izquierdo depends on a certain disguising of reality with theory. The global resistance, therefore, represents a kind of ideological exercise practiced by members of the educated elite.

While the first chapter illustrates the interactions between some Cuban and Filipino actors at the turn of the century, the origin of such contact is found in the anti-imperial impulse invoked earlier by Martí and Rizal. On the one hand, the two authors seek to define national identities in their respective colonies and to theorize the notion of what it means to be Cuban or Filipino. On the other hand, their texts similarly problematize the imperial project of Spain and the United States by using various rhetorical tools. With these basic assumptions, the rest of my dissertation discusses different ways in which Martí and Rizal confront the two empires through the practice of writing. My comparative study of their ideologies aims to illuminate how and to what extent their shared anti-imperial concepts symbolize the globalized form of resistance to imperial power. Once again, my purpose in this dissertation is to examine global resistance through both historical study (e.g. the communication between Ponce and Izquierdo) and literary analysis (e.g. the comparison of Martí and Rizal's anti-imperial writings).

Diverse literary forms concern the following sections, including the manifesto, the novel and the chronicle. In Chapter 2, I focus on the genre of the manifesto and study Martí's "Manifiesto de Montecristi" (1895) and Rizal's "Filipinas dentro de cien años" (1889-1890). In order to produce national solidarity as a viable response to the Spanish imperial agenda, the two writers similarly turn to the manifesto form and articulate their discourse of nationalism and anti-imperialism. My analysis explores an important characteristic of the manifesto genre, which I

call “theatrical performance.” I argue that a manifesto has a performative nature which enables the creation of an imaginary reality based on the author’s particular ideology. It is “imaginary” because the narrative of the text is often *fictional* rather than *factual*, like the world portrayed by a theatrical performance on stage. Similar to the way in which an actor produces an alternative reality to the audience through his/her performative work, the writer uses the manifesto to create a new vision of the world in the eyes of the reader, often invoking urgent and persuasive language. It is this characteristic of “theatrical performance” that allows Martí and Rizal’s manifestos to create a revolutionary narrative. Their performance portrays the ideal future of Cuba and the Philippines which distinguishes itself from the reality shackled by colonialism. For both authors, writing a manifesto means claiming national independence and constructing a subject that would constitute the future republic. By relying on the characteristic of theatrical performance, their texts similarly highlight the importance of imagining a national community capable of resisting the imperial power.

The outcome of such performance is, however, quite different in one text from the other. In an attempt to produce a unified national subject, Martí and Rizal invent distinct categories: the former uses the manifesto’s theatricality to conceptualize the entity of “pueblo” in “Manifiesto de Montecristi,” whereas the latter attempts to construct the idea of “raza” in “Filipinas dentro de cien años.” The peculiar aspect of these national identities lies in their imaginary, fictional and performative nature. Martí’s manifesto argues that “se une aún más el pueblo de Cuba, invencible e indivisible” (O.C., vol. 4, 101), emphasizing the imaginary characteristics of an “invincible” and “indivisible” people in Cuba. On the other hand, Rizal’s essay discusses the “indestructible” feature of the Filipino race by underlining how “es imposible destruir la raza filipina” (IV, 42). In both cases, the emphasis is placed on the desirable circumstance (i.e.

performance) of “indivisibility” and “indestructibility” rather than the reality of colonial life in Cuba and the Philippines. It is the theatrical performance of the manifesto that makes Martí’s “people” and Rizal’s “race” unitary entities of utopianism, imagined based on the authors’ wish. From this perspective, the conceptualization of national identities in their manifestos does not necessarily reflect the actual condition of societies riven by social differences. In the process of performing, therefore, the two writers aim to envision a utopian world in which individuals are homogenized and the differences are erased under the project of nation building and anti-imperial politics.

After studying their manifestos in comparative terms, the subsequent chapter turns to their novels. In particular, my analysis focuses on Martí’s Lucía Jerez (1885) and Rizal’s Noli me tangere (1887). The central concern of Chapter 3 continues to be the two writers’ critical views of Spanish imperialism. However, unlike their manifestos which emphasize the formation of collective identity, their fictional works involve a different kind of thematic issue to problematize the imperial agenda in Cuba, the Philippines and Latin America. What the two novels share is a particular way of describing colonialism through the question of gender relations: they present diverse characters of women and men whose interactions represent certain imperial powers, on the one hand, and the possibility of resistance, on the other. Most importantly, Martí and Rizal reverse the conventional gender roles assigned to women and men, portraying female figures as the ones who possess authority and male individuals as the ones controlled by women.

By examining the gender relationship in these melodramatic novels, I engage in a critical dialogue with Doris Sommer’s concept of “national romance.” In Foundational Fictions: The National Romances of Latin America (1991), Sommer argues that many romantic narratives of

nineteenth-century Latin America present an amorous union between individuals from different classes and ethnicities as a way to resolve conflicts in the emerging republic. Put differently, the idea of a unified couple points to a certain nationalist ideology and proposes a dynamic process of state consolidation. Contrary to her theory, my study seeks to demonstrate how Martí and Rizal construct a different kind of “foundational” narratives in their respective political contexts. Sommer’s “national romance” does not function for the two writers since their novels never show the example of a nationally “productive” couple. In fact, the rejection of such a model is precisely what enables Martí and Rizal to craft the narrative of anti-colonial discourse against the Spanish empire. By refusing to create a harmonious relationship (the essential condition for Sommer), the fictional characters in Lucía Jerez and Noli me tangere similarly intend to criticize the colonizers’ desire for exploitation and to construct an alternative agency upon which the colonized subject is able to defend itself. In other words, both novels reveal the *impossibility* of heterosexual union in order to create a certain condition of possibility for anti-imperial struggle.

Finally, Chapter 4 aims to compare and contrast Martí and Rizal’s perceptions of the other empire: the United States. As I mentioned earlier, the two writers express similar concern about the potential threat of U.S. expansionism at the end of the nineteenth century. However, the way in which they confront the new empire differs from one another. The main concern of this chapter resides in how they appropriate and translate different facets of U.S. society into their own contexts of Latin America and the Philippines. Even though Rizal’s reference to the U.S. is limited, his brief visit to the country in 1888 marks a critical moment in the development of his anti-imperial concepts. One of those concepts is the idea of “indios bravos,” which Rizal introduced when he saw Buffalo Bill’s Wild West in Paris in 1889. The valiant image of the American Indian in the show provided him with an effective tool through which to contemplate

the potential force of his own people, the Filipino “indios.” His conceptualization of the native Filipino is made possible partly due to his translation of an ethnic reality in U.S. culture. That is, he strategically integrates the U.S. into his political discourse of the resistant “indio,” thereby sketching an anti-imperial agenda which would determine the Philippines’ liberation. Moreover, Rizal’s incorporation of the American empire can also be identified by analyzing his second novel, El filibusterismo (1891). In the text, Rizal employs certain U.S. factors to portray the figure of the “filibustero,” the protagonist Simoun, whose resistant character is comparable to that of the “indio bravo.” As a mysterious “filibustero” secretly planning to incite a revolution, Simoun somewhat applies his experience in “la América del Norte” into his plan of destroying the colonial structure in the Philippines. In different ways, therefore, Rizal discovers the source of anti-imperial politics and Filipino nationalism in the modern empire.

On the other hand, Martí spent an extensive period of time (15 years) in the country that he famously called “el monstruo.”¹⁰ Consequently, he produced much more writings on diverse aspects of U.S. society than Rizal. The voluminous writings that Martí penned during his exiled life in New York are commonly known as Escenas norteamericanas (1880-1895). In order to understand Martí’s appropriation of the U.S. empire in the construction of his Latin American discourse, I analyze three important chronicles: “Emerson” (1882), “El terremoto de Charleston” (1886) and “Nuestra América” (1891). What interests me in particular is the way in which Martí develops the notion of “nature” through these seemingly unconnected articles—from the harmonious image of the natural world that he perceives through his translation of Ralph Waldo Emerson’s works to the invocation of Latin American “hombre natural” which, like the character of Rizal’s “filibustero,” symbolizes a significant force of anti-imperial resistance. By examining

¹⁰ In his often-cited letter to Manuel Melcado written the day before his death, Martí states that “Viví en el monstruo, y le conozco las entrañas” (O.C.: vol.4, 168).

these essays together, my goal is to show how Martí integrates the American, Emersonian vision of nature into the particular image of a rebellious figure, “hombre natural,” that represents the defiant gesture of “Nuestra América” toward the U.S. imperial power.

Through these chapters, I aim to highlight Martí and Rizal’s shared ideas and discursive practices against both the Spanish and U.S. empires. My study seeks to not only underline the trans-Pacific link between Cuba and the Philippines, but also propose a deeper appreciation of the Spanish-language Filipino writings which can be understood as part of nineteenth-century “Latin American” literature. Several literary forms allow Martí and Rizal to position themselves in the common space of anti-imperialism through which they disturb mutual opponents and establish a symbolic dialogue that embodies the idea of global resistance. From this perspective, my dissertation is also a contribution to the historiography of the globalization of anti-imperial literature, which will be valuable for the current debate surrounding theories of resistance and protest, especially within the context of Latin American literary and cultural studies.

1.0 CUBA, THE PHILIPPINES AND GLOBAL RESISTANCE

In front of me stream the flags of two geographically remote countries—both islands—one from the Caribbean and the other from the South Pacific. Although there seems to be hardly any link between the two nations on the surface level, it is quite surprising to realize how similar the two flags look. Both contain the tricolor of blue, red, and white, and their basic design is striped with an identical triangle at the hoist. Is this a mere coincidence between distinct cultural contexts? In order to understand this curious resemblance, one needs to return to the late nineteenth-century history of struggles against Spanish imperialism.

This chapter will explore the *fin-de-siècle* anti-colonialism that places political conflicts in Cuba and the Philippines in the same geopolitical sphere. By examining the history of the late nineteenth century, I intend to study some potential encounters and reciprocal influences between these two seemingly unrelated Spanish colonies. Moreover, my study also represents an attempt to expand the traditional scope of what we commonly know as “Latin America.” The Philippines have long been understood as an exception within global geopolitics. Joseph Fradera considers the country “la colonia más peculiar” due to its unique economic development.¹¹ And

¹¹ The notion comes from Fradera’s book, Filipinas, la colonia más peculiar: Las finanzas públicas en la determinación de la política colonial, 1762-1868 (1999), in which he examines the complex interplay of the economic and political system between the metropolis and its Asian colony. Fradera attributes the Filipino “peculiarity” to the unique characteristic of economic development in the Philippines. During the early nineteenth century, the most important component of the Filipino economy was the state sector. It was the fiscal monopolies of the state sustained by the tobacco and alcohol industries that allowed the Spanish empire to maintain its power. In other words, while the colonial system in Cuba and Puerto Rico economically depended on the *external* trade of

even though the Philippines are outside of “Latin America” from an Area Studies perspective, they are explicitly *inside* the Hispanic imperialist trajectory.¹² That is, the Spanish Caribbean and the Spanish Archipelago in Asia share a common history when perceived within a broad picture of the nineteenth-century Hispanic world.

The primary objective of this chapter is twofold. First, I intend to explore different historical conditions in which the Spanish empire exercises its power in Cuba and the Philippines. This comparison reveals that while Creole slave owners symbolize the central agent of exploitation in the Spanish Caribbean, Catholic priests from the Peninsula play a similar role in Southeast Asia. Second, I sketch the outlines of what I call “global resistance” between anti-colonial activists from the two colonies. By this idea, I mean to indicate a particular socio-historical moment when, in the nineteenth century, Cubans and Filipinos not only shared similar anti-colonial ideologies under a common enemy but also manifested reciprocal support for each other’s struggles for national independence. The experience of global resistance exposes the possibility that a globalized, trans-Pacific, anti-colonial form of knowledge already existed in the late nineteenth century, almost half a century prior to the celebrated emergence of a “Third World” consciousness associated with the non-aligned countries of “Global South.” By analyzing several correspondences and newspaper articles, this chapter will examine different ways in which people from the two distant Spanish colonies came to symbolize a political alliance across the ocean and created a large scale atmosphere of anti-imperialism during the final years of the old European empire.

sugar and coffee, the economy in the Philippines was principally based on the profits provided by the *internal* monopoly of tobacco and alcohol products.

¹² In this sense, the Philippines could form a productive part of the “Latinamericanism” that Román de la Campa identifies with a “transnational discursive community” (1). De la Campa’s concept defies readily apparent geographical boundaries and suggests an alternative way to understand the idea of “Latin America.”

1.1 HISTORY OF SPANISH IMPERIALISM IN CUBA AND THE PHILIPPINES

Imperialism has been a constitutive element of world history since the emergence of modernity, represented by the global expansion of Europe, the establishment of nation-states, and the colonization of the New World (Hobson [1902], Lenin [1916], Arendt [1951], and Hobsbawm [1987]). In one of the classic texts on the history of European empires, Imperialism: A Study (1902), Hobson centers his analysis on the development of *fin-de-siècle* imperialism.¹³ During the nineteenth century, the British empire framed the foundation of economic imperialism as stemming from the cultivation of industrial virtues, which created the vital force for liberty and moral progress (Hobson, 7). Toward the end of the nineteenth century, however, the international recognition of the “Great” Britain was increasingly endangered by other imperial forces that were growing at a rapid pace. Russian imperialism extended its power to the Middle and Far East, while the Germans began to compete with the British not only as an economic but also a naval rival in Africa, Northeast Asia and Oceania. By the 1880s, such imperial competition among the European nation-states was further intensified by the dramatic emergence of the United States.

When we look at the historiography of nineteenth-century imperialism, it is easy to realize that the Spanish empire has disappeared almost entirely during the Age of Empire. Scholars have argued that Spain’s political influence had dramatically waned by the mid-nineteenth century and, consequently, the Iberian Peninsula lost its predominant position in

¹³ Hobson studies the economic aspect of modern imperialism through a discourse of Western “parasitism” in the late 1890s. Here, the term “parasitism” refers to the situation in which a few global industrial countries in Europe exercised dominant power in the world. Imperialism, which he calls “a depraved choice of national life” (125), fundamentally endangers the future of world civilization because it “parasitically” exploits the poor in underdeveloped countries in order to enhance economic progress and create industrial foundations for dominant nations. Arendt would famously advance and complicate Hobson’s model in The Origins of Totalitarianism (1951).

Europe.¹⁴ One study suggests that the fall of the Spanish empire exposes its inability to grasp the historical transition toward a modern world: “Los españoles siguen viviendo, en muchos aspectos, en el siglo XVI, sin capacidad para asimilar las ideas del XIX o darse cuenta de que su país no es ya el dueño de los mares ni la potencia dominante de los continentes” (qtd. in Schmidt-Nowara 1998, 41). The decadence of the old empire can also be described as the crisis of its own national project. The central concerns of the metropolis included the absence of stable socio-economic structure that was undermined by the civil war between 1820 and 1823, the reemergence of multiple regionalisms within the country (Basque, Catalan, Galician, etc.), as well as the presence of frequent class conflicts and ideological struggles.¹⁵

Outside the country, the Spanish empire, which had once enjoyed the status of being the world’s most powerful, lost its grandiose fame during the nineteenth-century. Since the loss of the Louisiana Territory in the beginning of the century, Spain was continuously defeated by France and the United States, revealing its incapability to maintain overseas colonies against other imperial powers. The tension that existed within the country also made it difficult for the government to focus entirely on colonial affairs. Most importantly, the wars of independence in South America, led by José de San Martín (1778-1850) and Simón Bolívar (1783-1830), greatly contributed to Spain’s devastating decline in the first third of the century. As a result, the old empire lost almost all the colonial possessions in the New World by 1829. Spain’s growing irrelevance to the history of the modern world is perhaps best described by someone who wrote from one of its last colonies. According to the Cuban Roberto Fernández Retamar, “[e]n el

¹⁴ For some important studies of Spanish imperialism, see Schmitt (1950)—for whom Spain is decisive in forming the modern idea of sovereignty—, Pan-Montojo (1998), Fradera (1999, 2005), and Schmidt-Nowara (1998, 2006).

¹⁵ Throughout the nineteenth century, Spain witnessed disputes between progressives, liberals and conservatives within the country. Following the liberal revolution of 1868, many incidents intensified the pace of political instability in the metropolis: the Restoration of a constitutional monarchy under Amadeo de Saboya (1870), his abdication (1873), the Cavite uprising (1872), the Carlist war (1872), the declaration of the First Republic (1873), its fall (1874), and the Restoration of the Bourbon Monarchy (1874).

último cuarto del siglo XIX, afirmadas ya e incluso en vías de expansión imperialista las potencias capitalistas de Europa y los Estados Unidos, se hace evidente que no sólo los países hispanoamericanos, sino la propia España no se cuentan entre esas potencias” (1995, 145).

Despite the decaying façade of the old empire, the colonial authority was still at work in Cuba and the Philippines during the nineteenth century. In fact, the Caribbean island had played an essential role in the development of the empire in the American continent since the sixteenth century. Havana represented the principal route that enabled trade between the metropolis and its overseas colonies (González Echevarría, xi-xii). Alejandro de la Fuente explains how the arrival of trade ships from different parts of the world made Havana an important port city by the mid-sixteenth century where “peoples and products from virtually all corners of the globe were being constantly shuffled” (2008, 11). In other words, Cuba itself was always a cosmopolitan crossroad, receiving goods, peoples and ideas not only from Spain but from the empire writ large, including Mexico, Peru, and the Philippines.¹⁶ At the same time, Havana was also an administrative hub and thus one of the principal destinations for many Spanish immigrants, government officials and troops.¹⁷

The most notable aspect of the Spanish imperial project in Cuba was undeniably slavery, which constituted the basis of the economic system in the Antillean region. Cuba received

¹⁶ This historical fact reveals that the “trans-pacific” link between Cuba and the Philippines already existed in the sixteenth century. Pacific galleons would first reach Acapulco, Mexico, from Manila. There the goods would be shipped to Havana before arriving in the Spanish metropolis. One of the most important products that reached Havana during that time was silk, especially the Chinese silks. Beginning with the Spanish foundation of Manila in 1571, Chinese and other Asian products (silk, spices, drugs, etc.) enjoyed popularity throughout the New World. Havana was a central figure for this trans-pacific commerce. De la Fuente notes that “[o]n top of their excellent reputation, Chinese silk fabrics—particularly the damasks—enjoyed a clear competitive advantage in Havana, where they were traded at lower prices than those from Spain and Mexico” (2008, 29-30).

¹⁷ Unlike the Philippines, nineteenth-century Cuba enjoyed certain privileges as a Spanish “overseas province”: Cubans had the right to send representatives to the Spanish Parliament; the political domination of the church was relatively little; and there was a similar kind of legal system as in the metropolis together with a secular and state-provided educational system.

approximately 800,000 slaves from Africa between 1791 and 1867, exceeding the 700,000 slaves that were brought to all of Hispanic America between 1521 and 1773 (Curtin 25). The growth of the slave system and the monocultural economy that it would eventually support resulted in a critical division within the country: whereas the West had relatively few slaves with its economy primarily based on cattle-ranching, the East was characterized by huge slave populations dominated by wealthy sugar plantation owners. In many ways, slavery produced a definitive distinction between Cuba and the Philippines under the Spanish colonial regime. The Cuban question of anti-colonialism was directly linked to the anti-slavery movement as a way to unify the country, which then led to the struggle for independence and the emergence of cross-racial nationalism during the nineteenth century (de la Fuente: 2001, 3).

When Spain's other colonies became independent in Latin America, the colonial government imposed stricter regulations in both Cuba and the Philippines than in previous decades. It was Spain's desperate attempt to revitalize its power—a project of imperial regeneration—in order to recuperate its national dignity in the eyes of the rising empires. As Christopher Schmidt-Nowara notes, “el gobierno español en el Caribe y el Pacífico no era la cáscara vacía de una grandeza imperial del pasado, sino un nuevo proyecto colonial a una escala sin precedentes en la larga historia del colonialismo español” (1998, 32). In Cuba, for example, the number of Spanish troops during the two Cuban wars of independence (1868-1878, 1895-1898) was almost nine times higher than all the Spaniards brought to America between 1810 and 1820 to suppress South American independence movements (1998, 32). Though multiple factors must be considered in order to fully understand the complexity of this massive mobilization from Europe to the Caribbean, it is clear that the Spanish government was totally prepared to make

any sacrifice to protect its remaining colony in the Caribbean and the economic profits they could gain from it.

In another corner of the world, the old European empire was also determined to maintain control over its Asian colony. Spain had taken possession of Manila in 1571, designating the colony as “the Philippines” after King Philip II. Because of the great distance from the metropolis, Spain governed the Philippines through the viceroyalty of colonial Mexico until the beginning of the nineteenth century. If Creole plantation owners represented the principal agent of economic exploitation in Cuba, the same can be said about the Spanish friars in the Philippines. Perhaps one of the most striking features of the colonial system in the Philippines was the unity of church and state: while the state offered the military protection and political organization, the church was responsible for promising people’s “spiritual consolidation” and for ensuring their absolute submission to authorities. Since the friars outnumbered government officials in many parts of the country, the clergy was a central figure in the colonial Philippines. As León María Guerrero points out, “[t]he Spanish history of the Philippines begins and ends with the friar” (xiii).

In nineteenth-century Philippines, clerical power almost controlled the colonial government as the religious orders dominated over every aspect of the social life.¹⁸ To borrow David Scott’s words, the church came to symbolize “the systematic redefinition and transformation of the terrain on which the life of the colonized was lived” (205). The friars exploited the natives by imposing excessive taxes, tribute, forced labor, and personal services. Hence, the essential problem of imperialism in the Philippines entailed the domination of the

¹⁸ According to Peter W. Stanley, “[t]he power of the friars derived not only from a logical extension of Spanish colonial theory and from the reality of Catholicism as a cultural force in the archipelago. [...] the friar orders were able to control the government of the archipelago by using their great wealth and their influence at court to win offices for those who would cooperate with them and to remove those who would not” (13).

church, including the prohibition of native Filipinos' admission to the priesthood. As a result of the people's growing resistance to heavy taxation and religious suppression, the country witnessed the rise of various revolts during the nineteenth century.¹⁹

Although the commercial value of the Philippines never reached the dimensions of the Cuban enterprise for the colonizers, the nature of the Spanish colonial regime in the Pacific was somewhat comparable to that of the Caribbean. In Cuba, the colonizers brought massive numbers of African slaves to create one of the world's largest producers of sugar cane.²⁰ Similarly, the deteriorating Spanish empire was desperate to make the most profits out of the Philippines and increased the importation of Filipino tobacco by mid-century, especially after the completion of Suez Canal in 1868. Furthermore, Spain restructured the local economic system in the Philippines by promoting logging and mining for export. This process of reorganization often involved land grabbing by the friars and colonial officials who often sought aggressive modes of exploitation in the islands.²¹

Alongside their distinct roles in the political economy of the empire, there was a significant cultural difference between the two colonies. While degrees of acculturation are notoriously difficult to measure, it is generally understood that the process of "Hispanization" penetrated into the Filipino society less deeply than in the Caribbean. John Leddy Phelan argues that the Philippines were subjected to an "indirect" rather than a "direct" process of Hispanization (134), by which he indicates the isolation of most Filipinos from the Spaniards. It was "indirect" because the imperial project was in large part not conducted in the colonial language but in the still robust local languages, including Tagalog, Visaya, Ilocana, Jolo, and

¹⁹ One of the most important popular revolts took place in 1841 by a religious community known as Cofradía de San José with its charismatic leader, Apolinario de la Cruz (1815-1841).

²⁰ In 1870, Cuba produced 40 per cent of the world's sugar cane (Schmidt-Nowara, 1998: 37).

²¹ See the first chapter of Schumacher's The Propaganda Movement.

Mindanao.²² For instance, the Spanish Crown encouraged the clergy to preach in the native tongues in order to facilitate the transition from paganism to Catholicism. The Spanish language was used by only a very small number of educated individuals during the nineteenth century.²³ As a result, neither Spanish nor any other European language became the dominant language in the Philippines. Moreover, the indigenous communities in the Philippines were less thoroughly dominated by Spanish culture than in much of Latin America. The racial *mestizaje* occurred mostly among Chinese and Filipinos (people of Spanish descent born in the Philippines—i.e. those who would be considered “criollos” in Latin America).²⁴ Following the Spanish-American War in 1898, forty years of U.S. occupation imposed English as a lingua franca and finally ended the incipient process of Hispanization in the Philippines.²⁵

Because of the apparent geographical distance as well as the non-Hispanic traditions, the Philippines are practically unnoticed by most critics in the field of Latin American literary and cultural studies.²⁶ In spite of over three centuries of the Spanish dominance, the Philippines have rarely been studied by Latin Americanists, save a few noteworthy exceptions.²⁷ While Lifshy

²² As the presence of these multiple native languages suggests, there is rich ethnolinguistic diversity in the Philippines. Historically, the most important language has been Tagalog, used by the ethnic group residing in the region around Manila. When a revolutionary organization against the Spanish empire was established in 1892, Tagalog played an important role as the movement’s lingua franca. As we shall see in later chapters, José Rizal also considered the native language crucial for his works. His mother tongue was Tagalog, and he characterized his first novel as a “novela tagala.”

²³ The figure of the Spanish-speaking population in nineteenth Philippines varies depending on interpretations. Whereas Phelan claims that Spanish was understood by ten per cent of the whole population (131), Anderson suggests that it was less than five per cent (2005, 5).

²⁴ In the Filipino context of the nineteenth century, the word “mestizaje” refers to the mixture of Filipino-Chinese, *indio*-Chinese, and *indio*-Filipino.

²⁵ Currently, there are over 170 languages in the Philippines. Among them, the two official languages are English and Filipino, which is the de facto standard version of Tagalog.

²⁶ In fact, it is difficult to define Filipino Studies within any academic discipline. As Lifshy rightfully notes, “the nation remains virtually unacknowledged by Spanish departments despite over three centuries of Spanish colonialism; by English departments despite being, according to some measurements, the third or fourth largest anglophone country in the world; and by Asian departments despite geography, because of all the Western presences in the islands” (1435).

²⁷ Some important studies include Phelan (1967), Rafael (1988, 2005), Fradera (1999, 2005) and Morillo-Alicea (2005).

argues that “[m]yriad transpacific analyses that set Spanish-language Filipino literature alongside its Latin American counterparts are still to be formulated” (1441), John Blanco criticizes how “the social and cultural affinities between the Philippines and the Spanish Caribbean [...] are overshadowed by the discourse of Pan-Americanism and Latin Americanism” (2004, 97-98). It is thus easy to highlight the importance of re-examining Cuba and the Philippines in comparative terms in order to recuperate the lost articulations of the nineteenth-century Hispanic world and to narrate the obscured history within contemporary regionalist parameters and their academic cognates.

1.2 RECENT STUDIES ON THE CUBA-PHILIPPINES NEXUS

Recently, Javier Morillo-Alicea presents a historical study of the connection between Cuba and the Philippines. The analysis is itself not entirely new, but his comparative approach suggests that there are emerging interests in the Philippines among scholars of Latin American history. In his article “Uncharted Landscapes of ‘Latin America’: The Philippines in the Spanish Imperial Archipelago” (2005), Morillo-Alicea proposes to encompass the Spanish empire and its overseas territories within a single entity that he calls a “Spanish Imperial Archipelago.”²⁸ His intent is not only to reintroduce Spanish imperialism into the discourse of empire and postcolonialism in what is usually understood as “Latin America,” but also to examine the place of the Philippines in relation to the Spanish Caribbean. With his analysis of Spain’s influence over the Philippines during the last decades of the nineteenth century, the author also implicitly criticizes the current

²⁸ Morillo-Alicea’s idea can be understood in comparison with Antonio Benítez Rojo’s influential notion of “the repeating island.” See *La isla que se repite: El Caribe y la perspectiva posmoderna* (1989).

tendency by scholars of imperial studies to focus primarily on the United States' presence in the Americas and the Pacific.²⁹

Morillo-Alicea's attempt to "unchart" the "landscapes" of Latin America is a suggestive turn because it re-evaluates the conceptual map of the nineteenth-century Hispanic world by highlighting the connections between seemingly incommensurable territories in the Caribbean and the South Pacific. By comparing and contrasting the anti-imperial struggles in the two colonies, he asks, "Why was there never a meaningful alliance formed between colonial reformers and separatists in the Caribbean with their counterparts in the Philippines?" (26). Rather than offering a possible reason for this deficiency, however, Morillo-Alicea creates imaginary links between the two colonies within the particular space of the "Spanish Imperial Archipelago." For instance, he briefly mentions the figure of the Cuban Rafael María Labra who finds possibility in the cross-colonial association between *antillanos* and *filipinos*. Concerned about the need to unify the anti-colonial forces, Labra writes in 1873 that "on several occasions I lobbied for the creation of a Colonial Reformist Center in Madrid [...] and the founding of a newspaper, with the aim of making known the aspirations of our Colonies" (qtd. in Morillo-Alicea 34).

Although Morillo-Alicea's analysis of potential anti-colonial alliance is provocative, his approach to the historical link between Cuba and the Philippines appears incomplete when viewed from the perspective of the colonized. What is at stake in his study is an imperial perspective which underscores Spain's capacity to consolidate its strength by establishing connections across its colonies. His conceptualization of "imperial archipelago" is based on the

²⁹ See, for example, Amy Kaplan and Donald Pease, eds., Cultures of United States Imperialism (1993) and Gilbert Joseph, Catherine LeGrand and Ricardo Salvatores, eds., Close Encounters of Empire: Writing the Cultural History of U.S.-Latin American Relations (1998).

assumption that “the political strength of the nineteenth-century Spanish empire at times derived from its ability to view its various colony-metropole relationships on the same plane” (28). One of the ways in which Morillo-Alicea describes Spain’s “political strength” is by illustrating its power to shift people and information around the globe, traversing from the Caribbean to Southeast Asia. The most representative symbol of this imperialist gesture is the creation of the Overseas Ministry in 1863 whose function lies in governing the two distant regions under a centralized office in Madrid (31). The figure of Valeriano “the Butcher” Weyler provides another example of how the “imperial archipelago” attempts to maintain its authority. As a Spanish military governor in both territories, Weyler first implements a severe policy of relocation to suppress revolts in the Philippines and later incorporates the same military politics in Cuba, which would be known as the infamous *reconcentraciones*. Morillo-Alicea argues that “Weyler’s connection to both islands suggests the manner in which the state used knowledge, practices, and personnel from one colony to inform policies in another” (29). According to the author, the empire reconfirms its political power through these imperial “knowledge, practices, and personnel” and assures the state’s indisputable capacity to control its overseas colonies. In this picture, Cuba and the Philippines are juxtaposed merely as constitutive elements of the Spanish imperial project rather than possessing their own resistant force and agency. What is missing in Morillo-Alicea is the possibility of a transnational history that late nineteenth-century Cubans and Filipinos share in common: the history of what I call “global resistance.”

Benedict Anderson’s recent book, *Under Three Flags: Anarchism and the Anti-Colonial Imagination* (2005), discusses the *fin-de-siècle* Filipino nationalism and its intersection with the global circulation of anarchist inspirations that began to emerge in the 1870s. Through the history of what he calls “early globalization” (3), Anderson hints at a potential link between

nineteenth-century Cuba and the Philippines. According to him, “the near-simultaneity of the last nationalist insurrection in the New World (Cuba, 1895) and the first in Asia (the Philippines, 1896)” is in no way “serendipity” (parentheses in original, 2). Anderson’s study seems to highlight the possibility of a collective resistance against Spanish imperialism. He then claims that:

Natives of the last important remnants of the fabled Spanish global empire, Cubans (as well as Puerto Ricans and Dominicans) and Filipinos did not merely read about each other, but had crucial personal connections and, up to a point, coordinated their actions—the first time in world history that such transglobal coordination became possible (2).

However, despite his reference to this global network between Cubans and Filipinos, the idea remains underdeveloped in his broader discussion of nineteenth-century anarchism.³⁰ His initial proposal to examine “early globalization” is never fully discussed or expanded throughout the book: in fact, the only other time he employs the term is on the very last page of the book (233). Besides the possible inspiration that the Filipino exiles in Europe might have received from Cuban revolutionaries, Anderson does not provide compelling argument concerning the crucial connections between the two Spanish colonies. One cannot avoid thinking that this lack weakens his argument concerning the trans-national connections. As Sunil Amrith rightfully notes, “at no point does Anderson show reciprocal influence, from the Philippines back to Cuba” and therefore “[t]he links in Anderson’s global chain often seem in danger of coming apart” (230). Criticizing Anderson’s focus on the study of anarchism, Amrith concludes that “[i]f the world of global anarchist thought, with its journals and its salons, constitutes one particular instance of ‘early globalization,’ it is in fact a relatively marginal one; there were other, perhaps more important, globalizations afoot” (230).

³⁰ For a critical evaluation of Anderson’s book, see my review “The Three Flags of Philippine Anti-Colonialism” in A Contracorriente (2007).

In my view, Anderson's idea of "early globalization" is as problematic as his earlier conceptualization of "imagined communities." In what has now become a classic text on studies of the origin and spread of nationalism, his Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism (1983) describes how the world inside the novel enables a new understanding of, or even territorializes, the world outside that is bounded by the potential nation, "the *kind* of imagined community that is the nation" (25). Through the notion of "print-capitalism"—the newspaper and other literary forms that it produces (such as the realist novel)—Anderson discovers a crucial link between the rise of capitalism and the development of print-as-commodity in the national, public space. According to him, such a community is by nature *imagined* because its members never actually meet each other yet nevertheless share "in the minds of each lives the image of their communion" (6).

Since the publication of his book, many critics have challenged Anderson's narrative of national-imagination. Perhaps the most relevant and potent critique comes from Partha Chatterjee whose essential concern is described as the question, "whose imagined community?" By examining the relationship between "nationalism" and "state," Chatterjee claims that the nationalist, anti-colonial figures Anderson describes share similar epistemological-discursive roots with their colonial oppressors.³¹ In Chatterjee's words, "it became the historical task of nationalism, which insisted on its own marks of cultural difference with the West, to demand that there be no rule of difference in the domain of the state" (10). From this perspective, nation is transformed into a utopian place in which the nationalist elites seek to impose their own cultural values through the state and cultural institutions.

³¹ See the first chapter of The Nation and its Fragments: Colonial and Postcolonial Histories (1993).

Moreover, what is behind the concept of “imagined communities” is the author’s ambition to theorize a totalizing knowledge of modern history. For Anderson’s theory to be efficiently applicable in different corners of the globe, one of the key notions that he introduces is “the modular” (1983, 4). He argues that when a historical experience of nationhood emerges in a particular region, such experience can be reproduced in other parts of the world and even encouraged the homogenization of political consciousness. Nationalism has a “modular” characteristic for it is “capable of being transplanted, with varying degrees of self-consciousness, to a great variety of social terrains, to merge and be merged with a correspondingly wide variety of political and ideological constellations” (4). In this manner, the European and “Creole” fashion becomes the supplier of certain “modular” types of nationalism which the oppressed people in the (post)colonial countries are invited to adapt when defining their own national identities. The privileged models of modern national culture are provided by Western ideologies, and the only option for nationalism in Latin American colonies is to choose its desirable forms from the collection of these models. In this vision, the emphasis is placed not on the particular identity of each nation, but rather on how that identity is different from the “modular” form propagated by the modern West. Anderson’s articulation of the universal characteristic of nineteenth-century nationalism is a sociological-determinist theory that is unable to capture the historically specific dynamics of the social structure in the colonial world. Consequently, as H.S. Harootunian suggests, the theorization of modern nationalism through the idea of “imagined communities” serves to magnify the West at the expense of miniaturizing and diminishing the image of the colonial world (176).

In the same way, I argue, the notion of “early globalization” in Under Three Flags: Anarchism and the Anti-Colonial Imagination derives from a particular focus on the

development of European history. For Anderson, Cuban and Filipino activists of “transglobal coordination” are significant not because they symbolize what I call a global resistance against Spanish imperialism, but rather because they are all connected in some way to the hub of European anarchist movement during the nineteenth century. As he proposes in the introduction, the book is intended to “map the gravitational force of anarchism between militant nationalism on opposite sides of the planet” (2005, 2). In other words, Cuba and the Philippines are able to imagine an anti-colonial alliance only within the framework of this “gravitational force of anarchism” produced in Europe. Such a configuration would inevitably present the actors of anti-colonial movement as marginal “others” vulnerable to the power of Western thought. The colonized subject thus appears to be an unqualified being who can proclaim its full subjectivity only by obtaining acknowledgment from the West. In Anderson’s study, the shared attempt by the two Spanish colonies to construct a fully centered anti-colonial subject is secondary. Instead, he emphasizes how “[b]oth Filipinos and Cubans found, to different degrees, their most reliable allies among French, Spanish, Italian, Belgian and British anarchists—each for their own, often non-nationalist reasons” (2).

What Anderson overlooks is the possibility for the two Spanish colonies to create their *own* political agenda that is different from a larger anarchist project of the nineteenth-century Europe. The particular anti-imperial nature of the relationship between Cuba and the Philippines needs to be examined on its own terms rather than viewed through the European lens. I do not think that understanding the potential alliance between these colonies is exclusively limited to the expansion of anarchism. By highlighting direct communications between Cuban and Filipino protagonists, I now turn to a consideration of their collaborative anti-imperial trajectories in the late nineteenth century.

1.3 THE COMMUNICATION BETWEEN MARIANO PONCE AND JOSÉ

ALBERTO IZQUIERDO

Prior to the historical period studied by Anderson, we can identify various interactions between Cubans and Filipinos through the representation of nineteenth-century Freemasonry in Spain.³² During the first three quarters of the century, the Masonic lodges in Madrid served as the center for liberal conspiracies against clerical and colonial authorities (Schumacher, 1966: 328). Less known is the fact that Freemasonry also played a significant role in the development of revolutionary thought in many Spanish-American republics. As Patrick N. Mingos observes, the history of Freemasons is intricately related to the origins of Latin American nationalism during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (58). Many of the revolutionary leaders were associated with Freemasons: to name a few, these figures include Simón Bolívar, José de San Martín, Vicente Guerrero, Benito Juárez, Marcelo H. del Pilar, not to mention José Martí and José Rizal. In one way or another, pro-independent intellectuals from Cuba and the Philippines found initial inspiration in Spanish Freemasonry, which allowed those discontented with the colonial power to organize clandestine activities and provoke anti-clerical movements. The secret yet egalitarian atmosphere of Masonic lodges provided a valuable space in which racial, religious, and even political discourse could be discussed without restraint (Mingos, 57-60). Thus Cuban and Filipino nationalists began to interact with each other within the nineteenth-century Masonic circuit in such a way that, as Paul Kramer notes, “Masonry in Spain and [Filipino] *ilustrado*

³² Freemasonry is generally known as a worldwide fraternal association whose members share similar moral and spiritual concerns. One of the basic tenets is the equality of all men regardless of religion, race, ethnicity, or social standing. Its history dates as far back as the late 16th century, and some scholars claim that Freemasonry has played important roles in the construction of history in different countries. In Spain, the first Masonic club, *lodge*, was created in the 18th century. For more information, see Michael Poll’s Masonic Enlightenment: The Philosophy, History and Wisdom of Freemasonry (2006).

activism would be closely linked, with *ilustrados* joining lodges with Cubans and Puerto Ricans” (50).

In April of 1886, for example, the Masonic lodge known as “Solidaridad” was established in Madrid by people from various countries. Among the eight founders of the lodge, there were two Filipinos, three Cubans, one Puerto Rican, and two Spaniards (Schumacher, 1966: 332). Soon after its foundation, more Cubans and Filipinos joined the lodge, creating a trans-national association of educated individuals concerned with the abuse of imperial power in the Spanish colonies. As Schumacher observes, “[t]his association with students from Spain’s other overseas provinces, more advanced in self-government than the Philippines, no doubt stimulated Filipino nationalist thinking” (1973: 155). Although the lodge lasted less than a year, its importance of juxtaposing Cuba and the Philippines in the same group of anti-colonial orientation is noteworthy. “Solidaridad” represents one of the first cross-colonial associations to be followed by other similar lodges in the late nineteenth century.³³ Under the network of Freemasonry, Cubans and Filipinos are together exposed to liberal ideologies and cultivated certain nationalist thinking for their respective countries.

If we briefly return to Anderson’s idea of “early globalization” whose function is studied through the expansion of European anarchism, we can find a different approach to the comprehension of nineteenth-century history. The interactions in various Masonic lodges suggest that an important element of the linkage between Cuba and the Philippines is drawn not so much from their anarchist allies, but from the liberal ideology developed and encouraged by Freemasons. The mainline view of liberalism around the notion of “freedom” played a crucial role in bringing together the anti-colonial actors from the two Spanish colonies. While Anderson

³³ For instance, another Masonic lodge “Revolución” was established in 1889 by three Filipinos and two Cubans (Schumacher, 1966: 333).

prefers to highlight how Europe represents the ideological ground for the colonies in the Caribbean and Asia, I intend to focus on the way in which the colonized subjects turn to European thought in order to construct their identities and to define trans-national connections.

Influenced by the Masonic experience is a personal relationship between the Filipino Mariano Ponce and the Cuban José Alberto Izquierdo.³⁴ Ponce was a secretary of the Asociación Hispano-Filipina in Madrid as well as a member of the Masonic lodge “Revolución,” which was also frequented by Cuban activists. Later he became representative of the Comité Revolucionario Filipino in Hong Kong and attempted to raise money and collect arms for Manila’s revolutionary regime from abroad. Izquierdo, on the other hand, was a lawyer and a liberal thinker who belonged to the Cuban community in Paris at the turn of the century. The two figures first met in the Ateneo club in Madrid which at that time represented one of the most prestigious social clubs for men of letters and sciences in the Spanish metropolis.

Ponce’s Cartas sobre la revolución, 1897-1900 (1932) shows that Ponce and Izquierdo exchanged numerous correspondences between 1897 and 1898.³⁵ In his first letter written on May 11th 1897, Ponce tells Izquierdo, “MI QUERIDO AMIGO: Con satisfacción he recibido su carta del 1.º de Marzo ppdo y le agradezco las noticias interesantes del estado satisfactorio de la Revolución Cubana, lo que celebro en el alma” (5). While residing in Hong Kong, Ponce wrote to his Cuban friend in order to inform him about the ongoing insurrections in the Philippines and to inquire about the situation in Cuba. Izquierdo, on his part, supported Filipino independence by actively trying to communicate with Cuban leaders in the United States, hoping that they would send some material goods to the Philippines. The personal connection between Ponce and

³⁴ Both Estrade (1999) and Anderson (2005) make references to the connection between Ponce and Izquierdo, but they never fully develop this important link in their discussions.

³⁵ It seems that Izquierdo’s letters to Ponce have been lost. However, as we will see later, many of Ponce’s correspondences in Cartas sobre la revolución reveal different responses and reactions of his Cuban friend.

Izquierdo was made possible partly because of the development of transoceanic communication at the turn of the century. The communication between the two individuals reveals how people from geographically remote countries shared the same concern about Spanish imperialism and the urgent need for national independence.

The historical period during which Ponce and Izquierdo exchanged these letters was also parallel to the time when many Filipinos believed that the celebrated emancipation of Latin American republics appeared to be an ideal model for the liberation of their own country. To some extent, these Filipinos even identified their colonial experience as part of the larger history of Latin America.³⁶ In their eyes, Cuba's example seemed especially illuminating. The Cuban wars of independence (1868-1898) provided an exhilarating vision of nationalism for the Philippines between 1897 and 1898. For instance, the Caribbean country's critical role manifested itself when, upon declaring its "independence" in 1897, the Filipino government created its constitution taken *directly* from Cuba's revolutionary constitution of 1895 (Kramer 81). The Filipino revolutionaries were fully aware of the ongoing fortunes of the latest war in Cuba. Moreover, the Caribbean colony's influence in the Pacific was also revealed when Ponce and other leaders of the Filipino independence movement in Hong Kong glorified the 1897 Cuban revolution on the occasion of commemorating the first anniversary of their initial uprising in the Philippines (Estrade 1999, 84).³⁷ It was precisely during this time when General Emilio

³⁶ In a slightly different context, Rizal's contemporary, Graciano López Jaena, juxtaposed the Philippines with the New World: "En nombre del pueblo filipino, brindo por América, enviando su más cordial saludo, su fraternal abrazo a todo el pueblo americano cuya historia hasta entrado ya el siglo presente, historia era del Archipiélago filipino" (25).

³⁷ Ponce wrote about this meeting in one of his letters: "hemos celebrado con un meeting y un banquete el 25 de Agosto en que se dio el primer grito de rebelión hace un año. Como no podía menos de suceder, se dedicaron sentidos recuerdos á los valientes cubanos hermanos nuestros en desdichas" (31). According to Estrade, "los filipinos estuvieron muy al tanto de la lucha de los cubanos, lo prueba al hecho de que en el mitin del 25 de agosto de 1897, en Hong Kong, que realizaron para celebrar el primer aniversario de su propio levantamiento, vitorearon a la Revolución cubana" (1999, 84).

Aguinaldo designed the Filipino national flag in 1897, drawing inspiration from the flag used by the Cuban revolutionaries.

Filipinos' admiration for the Cuban model is illustrated in one of Ponce's letters to Izquierdo: "Hacemos votos fervientes por que [sic] Cuba siga escribiendo páginas gloriosas en su historia, para eterno escarmiento de los tiranos y saludable ejemplo para aquellos países que aún gimen en la esclavitud" (8). Inspired by "páginas gloriosas" in the Cuban history and its "saludable ejemplo" to have provoked revolts against the Spanish empire, Ponce seeks more information from Izquierdo who seems to have constantly supported Filipino independence.³⁸ In another letter, Ponce suggests an anti-colonial network between Cubans and Filipinos based on their mutual struggles. He argues that:

Es necesario también que, ya que tenemos un común enemigo, estemos de acuerdo cubanos y filipinos. No se olviden de que son Vdes. nuestros hermanos mayores y que somos nuevos y sin experiencia aún en estas empresas colosales, ya por lo tanto muy necesitados de ayuda, consejos, instrucciones, que sólo podemos esperar de Vdes. Cuba y Filipinas han recorrido juntas el doloroso camino de su historia de vergonzosa esclavitud; juntas deben también pulverizar sus cadenas (7).

This passage illustrates how, without traveling to the Caribbean, Ponce was familiar with the political situation of the "enslaved" Cuban island. Izquierdo undoubtedly serves to provide necessary information concerning the armed insurrections in Cuba. Ponce calls Cubans "nuestros hermanos mayores" because of their extensive struggles for independence. By underlining the same experience of colonialism, his correspondence reveals his desire to construct a transnational alliance between Cuba and the Philippines. He seeks both material and moral support from those "hermanos mayores" and, as I will show later, Cubans in return try to encourage Filipinos through their editorials.

³⁸ As Ponce expresses, "Hemos descansado siempre en la idea de que Vdes. están con nosotros en espíritu, toda vez que para alentar más y más, si cabe, el entusiasmo generoso de los que pelean por la causa de nuestra Patria, tenemos que invocar á los cubanos y presentar su ejemplo saludable y heroico" (29).

Let us pause here for a moment in order to examine the meaning of Ponce's aforementioned reference to the term "esclavitud." When he depicts Cuba's struggles for independence, Ponce proclaims that the Caribbean model symbolizes a "saludable ejemplo para aquellos países que aún gimen en la esclavitud" (8). History shows that when he wrote this letter in 1897, the actual practice of slavery had already been abolished a decade ago in Cuba (1886) as well as in the other Latin America republics. If the age of slavery was already over in Latin America, which countries that still suffer from "slavery"—"aquellos países que aún gimen en la esclavitud"—is Ponce talking about here? Moreover, when Ponce writes, "Cuba y Filipinas han recorrido juntas el doloroso camino de su historia de vergonzosa esclavitud" (7), does he mean that African slaves were actually brought to Cuba *and* the Philippines to create the fundamentally economic relation of production? The answer is clearly no, because slavery-as-institution never existed in the South Pacific. What we see here is the term "slavery" being used as a metaphor for the injustice caused by colonialism. It seems that for Ponce "slavery" indicates any type of "oppression" or "exploitation" that works against national independence.

The particular way in which Ponce employs "slavery" as a metaphor for one of the most important products of Spanish colonialism should not be taken lightly, because it represents both the possibilities and the limits of his proposal for global resistance. First, it is an effective rhetorical strategy to articulate the historical link between Cuba and the Philippines. The metaphor does not simply allow Ponce to juxtapose the two colonies under the specific category of colonial oppression. As a symbol through which the transnational network of resistance crystallizes, it also provides a conceptual and theoretical backbone to the metaphysical form of globalized anti-colonial discourse. In other words, the struggle against the Spanish empire is no longer a vague ideal of political alliance but rather a solid image that aims to connect the two

colonies based on the history of “vergonzosa esclavitud.” Through the use of the metaphor, Ponce is able to draw a logical conclusion that Cuba and the Philippines “juntas deben también pulverizar sus cadenas” (7). By *recognizing* or *identifying* the common historical experience of the Spanish colonial project precisely as “slavery,” he makes the case of the Cuban-Filipino coalition readily perceptible in the eyes of the anti-colonial activists in the late nineteenth century. “Slavery” is certainly an emblematic rhetorical ploy in all kinds of revolutionary movements from the eighteenth century onward. Following this trend, Ponce appropriates the power of metaphor to effectively bring the distant Spanish colonies closer.

The function of metaphor requires further consideration in philosophical terms. In the domain of semantics, metaphor represents more than an embellishment of speech. Clevis Headley argues, for example, that “metaphor brings new meaning into language; metaphor promotes ‘semantic impertinence’ (Ricoeur 1975) by putting words into tension; metaphor encourages tidal conflicts between the literal and the figurative in order to unsettle value rigidity, as well as complacent ways of thinking” (96). Through its creative force, metaphor constructs a new sense of reality in which the material world and its representation are in constant tension. One of the outcomes of this tension is metaphor’s adaptive possibility “to frame and model various structures of feelings, judgment, perception, thinking, and acting” (96). Furthermore, the production of alternative forms of consciousness also means the articulation of a new subject which has its own realm of representation. For Headley, therefore, the fundamental purpose of metaphor resides in “an expression of human agency and subjectivity” (96).

Examined from this perspective, we can argue that in Cartas sobre la revolución, Ponce employs the metaphor of “slavery” in order to underscore a new subjectivity of transnational orientation against the imperial power. The act of recognizing the symbol of “slavery” is

significant, for it enables Ponce to announce the appearance of such a globalized subject connecting Cuba and the Philippines. In arguing that “Cuba y Filipinas han recorrido *juntas* el doloroso camino de su historia de vergonzosa esclavitud; *juntas* deben también pulverizar sus cadenas” (my emphasis, 7), he puts emphasis not so much on “su historia” per se but on the word “juntas.” This way, he proposes the construction of a single, unified subject in defiance of Spanish colonialism. It is an attempt to evade being subjectified by the imperial power: instead of allowing the empire to determine the colonies’ own identity, Ponce undertakes the task of contextualizing its collective subjectivity through the “slavery” metaphor.

On the other hand, however, this metaphor also reveals certain limitations if we consider the (non)existence of historical reality. To understand this problematic, Susan Buck-Morss’s essay “Hegel and Haiti” (2000) is especially helpful. In the article, Buck-Morss contends that such Enlightenment thinkers as Locke, Hobbes, Rousseau, and Kant underlined slavery as a fundamental idea and symbol for their political discourse. “By the eighteenth century,” Buck-Morss argues, “slavery had become the root metaphor of Western political philosophy, connoting everything that was evil about power relations” (821). Through the project of abstract conceptualization, some European philosophers often ignored the actual history of slaves who made possible the development of global economy since the sixteenth century. By describing “slavery” in metaphorical and even allegorical (i.e. the notion of freedom) terms, these theorists of the West failed to capture the material and historical significance of actually-existing slavery. In other words, what is behind European Enlightenment is “the paradox between the discourse of freedom and the practice of slavery” (822).³⁹

³⁹ Buck-Morss further insists that this move toward the theorization of “slavery” would later re-appear in the Marxist approach to Hegel’s dialectic. As she notes, “[s]ince the 1840s, with the early writings of Karl Marx, the struggle between the master and slave has been abstracted from literal reference and read once again as a metaphor—this

Buck-Morss's critique of Enlightenment philosophy is useful to critically analyze Ponce's anti-imperial thoughts. Similar to his European predecessors, Ponce also seems to elide the historical problem of slavery. In fact, throughout his correspondences to Izquierdo he never comments on the legacy or fact of slavery within the context of revolutionary struggles. His use of the term "esclavitud" is therefore not a representation of slavery as an authentic historical event but rather an all-embracing metaphor that embodies colonial violence. Ponce's lack of attention to the real history of the relations of production indicates the limit of the trans-Pacific fight against the Spanish empire: a major part of its potentially radical force exists only in conceptual, ideological terms. The dialogue between Ponce and Izquierdo is likely symptomatic of a wider sympathy for the creation of a political alliance. Their letters even suggest the condition of possibility for a transnational resistance. However, such a dream remains veiled within the sphere of ideologies just like Ponce's "esclavitud" cannot reach beyond the metaphorical. His longing for a solid alliance that would enable the two colonies to collectively struggle against colonialism only functions as an abstract vision of utopianism without the necessary materials to actualize it. For him, "slavery," the name of a common historical experience, becomes an empty symbol which does not stand on the ground of an entirely graspable reality of slavery.

Moreover, the absence of material specificity in Ponce's discourse also leads us to a critique of the liberalism that underwrites global resistance. That Ponce and other Filipino anti-imperial activists of his time seem unconcerned with the actual history of slavery in Cuba reveals how their idea of collective resistance is characterized in terms of class consciousness. That is, their thought essentially symbolizes the concern of bourgeois intellectualism whose primary

time for the class struggle" (850).

interest does not reside in representing the history of the actually enslaved. These European-educated individuals belong to the elite classes, and their project of anti-imperialism depends on the disguise of reality (slavery as historical practice) with theory (“slavery” as metaphor). As Marx characterizes bourgeois thought in Capital I (1867), “Man’s reflections on the forms of social life and consequently also his scientific analysis of those forms, take a course directly opposite to that of their actual historical development” (67).⁴⁰ Marx’s analysis gives us some insight into the nature of the transnational struggle that Ponce and Izquierdo propose: it stems from bourgeois idealism rather than historical materialism.

Nevertheless, these critical accounts of Cartas sobre la revolución are not meant to undermine the importance of the personal relationship between Ponce and his Cuban associates. Ponce’s letters also show that through Izquierdo he attempted to initiate communications with other Cubans. For example, he kept in touch with the leaders of the Partido Revolucionario Cubano (PRC) in the United States. As he expresses in his first letter to Izquierdo, “uno de los motivos al escribir á V. es pedirle que nos indique medios de comunicación con la Delegación cubana en los Estados Unidos para ver si se puede allá organizar expediciones” (5). In response, Izquierdo contacted Gonzalo de Quesada in New York who then supposedly wrote to the Filipino revolutionary committee in Hong Kong. In another correspondence (September 8th, 1897), Ponce explains that he has received Quesada’s letter: “No puede V. imaginarse con cuánta satisfacción me entero de los párrafos que me transcribe de la carta del Sr. Gonzalez [sic] de Quesada” (31). It appears that Quesada showed interest in assisting the Filipino cause and offered some kind of support (either material or emotional), since Ponce’s same letter also alludes to “los generosos ofrecimientos que nos hace [Quesada]” and “la excelente ocasión que

⁴⁰ Facing different “forms of social life,” Marx further argues, “man seeks to decipher not their historical character (for in his eyes they are immutable) but their meaning” (67).

nos proporciona” (31). At that time his countrymen in the Philippines desperately needed military supplies and resources to continue their rebellions against the Spaniards. As demonstrated in the letter written on May 11th, “los filipinos siguen con el mismo espíritu; pero necesitan armas para sostenerse y esto ha sido siempre el objeto de nuestra preocupación” (6). Cubans in New York, however, could never provide more than basic material aid to the Philippines because they needed to concentrate on their own struggles. Ponce was disappointed to hear from Izquierdo that the armed expedition from the U.S. seemed unlikely: “Me desconsuelan las dificultades que V. insinúa para armar una expedición desde New York” (30).

It appears that Ponce also wrote to Quesada directly. As he notes in one letter, what can unite the two colonies are “la unidad de la religión que profesamos en punto á ideales patrióticos, la similitud que ofrece la suerte de nuestras patrias respectivas, los mutuos anhelos de prosperidad é independencia formulados en mil ocasiones por cubanos y filipinos y su proverbial bondad” (168). Ponce suggests that Cuba and the Philippines should collaborate in organizing political campaigns based on their shared ideology of patriotism and their anti-colonial orientation. By highlighting these cultural and ideological similarities, he insists that the recognition of these bonds would not only help achieve the freedom of both countries but also develop a transnational coalition beyond the traditional geographical boundaries.

In addition, Ponce also turns to the power of memory. One of his letters to Quesada reveals how he sought to construct the idea of global resistance through the memory of José Martí who had died in 1895. In the letter written on September 8th, 1898, Ponce tells Quesada that “De antiguo, [...] estaba ya en relaciones espirituales con la redacción de dicho valiente órgano cubano, hasta el punto de cruzar pocas pero cordiales correspondencias con el nunca

bastante llorado Dr. José Martí” (167).⁴¹ Here, the “valiente órgano cubano” refers to the Cuban revolutionary journal known as Patria, launched by Martí himself, which Ponce seems to have read on a regular basis. The passage reminds us that Ponce was already familiar with the Cuban revolutionary leader’s central role in the independence movement by mid-1897. For Ponce, however, the memory of Martí not only represents the legacy of the Spanish Caribbean, but also serves as a hinge that would connect the revolutionary struggles of both colonies. By invoking Martí’s name in the shared colonial context, he seeks to articulate the “relaciones espirituales” with Cuba’s revolutionary government. That is, Ponce’s imagination of a Cuba-Philippines nexus is fundamentally based on a spiritual, moral value that is derived from memory.

The attempt to recuperate Martí’s image is therefore purposeful and tactical: his aim is to provoke the notion of cross-colonial alliance through a kind of historical memory. On the one hand, memory represents a unique zone through which a colonized subject maintains its private domain that is impossible to be invaded by the colonial power. On the other hand, historical memory also plays the role of bringing one colony to the other based on the shared experience and symbol of colonial injustice. Seen from this viewpoint, Ponce’s following lines clearly appeal to the formulation of Cuba-Philippines coalition: “En medio de tantas amarguras, consuela pensar en Cuba y Filipinas y traer á la memoria lo que ha dicho el inolvidable José Martí, que los hombres que ceden no son los que hacen á los pueblos, sino los que se revelan”

⁴¹ To this day, I have not been able to locate the letters (“pocas pero cordiales correspondencias”) between Ponce and Martí. However, the former was always interested in learning the latter’s nationalist ideologies. For example, Ponce’s first letter to Izquierdo reveals his desire to read Martí’s political writings: “Le agradecería nos dé cuantos folletos y publicaciones tenga acerca de la revolución que crea pueden ilustrarnos y enseñarnos, sobre todo los documentos oficiales, como el manifiesto de José Martí y Gral. Gomez á principios de la guerra y otros” (7). The “manifiesto de José Martí y Gral. Gomez” is a reference to “Manifiesto de Montecristi” (1895), which is the central theme of my next chapter.

(8).⁴² Martí's maxim becomes "inolvidable" for Ponce's political project that considers the act of remembering an effective practice to amalgamate the colonized force.

Ponce's desire to place the Philippines alongside Martí's Cuba seems to produce a tangible result. His letters also tell us that some representatives of the revolutionary government in Manila came up with the idea of sending Filipino soldiers to Havana in order to support their struggles for independence. On May 11th, 1897, Ponce informs Izquierdo that "en Manila están resultando gente para que se presenten voluntarios por fuerza para Cuba; parece que hay el pensamiento de mandar allá voluntarios filipinos para sustituir á la parte de las tropas que piensan extraer de aquel punto y remitir á Filipinas" (8). The possibility of offering volunteers to Cuba was always in Ponce's mind since he mentioned this potential expedition across the Pacific again on September 8th of the same year.⁴³ Such a project, however, never became a reality due to the lack of communication between the Cuban revolutionary leaders (Havana and New York) and the Filipino delegates (Manila and Hong Kong). By January of 1898, the idea of further aid from Manila became practically impossible. Ponce lamented this stoppage in one of his letters to Izquierdo, stating that "Lo único que siento es que hemos dejado de prestar nuestra significativa ayuda á Cuba" (102).

Ponce's contact with his Cuban associates (Izquierdo and Quesada) was made possible thanks largely to another crucial figure for nineteenth-century Cuban and Filipino nationalism: a Puerto Rican, Ramón Emeterio Betances (1827—1898). During his stay in Europe, Betances and his allies from the Spanish colonies inspired the unification of exiles from both the Caribbean and the South Pacific. In his article "El acercamiento filipino-cubano en la guerra

⁴² See Ponce's letter on May 11th, 1897.

⁴³ Ponce writes, "[n]ecesitamos hacer previas consultas acerca del costo que podría tener una expedición en determinadas condiciones, para calcular los fondos necesarios" (31).

contra España (1896-1898),” Paul Estrade analyzes sporadic yet notable interactions between nationalists from Cuba and the Philippines in the late nineteenth century. Without offering much detailed analysis of the texts that he cites, Estrade argues that “se puede sentir ecos irregulares de Filipinas en la prensa de la emigración cubana y ecos lejanos de Cuba, repercutidos por la prensa local o por cartas particulares, entre los emigrados filipinos de Hong Kong, París, Londres, New Orleans o el Japón” (1999, 78). According to him, some dynamic elements of anti-Spanish sentiment existed in nineteenth-century France. A Hispanic-Cuban intellectual Fernando Tarrida del Mármol, for example, published an essay called “Le problème philippin” (1896) in La Revue Blanche, arguing that the Spanish army would inevitably suffer from a serious deterioration of its force because of the two independence movements that were concurrently rising in Cuba and the Philippines. Tarrida del Mármol’s presence and his polemical writings attest to “la relación íntima que en París los elementos independentistas establecen entre el problema filipino y el cubano” (Estrade 1999, 80).

As a historian specialized in the life and works of Betances, Estrade places particular emphasis on how this Puerto Rican abolitionist strived to combine the anti-colonial forces on a global scale. Estrade maintains that Betances, whom he describes as “el artesano clandestino del encuentro filipino-cubano” (1999, 78), played a central role in creating cross-national solidarity against Spanish imperialism. A liberal thinker from the very beginning (he was also a Freemason), Betances inherited Bolívar’s vision of continental unity which would work against not only the long-lasting tradition of Spanish colonialism, but also the imminent U.S. imperial project. Estrade claims that Betances’s extensive knowledge of the Filipino independence movement allowed Cuban revolutionary leaders in New York to be properly informed about the

political situation of the Pacific islands by mid-1897 (1999, 81). The information probably came from Ponce with whom Betances exchanged several correspondences between 1897 and 1898.⁴⁴

With his anti-colonial ideas and his wide range of political associations in Europe, Betances established himself as a central figure among Cuban, Filipino, and Puerto Rican nationalists in Europe by the late 1880s.⁴⁵ It was around this time that the PRC in New York appointed Betances as the official president of the clandestine El Comité Cubano in Paris.⁴⁶ The significance of his diplomatic labor in El Comité can be described in two different ways. On the one hand, he transmitted the Cuban experience of guerrilla tactics, such as the information on how to use weapons and how to organize insurrections, to the government in the Philippines. On the other hand, Betances sent the PRC headquarters the most updated reports on the Filipino uprising of which he was informed by Ponce and other contacts in Hong Kong. Consequently, it was Betances who recommended to the PRC “que se tenga por esa Delegación al corriente a nuestros hermanos de Cuba de la marcha de la insurrección de Filipinas” (qtd. in Estrade 1999, 81). Even though the Cuban leaders in the U.S. never seriously involved themselves in communicating with the Filipino revolutionaries, they nevertheless demonstrated steady interest in the other Spanish colony in Asia, as we saw in the interaction between Ponce and Quesada.⁴⁷

⁴⁴ See Ponce’s letter to Betances on September 20th, 1898, as well as his letter to Izquierdo on November 25th, 1898.

⁴⁵ For an important study on Betances’ life in Europe, see Estrade (2001).

⁴⁶ It was Martí himself who suggested the idea of leadership to Betances. In one of his letters to Betances, Martí wrote that “París es a un tiempo residencia de un gobierno nuevo y humano, y de un grupo considerable de hijos de Cuba, Puerto Rico y América del Sur. No hay en París de donde tanto bien, en influencia moral, y en recursos materiales, podemos prometernos, más tenaz ni infatigable trabajador americano que el Dr. Betances: ¿Querría Ud., señor– en tanto que el gobierno que en estos instantes se establece en Cuba ratifica oficialmente su nombramiento– levantar nuestra bandera honrada con su mano que no ha dejado nunca de serlo, en una tierra en donde pretende todo lo extraordinario y generoso? ¿Querría Ud. contribuir con su ayuda valiosa a organizar en París un grupo vigoroso y activo de auxiliares de nuestra seria y creciente Revolución?” (O.C.: vol 8, 55).

⁴⁷ Another example of how Cubans paid attention to the events in the Philippines is shown when their newspaper *Patria* published numerous articles on the Philippines between 1894 and 1895. Three articles entitled “España en Filipinas” appeared on June 23rd, 1894; December 8th, 1894; and January 26th, 1895. It seems that the third text was written by Martí who alluded to the figure of emerging Filipino revolutionary as “un pueblo en rescoldo”: “Bajo curas y gobernadorcillos vive aterrado el filipino naciente, que a derechas no habla aún la lengua de su conquistador,

Perhaps one of the most important ways in which Cubans maintained their ties to Filipinos was through the form of journals. In order to discuss how Betances and other members of El Comité Cubano portrayed the revolutionary struggles in the Pacific islands, the next section will examine various articles that appeared in 1896 and 1897.

1.4 LA REPÚBLICA CUBANA AND LA SOLIDARIDAD

El Comité Cubano manifested their support for Filipino independence through its newspaper, La República Cubana. As I will show in this section, the late nineteenth century witnessed the valuable contribution of newspapers and editorials in disseminating anti-imperial ideas among Cubans and Filipinos. Journal articles represented an effective way to juxtapose the two colonies on the same plane, making foreign events locally comprehensible. One of the strengths of these easily printable forms of production was the ability to be read across continents. Cuban periodicals were read by Filipinos in Hong Kong and Manila, while Filipino newspapers were sent to Cubans in the United States.⁴⁸ Writers had their political “allies” in mind when penning essays about the Pacific and the Caribbean islands. A cross-cultural form of resistance can be perceived in the existence of anti-imperial impulse through which the two Spanish colonies demonstrated mutual support for each other’s independence. It is this particular space of print community that creates the nexus between Cuba and the Philippines.

y pasea airado por el mundo, aprendiendo y preparándose, su esperanza y su humillación. Pero quien oye a un filipino culto, oye a un rebelde. No es un pueblo en cenizas: es un pueblo en recollo. Allí también hierve la ira criolla, y el gobernante incapaz y corruptor es aborrecido. Allí también se queda sin país España” (qtd. in Estrade 1999, 76).

⁴⁸ Once again, Betances played a key role in the transmission of newspapers across the Pacific. One of Betances’ letters to the editor of La República Cubana shows his desire to send their articles to Hong-Kong: “Le remito un cheque de £ 1 y 4 chelines de un suscriptor: Sr. D. José Rosales, Remedios Terrace 7, Hong-Kong. Conviene mandarle la colección de *La República Cubana* y seguírsele mandando” (qtd. in Estrade 1999, 78).

My argument concerning the importance of editorials may invoke the earlier concept of Anderson's "print capitalism" and his larger discussion of "imagined communities." However, my point differs from Anderson's model in that the nature of the communication that I indicate here is not only *national* but also *transnational*. For nineteenth-century Cuban and Filipino writers, the newspaper served as a critical tool to go beyond Anderson's imaginary frontier of nation, because they practically published articles for each other as if to exchange correspondences. In other words, I contend that the authors of Cuban and Filipino newspapers knew about each other (whether directly or indirectly), and their intent was precisely to show that they were aware of the independence movement in a far corner of the Hispanic world. Hence, there was a clear purpose in reporting each other's struggles: the colonized peoples established a symbolic dialogue of a transnational, anti-imperial characteristic by means of daily papers.

El Comité Cubano created La República Cubana in 1896 to propagate the idea of Cuban independence in Europe. It soon became popular among the Cuban emigrants in Paris, representing "un periódico variado, vivo, combative y, por consiguiente, gustado" (Estrade 2001, 88). As Félix Ojeda Reyes highlights, this newspaper, written in both Spanish and French, contained explicitly pro-Filipino narrative: "*La República Cubana*, editada en París por Domingo Figarola Caneda, mantiene una posición muy clara en solidaridad con estos republicanos [filipinos] que han comenzado una empresa colosal" (372). In the periodical, we can find a number of articles about the Philippines in 1897, including a biography and a portrait of José Rizal (April 29th), two letters sent by El Comité Revolucionario Filipino in Hong Kong (July 10th and September 9th), and a letter from Manila (August 8th). Although these are rather erratic references to the revolutionary war in the remote Asian country, we can perceive how El Comité Cubano regularly paid attention to the Filipino events.

Most significantly, two other essays in 1896 closely examine the question of Filipino independence: “¡Viva Filipinas Libre!” (September 3rd) and “¿Qué quiere Filipinas?” (September 24th).⁴⁹ First, “¡Viva Filipinas Libre!” opens with a powerful statement that describes the fall of the Spanish empire: “El gobierno español, después de inauditos esfuerzos por ocultar la verdad, se ha visto forzado á callar ante la realidad.”⁵⁰ Here, the unexpected “reality” refers to the Filipino insurrection initiated on August 29th of the same year, which was less than a week before the article appeared. In other words, La República Cubana and El Comité Cubano immediately reacted and published the essay when the rebellion took place in the Pacific islands. According to the text, “Ya es del dominio público que en Filipinas ha estallado una formidable revolución separatista.” The objective of this immediate disposition to report on the Philippines’ revolutionary incident appears to be twofold. While it intends to inform Cuban readers about the recent anti-colonial movement in Asia, it also seeks to provide moral support to the Filipino activists who were also reading these articles in Manila or Hong Kong.

It was probably Betances who obtained important information regarding the Filipino situation through a “spy” in the Spanish embassy in Paris where, according to Betances, “penetra como español [...] uno de los nuestros” (qtd. in Estrade 2001, 147). Or perhaps El Comité Cubano received such knowledge from someone who was either physically present in the Filipino battleground or a high-ranking leader like Ponce in Hong Kong. Be that as it may, the article is based on the information transmitted by Betances and his associates. “¡Viva Filipinas Libre!” first narrates how “A diez mil kilómetros de Manila, en Novaliches, *tres mil* filipinos han

⁴⁹ Both articles seem to be written by a group of editors (Domingo Figarola-Caneda, Ramón Emeterio Betances, Vicente Mestre Amábile, and Alberto Ruz). However, it is unclear from the front pages of the newspaper who was in charge of authoring each article.

⁵⁰ The entire article is found in the first page of La República Cubana, no. 33, September 3, 1896. It is on microfilm (S4587) at Yale University Library. All the citations are from the same page.

atacado las tropas españolas” and “varias ciudades de la provincia de Cavite se han sublevado también, calculándose en *unos diez mil* los que están en armas contra el gobierno español” (my emphasis). The secret knowledge concerning the specific number of soldiers in the remote island indicates that El Comité Cubano had detailed information about the occurrences in the Philippines. The essay further presents its analysis of the situation, suggesting that the Spanish force is increasingly destabilized since the metropolis is obligated to send additional reinforcement to its Asian colony: “De España se han enviado refuerzos, lo cual evidencia la crítica situación de la monarquía.” The allusion to “la crítica situación” of the decaying Spanish empire must have provided the Filipino readers with a useful reference and evaluation for their ongoing revolution.

Perhaps the most noteworthy characteristic of the article is how it demonstrates Cubans’ moral and spiritual support for Filipino independence: “Por nuestra parte, como republicanos cubanos en lucha por conquistar la independencia, simpatizamos de todo corazón con esos otros esclavos, á quienes alentamos con un **¡Viva Filipinas Libre!**” (emphasis in original). The author acknowledges the importance of the armed struggles in the Philippines and declares “**¡Viva!**” By identifying the Filipino experience with the similar fight for freedom in the Caribbean, La República Cubana expresses its concern “de todo corazón” for “Filipinas Libre.” What can be termed “the spiritual” aspect (shown in the phrases “simpatizamos” and “alentamos”) represents a dynamic and creative force of transnational resistance articulated by the Cuban activists.

However, the problematic metaphor of “slavery” that we have examined earlier is once again at work in this article. In the passage “simpatizamos de todo corazón con esos otros esclavos,” the word “esclavos” simply refers to the colonized people in the Philippines as opposed to the genuine slaves in the Caribbean. Although the metaphor seeks to capture the

symbolic, universal value of “the oppressed” upon which the idea of global resistance is based, this gesture suggests that the kind of support El Comité Cubano offers to Filipinos is limited to the encouragement within the text. It cannot transcend the realm of sympathetic “corazón,” which means that such a discourse is ultimately a utopian transnationalism. Indeed, the article can be understood as an idealized depiction of anti-colonial movement. Separated from reality, the text has practically no account of the difficult situation in which the Filipino soldiers found themselves at that time due to the shortage of weapons and other necessary resources to fight against the Spanish armies.⁵¹

Furthermore, the utopian, sentimental idealization also brings us back to the question of bourgeois intellectualism. Just as Ponce and other Filipino intellectuals neglect the real history of slavery in Cuba, El Comité Cubano similarly fails to articulate different forms of labor exploitation within the specific context of the Philippines when the clerical power still dominates the colonial politics throughout the archipelago.⁵² Nor does La República Cubana talk about the formerly-existing slavery in the Caribbean in relation to the colonial situation in the South Pacific. The indication of “esos otros esclavos” in the text is not related to the material history of “slavery.” Thus, it should come as no surprise that we can find no ex-slaves among the members of El Comité Cubano in Paris (Estrade 2001, 33-46). As Estrade notes, the committee is composed of “la pequeña burguesía de las profesiones liberales” which represents “el importante grupo social de hombres de ciencia, abogados y escritores” (2001, 28). For them, the independence movement and anti-imperial struggles are defined exclusively on bourgeois terms

⁵¹ When the uprising took place in the Philippines, Rizal declined to associate himself with the rebellion because he believed that the time for revolution was not ripe yet and that his countrymen did not have enough resources to fight against the Spanish troops. See his “Manifiesto á algunos filipinos” (1896).

⁵² While the practice of slavery was abolished in Cuba in 1886, Spanish friars continued to have control over the majority of the Filipino population until the complete collapse of the colonial system in 1898.

rather than grounded on a specific historical aspect. The “slavery” metaphor works as a particular device intended to detach the ideology of national freedom from its problematic reality.

Three weeks after the publication of “¡Viva Filipinas Libre!,” another important essay on the Philippines “¿Qué quiere Filipinas?” appeared in the Cuban periodical. Following the preceding piece, this article reports updated information about the revolutionary war in the Philippines, analyzing that “esa guerra, lejos de verse localizada, adquiere mayor extensión cada día.”⁵³ We can recognize that every time the text mentions the Filipino rebellion there is *always* a comparison with the situation in the Caribbean. Such juxtaposition is undoubtedly deliberate insofar as “la importancia de aquella guerra” is not simply a local matter but a larger concern that affects both colonies. One of the first lines of the article shows an example of how the editors of La República Cubana attempt to understand the Filipino question in relation to the Cuban history:

Convencidos estábamos de que el gobierno español usaría de su táctica acostumbrada, ó sea proceder como con las revoluciones de Cuba de 1868 y 1895; esto es, anunciar al mundo en repetidos telegramas, que lo del archipiélago no es más que una revuelta fomentada por ingratos, extranjeros, bandidos é *indios*, en reemplazo estos últimos de los *negros* (emphasis in original).

It should be noted that Filipino “indios” are somewhat awkwardly compared to Cuban “negros.” The author’s purpose is to juxtapose two of the most exploited classes of people under the Spanish imperial project, suggesting that the *indios* undergo the same experience of colonial injustice as Afro-Cubans do. However, this approach seems to disregard the distinct historical conditions in which the two ethnic groups lived for over three centuries. As I discussed in the first part of this chapter, the principal exploiter of the African race in Cuba was the Creole

⁵³ The article is in the first page of La República Cubana no. 36, September 24, 1896. All the citations are from the same page.

plantation owner, whereas the indigenous population was subjugated first and foremost to the Spanish priest in the Philippines. Therefore, “indios” cannot be simply replaced by “negros” in the specific historical context of nineteenth-century Hispanic world.

There is more to say about this seemingly superficial reference to “indio/negro.” The conflation of the two figures certainly speaks to a common history of injustice that is a reasonable and well-worn strategy of anti-colonial resistance. However, the basic problem with which the article is concerned lies not so much in the exploitation of *indios* and *negros* as in the idea that the Spanish will label “us”—the bourgeoisie nationalists—“indios” and “negros.” The logic of the argument is that “we” are not those exploited individuals because “we” belong to a different social class. In other words, class consciousness once again plays an essential role in fighting against the empire. It seems that the internationalist wing of this kind of anti-imperial revolution cannot yet find common cause with the most oppressed, precisely those whom it should be most urgently joining forces with. The articulation of “indio/negro” in the article is similar to the problematic “slavery” metaphor in the discussion of the bourgeois idealism: on the one hand is slavery (symbol) and on the other hand are the actually enslaved (problematic reality).

In addition, we can also see the persistent metaphor of “slavery” emerging in “¿Qué quiere Filipinas?” The text narrates the history of Spanish colonialism in the Philippines, characterizing the Asian country as “explotada sin tregua ni consideración ninguna” as well as “esclava eternal de la voluntad de un soldado que no le habla de otro modo que con el *ordeno y mando*.” As we have discussed earlier, the term “esclava” represents a universal synonym for the oppressed. Moreover, the “eternally enslaved” Filipino reveals its defiant characteristic through the rising opportunity of a revolution. The article openly celebrates the insurrection by

exalting the indomitable spirit of Filipino soldiers: “ni por las amenazas ni los asesinatos que contra los indefensores ejerce el general Blanco [...] detiene aquellos la decisión y la bravura con que se baten, ni llevan trazas de ceder fácilmente.” The Cuban newspaper’s expression of support for the Philippines stems from their emphasis on the “spiritual” or “internal” strength of the Filipino military personnel. According to the article, an impressive characteristic of the Filipino soldiers is the combination of “la decisión y la bravura” both of which symbolize the army’s unyielding attitude before the Spanish troops. Whether or not this depiction coincides with actual history is a topic for further study. Here, what is important is that the text glorifies the soldiers’ rebellious mind-set and declares Filipino independence as a “santa independencia,” a symbol of romantic idealism par excellence. Through the celebration of a genuine Filipino “spirit,” El Comité Cubano seems to proclaim that the independence of their sister colony in Asia is both inevitable and predestined.

The conclusion of this article goes beyond the one we saw in “¡Viva Filipinas Libre!” The Filipino experience is not only juxtaposed to Cuba’s struggles, but it also reflects the complex history of Latin America as a whole: “Es el mismo problema en cuya resolución se ve empañada Cuba, y es también idéntico al que para su felicidad resolvieron las hoy repúblicas de Centro y Sur América.” By placing the Philippines alongside Central and South America, the article incorporates the former into the realm of Latin American history. That is, the Cuban periodical seeks to portray the Philippines’ struggles against the Spanish empire as an important experience of anti-colonial struggle in Latin America. The text finally ends with a rhetorical question that declares Cuba’s unequivocal support for Filipinos: “¿Quién no hará todos sus votos porque alcance el triunfo?” Since the reader (both Cuban and Filipino) is invited to respond to the question posed in the newspaper, he/she participates in the collective support for Filipino

independence. The article establishes, by content and its mode of persuasion, an urgent call to regard the Philippines not as geographically remote islands but rather part of Cuba and Latin America's own fight for freedom.

Now one might ask, how did Filipinos view Cubans in their newspapers? Was there a communication between the two colonies through periodicals? Was the support for national independence reciprocal? In order to contemplate these questions, I will turn to the Filipino newspaper of the time, known as La Solidaridad (1889-1895). A few years before the publication of “¡Viva Filipinas Libre!” and “¿Qué quiere Filipinas?” by El Comité Cubano, some Filipino activists also discussed the importance of the Cuban independence movement in their own journal. Like La República Cubana, the Barcelona-based La Solidaridad provided the exiled Filipinos with the principal means to propagate nationalist ideas in Spain and, more generally, Europe. The periodical represented the most effective political strategy to speak and be heard in Europe. It promoted various aspects of the Philippines' political assimilation to the metropolis, including parliamentary representation and freedom of the press.

The Cuban presence in La Solidaridad became apparent in the publication process itself, as one of the writers who frequently contributed articles was Juan José Cañarte from Cuba.⁵⁴ Among various articles dealing with the question of Spain's other overseas provinces, probably the most relevant one to my study is “¿Se vende Cuba?,” which was published on March 31st, 1889.⁵⁵ The text intends to examine the breaking news, reported by the newspaper The Sun in the United States, concerning the U.S. government's interest in purchasing Cuba from Spain: “¿es cierto el rumor que corre con respecto á la venta de la Isla de Cuba?” (114). It was during

⁵⁴ Cañarte belonged to the Masonic lodge in Madrid with several Filipinos, including Evaristo Aguirre and Julio Llorente.

⁵⁵ The article is signed by “Juan,” which probably refers to Cañarte.

the time when the U.S. was consolidating itself as a new imperial power through the idea of “manifest destiny.”

In “¿Se vende Cuba?,” Filipino nationalists adamantly oppose the idea that the Caribbean colony will be transformed into an object of American imperialism. The author disapproves the claim which, informed by the U.S. newspaper, states that “[y]a se conformaría el Sr. Sagasta en recibir 300 millones de pesos” (emphasis in original, 114). In response, the Filipino newspaper declares that “[s]upongamos, como queremos suponer, que el hecho de que se trata sea un solemne disparate ó alguna negociación ambiciosa forjada en la fantasía del autor de la noticia” (114). The comment is made perhaps out of fear that the Philippines can become the next American colony if Spain sold Cuba to the U.S. According to the text, Europeans and Americans “han convertido á Cuba las influencias políticas en fuente inagotable de riquezas para sus amigos y parientes” (114). Filipinos are worried that the same experience of economic exploitation will haunt the history of their own country.

However, the article gives more than the plain expression of terror: “nosotros no toleramos, ni podemos tolerar que aquel pedazo de tierra pequeña, si, pero *grande en el corazón* de sus hijos, sea como una mercancía cualquiera propuesta en los mercados de la diplomacia Europea” (my emphasis, 116). It is a manifestation of how “nosotros” Filipinos condemn the imperial project of commercializing their sister colony, the project that would allow both traditional (Spain) and modern (U.S) empires to exploit Cuban people. It is important to recognize that the text highlights Cubans’s moral characteristic—“grande en el corazón”—in order to support their freedom. Similar to the way in which La República Cubana claims its defense of Filipino independence by underlining Filipino soldiers’ “spiritual” power (i.e. the defiance of the army), La Solidaridad also characterizes Cubans in terms of their spirit or “el

corazón.” Indeed, this perspective of the two periodicals is somewhat compatible: while the Cuban newspaper idealizes Filipino independence as a “santa independencia,” the Filipino press criticizes the purchase of Cuba as a “sacrílege venta” (114). In “¿Se vende Cuba?,” therefore, the Caribbean island symbolizes a place “donde hay inteligencias que piensan [...] y voluntades que anhelan, allí en una palabra, donde existen *hombres que tienen corazón*” (my emphasis, 116).

The article further produces criticism against “la política del caciquismo” implemented by the Spanish authority (114). Attentive to the colonial situation in Cuba, the essay points to both the Spanish colonial system of “caciquismo” and the newly emerging agenda of U.S. imperialism. In the climax of its argument, “¿Se vende Cuba?” demonstrates strong support for Cuba’s freedom by insisting that political changes must be crystallized in the Caribbean island: “Llévense á aquel país las reformas pedidas por el partido liberal-autonomista, organícesele con las mismas leyes que está la Peninsula” (116). Like the Cuban newspaper, this Filipino editorial openly advocates freedom because “veneramos la libertad en su más lata manifestación” (116). It is through the daily print form that Filipinos not only condemn the Spanish-U.S. imperial projects but also articulate their support for the achievement of “reformas pedidas” in the Caribbean colony.

There is only one problem with the way in which the article supports Cuba’s struggles for national independence, and this is where the difference between La Solidaridad and La República Cubana emerges. In a line that seems to contradict the rest of the essay, the author of “¿Se vende Cuba?” expresses that “no cabe comprender que se les venda porque, [...] aquel país es un pedazo del territorio español” (116). Here, the tone of the text changes so abruptly that the reader may find it implausible at first. Why does the author suddenly change his pro-

independence argument and affirm that Cuba is part of the Spanish territory? Perhaps it is because of a concern that such a radical claim may disturb certain Spaniards and produce negative effects on the ongoing Filipino nationalist movement in Spain (the editorial was published in Barcelona). Or perhaps it is caused by the lack of information about Cuba that makes the writer suspicious of the actual possibility of independence. Whatever the reason is, the article differs from “¡Viva las Filipinas Libre!” and “¿Qué quiere Filipinas?” in such a way that it does not maintain its solid support for national independence of the Caribbean colony. As a result of this contradiction, “¿Se vende Cuba?” appears to be less persuasive than the other two, wavering between the attempt to support Cuba’s freedom and the effort to avoid confrontation with the Spanish and the U.S. authorities.

In this chapter, I have tried to discuss how the historical interplay that involved Cubans and Filipinos through correspondences and newspapers represents a large scale circulation of anti-imperial ideas behind the decaying force of the Spanish empire. It is true that the initiative of such global resistance was usually taken by Filipinos, but various Cuban figures actively responded to those calls during the last decade of the nineteenth century. By examining the relationship between Ponce and his Cuban associates in Cartas sobre la revolución and by analyzing editorial articles published in La República Cubana and La Solidaridad, I have presented both the possibilities and limits of global resistance as a particular form of *fin-de-siècle* anti-imperialism. My reading of the two periodicals showed the extent to which the two Spanish territories expressed support for each other’s national independence. They did not produce a concrete organization or institution based on their shared anti-imperial ideologies (as in the form of “Conferencia Tricontinental de los Pueblos” in 1966). Nonetheless, nineteenth-century intellectuals from Cuba and the Philippines maintained constant communications and encouraged

each other through letters and newspaper articles. These literary forms created the invisible link between the distant colonies and produced an ideological symbol of transnational coalition.

The war of 1898 not only marked a new page in modern world history but also put the two colonies on different developmental paths. Consequently, Cubans and Filipinos took different historical routes, as evidenced by the fact that the Spanish language is conserved only in the Caribbean and not in Asia. The notion of global resistance remains as an important cultural heritage of the postcolonial world. As the next chapter illustrates, aspects of this heritage can be perceived in the anti-imperial texts of arguably the most important writers of nineteenth-century Cuba and the Philippines: José Martí and José Rizal. Neither Martí nor Rizal lived to witness the collapse of the Spanish empire, but in different ways their writings influenced individuals who would construct post-1898 republics. In order to study their political ideologies, the next chapter will focus on their manifestos in which they seek to define their respective national identities as a viable response to the imperial power.

2.0 THEATRICAL PERFORMANCE IN THE MANIFESTO: COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF MARTÍ'S "MANIFIESTO DE MONTECRISTI" (1895) AND RIZAL'S "FILIPINAS DENTRO DE CIEN AÑOS" (1889-1890)

In the previous chapter, I discussed a history of global resistance by tracing numerous connections between late nineteenth-century Cuba and the Philippines. On the one hand, the historical interplay in which some Cubans (e.g. Izquierdo, Quesada) and Filipinos (e.g. Ponce, Aguinaldo) involved themselves symbolizes a large scale circulation of anti-imperial ideas during the final years of Spanish imperialism. To varying degrees, these revolutionaries moved beyond the readily apparent geographical boundaries that separated the two colonies and sought a way to amalgamate the anti-imperial force based on their shared ideologies concerning national independence. On the other hand, I also discussed some limitations of these links through the "slavery" symbol. The creation of a transnational, anti-imperial network depended on the rhetorical power of metaphor rather than grounded on the existent reality of slaves. In other words, conceptualizing the cross-colonial alliance was possible only within the restricted intellectual circuit of nineteenth-century Hispanic colonies in which the main concern was not to represent slavery as a concrete historical practice but to employ "slavery" as a metaphorical concept in order to highlight the common experience of Spanish colonialism.

My discussion of global resistance provides an initial point of departure for a comparison between José Martí and José Rizal. Both writers produced multiple texts on revolution and

resistance that marked considerable influence on other anti-imperial activists of their time. Their writings contributed to the development of nationalist ideas in Cuba and the Philippines in such a way that they created a conceptual framework that allowed for the emergence of transnational resistance. Here, Ponce's correspondence is once again helpful. As I mentioned in the previous chapter, his first letter to Izquierdo in 1897 reveals that he was interested in learning about Martí's nationalist ideas concerning the principles of revolution. According to Ponce, "[l]e agradecería nos dé cuantos folletos y publicaciones tenga acerca de la revolución que crea pueden ilustrarnos y enseñarnos, sobre todo los documentos oficiales, como *el manifiesto de José Martí y Gral. Gómez á principios de la guerra y otros*" (my emphasis, 7). Among Martí's many other political writings, Ponce gives emphasis to "el manifiesto" as a point of reference, alluding to the well-known "Manifiesto de Montecristi" signed by Martí and General Máximo Gómez in 1895. Given that "Manifiesto de Montecristi" is Martí's last political essay and arguably represents the culmination of his anti-imperial thought, Ponce's attention to the text should not be taken lightly. What attracts Ponce to the manifesto? How does the article's rhetoric work to produce a particular junction in which Cuba and the Philippines come together?

Examining the significance of Martí's "Manifiesto de Montecristi" is thus a central theme of this chapter, especially in comparison to Rizal's manifesto "Filipinas dentro de cien años." Read together, the two essays reveal some of the most important aspects of Martí and Rizal's anti-imperial views. What concerns me is the way in which the two writers similarly turn to the manifesto form in order to create an imperative call for national solidarity and to rebuke the colonial system. Through a comparative approach, my study will attempt to answer the following questions: In what way are the possibilities of anti-imperial politics articulated in their

manifestos? Why do Martí and Rizal choose the manifesto form to express their ideologies? How do they relate the larger picture of anti-imperialism to the local concern of nation building?

“Manifiesto de Montecristi” seeks to underscore the history of injustice committed by the Spanish colonizers and to produce an urgent call for independence. In the text, Martí refers to different temporalities that create the basis of Cuban identity: he explains why previous wars of independence failed in the past, what is necessary to embark on a new struggle of resistance in the present, and how a free republic should be built in the future. A similar emphasis on temporalities can be perceived in “Filipinas dentro de cien años” where Rizal analyzes the colonial past and present of the Philippines in order to contemplate the possible future that may await the country. As the title suggests, Rizal’s manifesto is mainly concerned with what *can* and/or *will* happen to the Philippines “within a century.” Both articles describe the colonial histories while simultaneously imagining an ideal future by trying to provoke a revolution in the present time. I understand the practice of writing a manifesto as something similar to the art of performing a theatrical drama: the author constructs an imaginary, utopian vision through words just as an actor creates a fictive world by using his or her speech. In my view, this idea of what can be called “theatrical performance” is an essential characteristic of Martí and Rizal’s manifestos. Through this performative act, the two writers produce an ideal condition for anti-imperial politics in which an alternative discourse is proposed not only to confront the shared opponent (the Spanish empire) but also to create a desirable subject that constitutes nationalism in Cuba and the Philippines.

Moreover, I use the notion of “theatrical performance” to examine the relationship between the manifesto form and the production of a collective subject in Martí and Rizal. It is well-known that Martí rejects the category of race as a determinant of Cuba’s national identity.

One of his most frequently cited passages reads, “no hay odio de razas, porque no hay razas” (O.C.: vol. 6, 22). Instead of “race,” I would argue, Martí presents an alternative notion to capture the totality of Cubanness in his manifesto: the idea of “pueblo,” specifically understood as *people*. My contention is that “Manifiesto de Montecristi” is a crucial text that reveals how Martí conceptualizes a Cuban “people” through theatrical performance. It is the idea of “people” that he underlines when thinking about a solution to the problematic notion of “race”; as he writes elsewhere, “Cubano es más que blanco, más que mulato, más que negro” (O.C.: vol. 2, 299). Unlike Martí, however, Rizal directly turns to the concept of “raza” as a basis for the country’s ideal future. This concept plays an important role for Rizal who seeks to distinguish the Filipino “race” from the Spanish “race” through the manifesto’s theatricality. By delineating the border between the national and the foreign, he defends the interests of his own “race” while defining its particularity through the process of nation building as well as anti-imperial resistance.

Structurally, this chapter first outlines the historical contexts of “Manifiesto de Montecristi” and “Filipinas dentro de cien años” in order to show the particular circumstances under which the two texts were written. I then define three important characteristics of the manifesto form by looking at some conceptual works, which mainly draw from Louis Althusser and Jacques Derrida. This will illustrate the specific way that I intend to employ the term “manifesto” in my analysis: it is a text written *against* a certain opponent, *for* a particular group of individuals, and *through* the act of “theatrical performance.” As political manifestos that intend to create a new history of the nation, the power of Martí and Rizal’s manifestos lies in their theatrical characteristic. They are short, urgent, persuasive, assertive, and most importantly for my analytical work, productive of “people” (Martí) and “race” (Rizal). My analysis of the

two texts thus aims to highlight how the ideas of Cuban “people” and Filipino “race” are articulated similarly and/or differently. For insight into this process, I turn to Etienne Balibar’s concept of “fictive ethnicity,” on the one hand, and Michel Foucault’s idea of “race war,” on the other. In different ways, these two theories help understand the relationship between such notions as people, race, nation, and theatricality in Martí and Rizal’s manifestos.

2.1 HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Together with the general Máximo Gómez, Martí signed the “Manifiesto de Montecristi” on March 25, 1895, before embarking upon a war of independence in Cuba. By then, Martí had stopped producing more “literary” writings (e.g. poetry, novel) in order to dedicate himself entirely to the emerging revolution. The manifesto’s most obvious significance resides in the fact that it was the last political essay that Martí produced during his life; two months after signing the document, he was killed in the battlefield. However, the text is also important for understanding the history of anti-colonial struggles in Cuba, because its appearance marked the opening of a new historical period of revolutionary war. Prior to the publication of the manifesto, Cuba had experienced multiple attempts to achieve freedom, including various conspiracies during the 1820s and 1830s, the Ten Years’ War (1868-1878) and finally the Little War (1879-1880). Although these struggles gave birth to such historical figures as Félix Varela (1788-1853), José María Heredia (1803-1839), José Antonio Saco (1797-1879), and Carlos Manuel de Céspedes (1819-1874), none of these uprisings brought liberation to the country. After experiencing the failure of the so-called “Fernandina Plan” in the beginning of 1895 when three Cuban ships fully equipped with military supplies were seized by U.S. authorities in

Florida, Martí decided that it was time to initiate another rebellion and delivered a momentous discourse of war in “Manifiesto de Montecristi.”

There are three principal goals in Martí’s manifesto: to announce the intentions of the revolutionary government, to outline the objectives of the independence movement, and to make every Cuban equally participate in the emerging anti-imperial fight. The text explicitly states that the future of the Cuban republic will be an independent nation that is capable of protecting itself from any external power. Martí’s vision of an immediate and speedy revolution is evident in the text. The leader of the Partido Revolucionario Cubano not only condemns “la ineptitud y corrupción irremediables del gobierno de España” (O.C.: vol. 4, 99) but also elucidates the goals of the war by highlighting that it should be “la guerra más breve, sus desastres menores, y más fácil y amiga [*par*] la paz” (97).⁵⁶ Martí’s characterization of the war as “friendly” or “peaceful” represents a typical characteristic of his poetic language where contradiction between harmony (peace) and conflict (war) is a necessary constituent of the universe.⁵⁷ Although he hopes to produce a “friendly” war, the possibility of violence is never fully rejected. Martí claims that “[a]l acero responda el acero, y la amistad a la amistad” (97). The idea of bloodshed symbolizes the unwanted and yet possible condition of Martí’s war politics through which his ideologies seek to put an end to the Spanish colonial system.

Nonetheless, his pronouncement of war in the manifesto was not the first time he made such an assertion. Already in 1880 upon his arrival to New York, Martí claimed the need to systematically organize an anti-colonial revolution against the Spaniards. During his speech to

⁵⁶ The text is found in O.C. vol. 4, 93-101. For subsequent citations from this article, I will only indicate the page number.

⁵⁷ Ivan A. Schulman describes the apparent contradiction in Martí as follows: “Mediante un salto sintáctico, sin conectivo, en prosa expresionista, el poeta detalla las dos caras de la vivencia humana—la de la violencia [...] y la de la serenidad armónica característica del modelo clásicobucólico” (90).

Cuban immigrants in Steck Hall, New York, he wrote, “[e]s que cuando ya nos ahoga, se hace preciso cortar el lazo que no sabe aflojarse a tiempo” (O.C.: vol 4, 192). The lecture was Martí’s first public discourse in the U.S. and represented his initial attempt to examine the cause and the goals of the revolution that was to be prepared. The impact of his speech on the audience was exactly what he had expected: the audience saw the figure of a great orator in Martí and immediately acknowledged him as their leader (Vitier, 2004: 85). His discourse at once underscored the continued relevance of the Ten Years’ War and celebrated the potential force of resistance among the immigrants in New York, creating “una primera configuración política, y aún filosófica, del hecho revolucionario cubano” (Vitier, 2004: 85-86). After the lecture at Steck Hall, his political ideas would be reiterated and further developed in various occasions during his fifteen years of stay in the United States. Therefore, the production of “Manifiesto de Montecristi” in 1895 can be understood as an outcome of his exiled life in the U.S. as well as the zenith of his anti-imperial thought.

Across the Pacific, Rizal published “Filipinas dentro de cien años” as a series of articles between 1889 and 1890 in La Solidaridad.⁵⁸ In the text, Rizal analyzes the Filipino past and present in order to predict a possible future. He notes in the beginning of the article that his intention is “leer en el destino de los pueblos [filipinos],” which requires “abrir el libro de su pasado” (I, 582). The first part of the essay is thus dedicated to the description of more than three centuries of Spanish colonialism in the Philippines. As one of the principal leaders of the Filipino struggles against the European empire, the author seeks to study the country’s history and to reveal “la profecía basada en mejores probabilidades” (IV, 48). Paul A. Kramer argues that Rizal’s interest in returning to the country’s history stems from his wish to define the rights

⁵⁸ The article is divided into four parts: I (September 30, 1889), II (October 31, 1889), III (December 15, 1889), and IV (February 1, 1890).

of the Filipino population: “Rizal’s historiography, with its confident separation of the ‘national’ from the ‘foreign,’ sought Filipino rights through historical insulation” (9). Concerned about the possibility of independence, Rizal asks, “¿Continuarán las Islas Filipinas como colonia española, y, en este caso, qué clase de colonia? ¿Llegarán á ser provincias españolas con ó sin autonomía? [...] ¿Se separarán tal vez de la Madre patria para vivir independientes, para caer en manos de otras naciones ó para aliarse con otras potencias vecinas?” (I, 584). In the text, he offers three possibilities to the inquiry based on his own assessment of the country’s history: 1) it will remain a Spanish colony but will enjoy respect, equality, and political autonomy; 2) it will attempt to obtain independence through inevitable violence; or 3) it will once again be colonized by another nation, such as the United States.⁵⁹

The illustration of the country’s past in “Filipinas dentro de cien años” was an important turn at that time because Rizal knew that the history of the Filipino people had been previously misinterpreted by the Spaniards. As Floro C. Quibuyen suggests, he was the first to rewrite the national history from the perspective of the colonized people (211). His manifesto seeks to recuperate the long history of colonial injustice by exploring “tres siglos de embrutecimiento y oscurantismo” that have converted the colonized population into a “caricatura” (II, 660). In fact, to narrate the untold history of Spanish imperialism was one of Rizal’s primary concerns between 1889 and 1890 while he was residing in London. He explained in a letter to his friend Ferdinand Blumentritt how he was attentively conducting historical studies at the British Museum during that time. He wrote, “I am assiduously reading all the old sources of the history of the Philippines; I do not propose to leave London until I have read all the books and

⁵⁹ Toward the end of the text, Rizal briefly mentions that the U.S. can be a potential empire that is interested in exploiting the Philippines. His perspective on the modern U.S. empire and its comparison with Martí’s vision will be discussed in Chapter 4.

manuscripts which have anything to do with the Philippines” (Guerrero 208). One of the products of such an assiduous endeavor was his annotated edition of a high-ranking Spanish official Antonio de Morga’s Sucesos de las islas Filipinas, which was originally written in 1609. Rizal describes the purpose of his edition in the introduction of the book: “Si el libro logra despertar en vosotros la conciencia de nuestro pasado, borrado de la memoria, y rectificar lo que se ha falseado y calumniado, entonces no habré trabajado en balde, y con esta base, por pequeña que fuese, podremos todos dedicarnos á estudiar el porvenir” (vi). No other Filipino had written a comprehensive history of the Philippines before Rizal. By examining the “genuine” history of the Filipino people, he attempted to recuperate the country’s lost memory to advance his nationalist project. Reynaldo Ileto points out that Rizal showed “the ilustrado nostalgia for lost origins” by articulating “a flourishing, precolonial civilization, the lost eden” in order to “reconstitute the unity of Philippine history” (31, 35).

Although the idea of rewriting history is also recapitulated in “Filipinas dentro de cien años,” this essay differs significantly from his annotation of Sucesos de las islas Filipinas in that its insistence of a future war of independence is more explicit and pressing. Unlike the latter, the former is written unequivocally against the Spanish empire. “Filipinas dentro de cien años” is not just a historical study, but more importantly a political discourse that seeks to sketch out the course of a possible revolution against the colonizers. In other words, Rizal’s manifesto is an instrument to awaken the national consciousness as well as a tool to mobilize the entire population. He states that the discontented Filipinos will one day demand their freedom through a radical approach if their request for autonomy is rejected by the colonial authorities. For Rizal, independence is both inevitable and unmistakable: “las Filipinas se han de declarar un día fatal é infaliblemente independientes” (IV, 42). Depending upon the circumstances, he adds, even

blood may be shed in order to attain freedom. The country will not hesitate to free itself “después de ensangrentarse y ensangrentar á la Madre patria” (II, 670). Similar to the way in which Martí implies “acero” as an ultimate symbol of war, Rizal suggests an aggressive revolution as a potential solution for the liberation of the Philippines. Both Martí and Rizal attempt to transform a printed text into a politically charged speech act that will change the colonial condition, whether by preferable means of peace or by undesirable use of violence. Confronting this difficulty, the two writers must deal with the elusive task of turning words into actions and ideals into reality. As the following sections show, they will find a possible means to solve the problem in the theatrical aspect of the manifesto form.

2.2 THEATRICAL PERFORMANCE OF THE MANIFESTO FORM

Before entering into my close reading of “Manifiesto de Montecristi” and “Filipinas dentro de cien años,” it is necessary to clarify the specific way in which I employ the term “manifesto,” or more precisely “political manifesto,” in my analysis.⁶⁰ According to the Oxford English Dictionary, a manifesto is “a public declaration or proclamation, written or spoken; especially a printed declaration, explanation, or justification of policy issued by a head of state, government, or political party or candidate, or any other individual or body of individuals of public relevance, as a school or movement in the Arts.” Generally, a manifesto represents a text issued by

⁶⁰ Because of the nature of my study, I focus on the *political* aspect of the manifesto genre rather than its *aesthetic* characteristic. However, it is important to acknowledge that the manifesto form is often used for an artistic purpose as well. In Latin America, for instance, many *vanguardistas* from the early twentieth century incorporated the manifesto form for their cultural production, creating an innovative style of art in such countries as Chile, Argentina, Mexico, and Brazil. Some of the most notable examples include Vicene Huidobro’s “Non serviam” (1914), Jorge Luis Borges’s “Anatomía de mi Ultra” (1921), and Oswald de Andrade’s “Manifiesto antropófago” (1928).

someone with authority and written in order to persuade the public audience. By declaring or proclaiming something, the text emphasizes the significance of the socio-political changes it hopes to produce. When it is used effectively, a manifesto can become a powerful instrument to define the universal legitimacy of a particular social class (e.g. “The Communist Manifesto”) or to attack the traditional power structure of Western hegemony (e.g. “Anarchist Manifesto”). The common thread among authors of manifestos is the will to transform empty words into concrete political actions that can bring tangible results to the society at large.

One of the theories of the manifesto genre is introduced by Louis Althusser who argues that a manifesto is “not a text like others” because “it is a text which belongs to the world of ideological and political literature, which takes sides and a stand in that world” (2000: 23). Following Gramsci’s reading, he calls Niccolò Machiavelli’s The Prince a “revolutionary utopian manifesto” (2000: 14) and develops a theory of the manifesto based on his analysis of Machiavelli’s text. According to Althusser, “[a] manifesto is not written for an individual, especially a nonexistent individual: it is always addressed to the masses, in order to organize them into a revolutionary force” (2000: 25). His idea suggests the possibility that the rhetoric of a manifesto is capable of turning a text into “a political act” (2000: 23). In order for this transformation to happen, he argues, a manifesto “demands to be written in new literary forms” which include the characteristics of being “lucid, compact, vigorous and impassioned” (2000: 23). For him, a manifesto is written as a means to provoke the feeling of urgency in the reader’s mind and to challenge the established order through its particular speech act.

Althusser’s theory proposes two essential characteristics that make a manifesto. On the one hand, a manifesto is written *for* a group of people who are in need of certain political change and, on the other hand, it is produced *against* some specific opponent. In the case of The Prince,

Machivelli pens the text for “the masses” and against the enemies of “the prince.” Similarly, “The Communist Manifesto” is created for the universal working class and against the hegemonic bourgeois subject. When Althusser calls one of the aspects of a manifesto “impassioned,” his proposal points to the *againstness* that is inherent in the manifesto form.⁶¹ My analysis of “Manifiesto de Montecristi” and “Filipinas dentro de cien años” follows this systematic understanding of the manifesto form. Both texts are written in support of the colonized peoples in Cuba and the Philippines, while presenting their criticism against the Spaniards. For Martí and Rizal, the particular style of the manifesto serves to define the colonized subject as “Cuban” and “Filipino” in opposition to the colonizing subject of “Spaniard.”

However, there is another characteristic of the manifesto that I want to highlight: the idea of “theatrical performance.” By “theatrical,” I mean to indicate the way in which a manifesto creates an imaginary reality and subjectivity that the author desires. Its context is more fictional and utopian than descriptive and factual: as Althusser reminds us, a manifesto exists in the domain of ideology (2000: 23). In general terms, a manifesto is an exclusive one-way discourse by a writer who does not provide the possibility of dialogue with the audience. It accepts neither interpretation nor opposition. Rather than inviting the public to participate in a discussion, the author only conveys his/her argument as if to speak from the theatrical stage. In order to persuade the audience and to eventually provoke revolutionary actions through the power of speech, the voice of the manifesto is usually aggressive, urgent, straightforward, hyperbolic, and

⁶¹ My emphasis on the “againstness” of the manifesto form follows Mary Ann Caws’ study which suggests that “as if by defining a moment of crisis, the manifesto generally proclaims what it wants to oppose, to leave, to defend, to change. Its oppositional tone is constructed of *againstness* and generally in a spirit of a one time only moment” (xxiii).

exceptionally self-assured.⁶² As Janet Lyon observes, “[t]he form’s capacity for rhetorical trompe l’oeil tends to shape its wide intelligibility: the syntax of a manifesto is so narrowly controlled by exhortation, its style so insistently unmediated, that it appears to say only what it means, and to mean only what it says” (9). The concise presentation of ideas in the manifesto allows the author to deliver a desirable discourse whose main purpose is to teach something to the reader in the form of theatrical performance. Hence, the manifesto style is pedagogical in nature, and it is this calculated pedagogical tendency that makes the manifesto a unique genre.

In the manifesto, what one finds is a theatrical performance in which the author-as-actor seeks to produce a desirable world rather than describing the reality of the reader-as-spectator. The space enacted in the text represents a non-existent, hypothetical place. At its peak of theatricality, the manifesto creates its own fictive meaning and representation of reality. The author’s language is the only audible speech in the textual stage, which is self-authorizing (because it has no other authority than the text itself), didactic, and even authoritarian. Consequently, each reader is unknowingly made to comprise an integral part of this peculiar performance without having any active role in the development of the show. In Althusserian terms, the reader is made to be a concrete “subject” through the process of “interpellation” by the text itself.⁶³ By producing a manifesto as a theatrical performance, the writer is capable of presenting a utopian condition through which he/she invents an alternative discourse to confront the announced opponent and to make the audience possess the same attitude of resistance as the writer him/herself.

⁶² Caws describes the nature of the manifesto form in the following way: “immodest and forceful, exuberant and vivid, attention-grabbing. Immediate and urgent, it never mumbles, is always in overdose and overdrive” (xxi).

⁶³ For his discussion of “interpellation” as a particular mode of subjectification, see his “Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses (Notes Toward an Investigation).”

Regarding the theatrical performance of the manifesto form, Jacques Derrida offers some insight in his study of America's "Declaration of Independence" (1776) which he regards as a manifesto-like text.⁶⁴ The Declaration can certainly be read as a manifesto because it is not only written *for* the American people but also *against* King George III of Great Britain. Through his critical analysis of America's foundational text, Derrida shows how the Declaration of Independence derives its power from a theatrical characteristic.⁶⁵ His initial question deals with the meaning of "signature" in the text. What concerns him is "*who signs, and with what so-called proper name, the declarative act which founds an institution?*" (emphasis in original, 8). It is not Thomas Jefferson since he only plays the role of a "draftsman" as the delegate of the other representatives of the thirteen States who assign him the task of articulating what they want to express. However, those "representatives" are not the real signatories either because in principle they do not sign for themselves but for someone else. That is, they become signers of the Declaration in the name of "the people" of the United States of America. Thus the true signer is the people, or more precisely the "good people" of America, who seek to declare themselves free and independent through the voice of their representatives (9).

Derrida then relates the question of signature to another issue concerning the performativity of national independence and collective subject. He wonders if the Declaration actually *announces* independence or theatrically *creates* it. As he argues, one cannot decide whether "the good people have already freed themselves in fact and are only stating the fact of this emancipation" or whether "they free themselves at the instant of and by [*par*] the signature

⁶⁴ Lyon also briefly discusses Derrida's perception of the Declaration (27-28).

⁶⁵ Hannah Arendt also celebrates the Declaration of Independence but from a different perspective than Derrida's. While Derrida is interested in *who* wrote the document, Arendt explores the question of *how* it was written. For her, the significance of the Declaration lies "not so much in its being 'an argument in support of an action' as in its being the perfect way for an action to appear in words" (1963, 130).

of this Declaration” (9). Put differently, the question is whether the manifesto declares the existence of an already-liberated subject or whether it makes a yet-to-be-liberated subject independent through the text itself. Certain tension is perceived between reality (the fact of emancipation, the announcement of a free subject) and theatrical performance (the creation of emancipation, the making of a free subject). For Derrida, this tension is “*required* in order to produce the sought-after effect” (emphasis in original, 9). What he suggests is the idea that a manifesto not only depicts the condition of the liberated people, but also makes those people independent *through the act of invocation*. The difference is subtle and yet significant: while the first instance refers to the “people” as an already-existent subject, the second example implies that the “people” become independent at the precise moment of textual declaration. That is, the collective subject of “people” is being made in the text itself. In Derrida’s words, “this people does not exist. They do *not* exist as an entity, it does *not* exist, before this declaration, not *as such*” (emphasis in original, 10). What we see here is not a fixed subject but rather a mobile subject or a subject in the process of becoming, one that crystallizes only when it is pronounced by a manifesto. In the Declaration of Independence, the addressed subject—the “good people” of America—does not really exist as a political entity before it is recognized and given name through the text.⁶⁶ This process can be understood as a theatrical performance because it produces a new subject in ideological terms. The manifesto announces the ideal condition of an emerging American nation by performatively giving the quality of “goodness” to the “people” that will constitute the new republic.

⁶⁶ For Lyon, “the manifesto is, after all, a text of radicalism which forges an audience through its efforts at effective and experiential intelligibility. That is, an audience crystallizes as the manifesto formulates and performs a future audience’s experience of a response to oppression” (28).

2.3 MARTÍ AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF CUBAN “PEOPLE”

Derrida’s discussion of the “Declaration of Independence” argues for the possibility that a subject that does not yet exist in reality can become materialized as it is pronounced on the text. In short, the theatrical characteristic of the manifesto allows the creation of a politically desirable subject (the “good people” of America). Although there seems to be hardly any relationship between the “Declaration of Independence” and Martí’s “Manifiesto de Montecristi,” we can detect certain links on a symbolic level. The Cuban revolutionary leader discusses the significance of America’s foundational text on a number of occasions during his life.⁶⁷ For example, in an article written six years before his manifesto, Martí celebrates the Declaration of Independence as a text that exemplifies the project of mobilizing a population. In the article, he states that the document’s particular value is its ability to “clavar en los corazones de los hombres, como el asta de bandera en la cuja, las ideas con que se han de levantar los pueblos” (O.C.: vol. 12, 255). His understanding of the Declaration in terms of its impact on “los pueblos” is significant as the concept of “pueblo” will be rearticulated in his own declaration of the Cuban independence war in “Manifiesto de Montecristi.” Whether the Declaration of Independence directly influenced Martí’s conceptualization is not the topic of my analysis. Rather, I intend to explore the way in which Martí defines the Cuban “people” through the function of theatricality in his manifesto. How does he use the manifesto form to performatively construct the idea of “people”? What are the effects of such construction? What does it mean for him to belong to the “people”? Or conversely what does it mean *not* to belong? How is the

⁶⁷ See, for instance, O.C.: vol. 12, 257 and vol. 13, 380.

national subject brought into being or deprived of its existence through the act of theatrical performance?

In the first place, it should come as no surprise that “Manifiesto de Montecristi” defines the idea of “people” in the specific context of the war for independence. Martí conceptualizes the idea as he proclaims the principles of the revolution. In the text, what he calls “la guerra sana y vigorosa” functions as “el piadoso anhelo de dar vida plena al pueblo que, bajo la inmoralidad y ocupación crecientes de un amo inepto, desmigaja o pierde su fuerza superior en la patria sofocada” (100). For him, the “healthy” and “vigorous” characteristics of the imminent war depend on the creation of a new subject: “el pueblo.” “As we declare a war today,” Martí states, “we will give a full life (*vida plena*) to the people.” The meaning of his insistence is both literal and symbolic. It is literal because the announced revolution actually gives a new history or “full life” to Cubans whose bitter experience of colonialism is described through the image of “la patria sofocada.” Martí’s utterance of “pueblo” represents a particular speech act that seeks to initiate a new historical period: “La revolución de independencia, iniciada en Yara después de preparación gloriosa y cruenta, ha entrado en Cuba en un nuevo período de guerra” (93). The subject of “pueblo” is the protagonist of this “nuevo período de guerra.” The purpose of the manifesto is to explain how the imminent war will be different from earlier wars and what it will bring to the people: as Martí writes else where, “[u]n pueblo, antes de ser llamado a guerra, tiene que saber tras de qué va, y adónde va, y qué le ha de venir después” (O.C.: vol. 1, 186). Unlike the previous anti-imperial struggles, what he proposes in the text is “la [revolución] que no haga Presidente a su caudillo, la revolución contra todas las revoluciones” (O.C.: vol. 6, 360). Put differently, “Manifiesto de Montecristi” attempts to change the history of exploitation into the

future of freedom and justice through the creation of a revolutionary subject: “[un] pueblo avergonzado” is given a new life and transformed into “un pueblo libre” (96).

On the other hand, Martí’s production of “people” also has a symbolic significance insofar as the manifesto seeks to define Cuba’s “pueblo libre” as a national subject that distinguishes itself from the Spanish “amo inepto.” This dichotomy points to an anti-imperial gesture that characterizes “the national” in opposition to “the foreign.” The announcement of “el pueblo cubano” becomes a political discourse that marks a distance in ideological ground between the addressed subject and the accused opponent. As Alfred J. López observes, Martí frequently applies the notion of “pueblo” within the specific context of nationalism (110).⁶⁸ “Manifiesto de Montecristi” creates a decisive moment in which such notion is pronounced as a politically desirable subject, both in terms of nationalism and anti-colonialism. In other words, the collective subject of “we the people of Cuba” emerges out of the particular junction between the project of nation building and that of anti-imperial resistance.

My understanding of the relationship between the creation of “people” and the idea of “nation” draws on Etienne Balibar’s theory of the “nation form” in Race, Nation, Class: Ambiguous Identities (1991). Balibar argues that the fundamental problem of any nationalism is “to produce the people” or, more precisely, “to produce the effect of unity by virtue of which the people will appear, in everyone’s eyes, ‘as a people,’ that is, as the basis and origin of political power” (93-94). For him, the idea of “people” never exists “naturally, and even when it is tendentiously constituted, it does not exist for all time” (93). The reason behind this claim is that “no modern nation possesses a given ‘ethnic’ basis, even when it arises out of a national independence struggle” (93). The “people” is thus always an imaginary subject that is

⁶⁸ Martí’s use of “pueblo” in the particular context of national independence can be found in many of his earlier anti-imperial writings. See, for examples, O.C.: vol. 2, 61-63, 335-349; vol.5, 177; and vol. 7, 36-45.

constructed according to specific political and social conditions that constitute the ideological form of “nation.” Following Rousseau’s classical inquiry about “what makes a people a people,” Balibar then poses the question, “How are individuals nationalized or, in other words, socialized in the dominant form of national belonging?” (94).

He further defines the imaginary characteristic of “people” through the notion of “fictive ethnicity” (96). By “fiction,” he does not speak in the sense of “false” but in the older etymological sense of *fictio* which indicates the quality of being “made” or “fashioned.” The term must be understood “by analogy with the *persona ficta* of the juridical tradition in the sense of an institutional effect, a ‘fabrication’” (96). The notion of “fictive ethnicity” represents the essential condition upon which the nation is formed: it is “fictive” because “no nation possesses an ethnic base naturally, but as social formations are nationalized, the populations included within them, divided up among them or dominated by them are ethnicized” (96). Balibar’s concern is the discursive naturalization of social inequalities that divides “authentic” components of nation from “false” elements. The process of nationalization, which means “the naturalization of belonging and the sublimation of the ideal nation,” necessarily involves the erasure of a set of social-class differences that are considered non-national (96). The production of a collective identity thus symbolizes an attempt to minimize each individual citizen into a mere carrier of national homogenization. From this perspective, every group identity in a nationalist project always leads to the creation of a collective fiction.

While Balibar calls the nationalized subject “fictive,” I would add that it is also “theatrical” in the case of Martí. The production of Martí’s “people” becomes theatrical in such a way that the concept is constructed based on the author’s self-authorizing confidence and performance. Throughout the text, he expresses conviction that the announced “pueblo” will

undoubtedly achieve freedom. For example, the manifesto promises that the Cuban people are capable of realizing “la victoria asegurada a las determinaciones finales” (100) because they possess “el espíritu de redención” (99). Even before embarking on the battle, their victory is “guaranteed” in the manifesto. Such hyperbole is made possible because the manifesto’s theatrical characteristic allows the author to create a utopian world. Instead of presenting concrete plans to achieve victory—which would be the work of other documents (ordenanzas and the like)—the manifesto announces that victory *is already* determined. In other words, Martí’s call for freedom is a performative act: like a theatrical stage that enables the production of a hypothetical space, his vision of a liberated “people” must first become convincing within the realm of the imagination. In the same way, the text states that the Cuban people “no dudan de Cuba, ni de sus aptitudes para obtener y gobernar su independencia” (96). With the manifesto’s theatricality, Martí evokes a world in which “el pueblo cubano” is not permitted to doubt the possibility of independence. It is clear that the power of the argument in the manifesto largely depends on the author’s confidence. Martí’s rhetoric functions to expose a desirable subject of “people” whose nature is characterized by its “espíritu de redención.” It is his own desire and hope that Martí emphasizes in articulating the Cuban “people.” What we see in “Manifiesto de Montecristi” is, therefore, a declaration of the author’s desire, the “fictionalization” of a project, a truth that he seeks to convey to the audience through theatrical performance. To borrow Shalini Puri’s words, “the value of inspirational speech lies not in its literal un/truth but in what its performance of confidence might make *possible*” (emphasis in original, 89).⁶⁹

⁶⁹ Puri examines the effect of the author’s confidence in the manifesto, albeit from the viewpoint of hyperbole. For her, hyperbole not only produces “the appearance of confidence, whether that confidence is genuine or a masquerade” but also “seeks to inspire in the reader a similar confidence so as to expand the collective projected by

Moreover, the theatricality of Martí's "people" also becomes apparent in his attempt to idealize the subject. Similar to the way in which the manifesto performatively "guarantees" Cuba's independence, the text provides essential characteristics of flawlessness to the national subject in the form of performance. Martí determines the nature of the Cuban "people" as he proclaims a revolutionary war:

se une aún más *el pueblo de Cuba, invencible e indivisible*, séanos lícito invocar, como guía y ayuda de nuestro pueblo, a los magnánimos fundadores, cuya labor renueva el país agradecido —y al honor, que ha de impedir a los cubanos herir, de palabra o de obra, a los que mueren por ellos— (my emphasis, 101).

Here, the declaration that "the Cuban people are invincible and indivisible" can be understood as a performative statement, because it intends to produce a hypothetical world that the author hopes to realize. Rather than portraying the reality of socio-cultural heterogeneity in Cuba, the manifesto performs its own version of the imaginable through the voice of someone who serves as "guía y ayuda de nuestro pueblo." It is in pronouncing these words that the new subject of "people" is believed to possess such ideal characteristics as invincibility and indivisibility. It is the *possibility* of being invincible and inseparable that Martí underlines. His desire is to unite the "pueblo" under the rubric of an indissoluble nation: he writes "Manifiesto" precisely to politicize a national subject and to fuel the patriotic fervor of the independence movement. What he really addresses is not that the Cubans *are* already "invincible and indivisible" but rather he wishes that they *were*. Theatricality is what makes Martí's "pueblo" an indivisible and homogenous entity out of the multi-ethnic and multi-cultural Cuban people. The manifesto does not represent things as they are or name things that are already existent; the form itself resists this. Since neither the war nor the nation is yet accomplished when the text is written, the liberated subject of "people" that Martí invokes is a non-existent subject or a subject in the process of becoming. As we saw

the manifesto" (91).

in the previous discussion on how America's Declaration of Independence performatively produces the collective subject of a "good people," "Manifiesto de Montecristi" creates Cuba's imaginary subject of an "invincible and indivisible people." The articulation of this idealized "pueblo" indicates the author's wish to integrate all the Cubans into a single entity. The rhetorical function of his manifesto is to make the reader believe in this entity and to lead the country toward the kind of war the author desires to set off.

As Balibar's concept of "fictive ethnicity" illustrates, the production of a "people" always indicates an exclusive and hegemonic program of nationalism. In "Manifiesto de Montecristi," Martí constructs the notion of "people" based on two specific conditions: first by excluding fainthearted, non-national individuals and second by performatively defining Cuban *people* in relation to Latin American *peoples*.⁷⁰ The theatrical aspect of the manifesto makes it possible for Martí to produce an imaginary subject derived from hope, desire, and idealism. Martí's "people", therefore, establishes its own subjectivity by tracing a border between an "authentic" Cuban and a "false" one. For instance, his manifesto states that the announced revolution does not include what he calls "a mistaken group of Cubans": "La guerra no es [...] la humilía siquiera de un grupo equivocado de cubanos" (94). By "equivocado," he means the Cubans who are reluctant to participate in or who have wrong ideas about the war of independence. The category of "people" does not involve some "mistaken Cubans," though the ideas of "right" or "wrong" are only defined from the manifesto's subjective perspective. Instead, what Martí proposes is a univocal and single-minded subject that represents a collective will of the country or "la voluntad

⁷⁰ It can be argued that Martí's conceptualization of Cuban "people" also reflects his complicated relationship with Afro-Cubans. The link between Martí's nationalism and his ambiguous vision concerning Cuba's "race problem" has been widely discussed by scholars of Latin American literary and cultural studies. Ada Ferrer, for instance, convincingly argues that Martí's national project seeks to "silence" the singular subjectivity of the black race during the war of independence (228-36). See Ferrer (1999), Duno-Gottberg (2003) and Montero (2004).

de un país” (93). For Martí, there is no compromise when it comes to the spirit of revolution: the manifesto declares a war not only against the Spanish colonizers but also against those Cubans who lack the nerve to fight along with him. As the manifesto states, it is a war “para sobreponerse a las cobardías humanas y a sus varios disfraces” (93). The notion of “human cowardice” becomes an important factor that determines Martí’s peoplehood—the condition of being a Cuban “people”—and this will decide what can count as “national” or “non-national.”

In his construction of the Cuban “people,” those who do not meet the standard set by the manifesto are excluded from the national space. Martí writes, “La guerra [...] debe imponer silencio a *aquellos cubanos menos venturosos que no se sienten poseídos de igual fe en las capacidades de su pueblo* ni de valor igual con que emanciparlo de su servidumbre” (my emphasis 94). The enunciated “people” is a restricted subject that is only applicable to the individuals who share “equal faith” with Martí. The idea of silencing “less venturesome” Cubans reveals an attitude that displaces individuals who are not as “faithful” as the author himself. Similarly, Martí claims that his country will enter a war with full certainty of its victory which is “inaceptable solo a los cubanos sedentarios y parciales” (94). Like “the less venturesome,” “the halfhearted” also do not constitute what Martí defines as a national subject because they do not believe in people’s ability to achieve freedom. Rather than representing diverse levels of commitment among the participants of the independence war, the author simply evokes a unitary subject based on the degree of one’s “faith.” Through a particular rhetoric, he gives the national community an exclusive space, one which seeks to turn non-national subjects invisible. By stating that those who lack “equal faith” do not comprise a “people” and thus are not “national,” Martí turns the declaration of revolution into something like a sermon delivered in a religious activity. It is the abstract “faith” that matters: as Nicola Miller points out, “[t]he

Manifiesto particularly emphasized Martí's faith in the Cuban character, the Cuban's unusual gifts of tolerance, humanity, culture, and devotion to justice" (251). The text produces a national subject around the recognition of one's faith. That is, only by *believing* in the notion of the "people," can one successfully belong to the selective community Martí wants to create.⁷¹

Furthermore, we can perceive another level of his insistent faith in Cuba. In the manifesto, he develops the characteristic of the national Cuban *people* in comparison to, or more precisely in opposition to, the continental Latin American *peoples*. In this sense, his well-known discourse and defense of Latin American republics can be reexamined from an alternative perspective. "Manifiesto de Montecristi" presents a political dramaturgy through which one's national identity is characterized in terms of relations. That is, it is the relationship between Martí's Cuba and his equally significant "Our America" that defines a nationalized "people." The manifesto declares that the war will be led by "un pueblo democrático y culto," which is the idea originated in the classical notion of Plato's "the chosen one" who plays the essential role of establishing an ideal republic. Martí writes in the text that:

Cuba vuelve a la guerra con un pueblo democrático y culto, conoedor celoso de su derecho y del ajeno; o de cultura mucho mayor, en lo más humilde de él, que las masas llaneras o indias con que, a la voz de los héroes primados de la emancipación, se mudaron de hatos en naciones las silenciosas colonias de América (95).

His war of independence is different from previous attempts because it calls for the emergence of a new ideological subject. Unlike other revolutionaries, Martí's political figure is aware of its own rights and is capable of properly applying them into the fight against colonizers. The manifesto creates a division between the national and the continental: the former is represented by "un pueblo democrático y culto," whereas the latter is symbolized by "las masas llaneras o

⁷¹ Martí's emphasis on "faith" reflects, at least partly, the nature of the manifesto form that is often used for religious discourses. The theological use of the term "manifiesto" refers to the concept of divine revelation and can be found in, for example, seventh-century England as well as nineteenth-century America (Lyon 1999).

indias.” By emphasizing the importance of its enlightened culture, Martí’s “people” distinguishes itself from the masses of plainsmen or Indians with which the “silent” Spanish colonies in Latin America transform cattle ranches into nations. What he seems to suggest is that “our country is somehow more advanced than our continent because Cuban people have a better culture (*de cultura mucho mayor*) than the masses of Latin America.” From this perspective, he demands a hierarchical relationship between the national collectivity and the continental subject.

Martí further discusses the critical difference between Cuba and Latin America. He argues that Cuba will be able to overcome the “disturbances” that other countries in the continent have failed to resolve, namely “los trastornos en los pueblos de América” (95). His invocation of “los trastornos en los pueblos de América” refers to the multiple socio-political difficulties that have historically confronted and disturbed Latin American peoples. The manifesto presents a rather lengthy list of “mistakes” in different Latin American nations. For example, he mentions the problem of adopting foreign models, the concentration of literary culture in the capitals, the countries’ erroneous attachment to the feudal customs of the colony, and the presence of rival leaders among separate regions that produces disarray in each country (95).⁷² After illustrating these problems, Martí states that his announced Cuban “people” are capable of prevailing over these difficulties. According to him, “los trastornos americanos [...] no son, de ningún modo los problemas de la sociedad cubana” (95). The reason behind this claim is the idea that his national subject represents more productive characteristics than the continental subject. He claims that Cuba will be able to resolve Latin America’s “mistakes” because its national community has a

⁷² Martí’s articulation of Latin American errors includes “error de ajustar a moldes extranjeros; de dogma incierto o mera relación a su lugar de origen, la realidad ingenua de los países que conocían solo de las libertades el ansia que las conquista, y la soberanía que se gana por pelear por ellas. La concentración de la cultura meramente literaria en las capitales; el erróneo apego de las repúblicas a las costumbres señoriales de la colonia; la creación de caudillos rivales consiguiente al trato receloso e imperfecto de las comarcas apartadas; la condición rudimentaria de la única industria, agrícola o ganadera; y el abandono y desdén de la fecunda raza indígena en las disputas de credo o localidad que esas causas de los trastornos en los pueblos de América mantenían” (O.C.: vol. 4, 95).

better system of republican education, patriotism of war fighters, realistic and modern employment of various intelligentsias and resources, and admiration of common virtues among its members (95). Through these factors, Martí establishes the concept of national people as “un pueblo feraz en la república justa” in which diverse elements are rapidly integrated into a single entity (95). Martí’s subject of Cuban people emerges precisely by opposing and defining itself as an alternative to the “erroneous” history of “Our America.” Given that Martí’s defense of Latin America is a well-established discourse, it is interesting to recognize how Latin American *peoples* are described through their mistakes and disturbances, while Cuban *people* are defined in terms of their ability to successfully produce the future of justice and freedom. The idea of national character and that of continental identity do not coexist in his manifesto. In this sense, it is misleading to regard “Manifiesto de Montecristi” as equally national and continental, like the “official” reading suggested by Cuba’s National Congresses of History in 1959.⁷³ On the contrary, Martí’s claim for national independence in fact depends on his critical view of Latin American countries, a theme that is often overlooked by readers of his anti-imperial writings.⁷⁴

The dichotomy between Cuban “people” and Latin American “peoples” brings us back to the question of theatrical performance in Martí’s manifesto. Just as there is a triumphant protagonist and an unsuccessful antagonist in a theatrical drama, “Manifiesto de Montecristi” portrays Cuba as a central figure of the show whose experience is constructed against Latin America’s history. Put differently, Martí finds the potential of the national subject in the future, while the continental subject is unable to move away from its suffocating past. His manifesto

⁷³ According to Revaloración de la historia de Cuba por los congresos nacionales de historia, Martí’s manifesto brings together a profound sense of nationality, a collective identity of the whole American continent and an inspiration for universal harmony (18).

⁷⁴ As Enrico Mario Santi notes, Martí’s critique of Latin America has not been fully explored by critics who tend to overemphasize Martí’s defense of “Our America” against U.S. imperialism (180).

declares a call to affirm the possibility of the Cuban population through the act of theatrical performance, producing the idea of “people” and hypothetically speculating its future. Theatricality is what enables Martí to not only imagine a utopian republic but also to project a political subject that will achieve its vision.

2.4 RIZAL AND THE FORMULATION OF FILIPINO “RACE”

While Martí’s “Manifiesto de Montecristi” emphasizes the term “pueblo” to define the subject that produces the ideal condition of nationhood in Cuba, Rizal’s “Filipinas dentro de cien años” turns to the notion of “raza” as the basic structure of a future Filipino republic. Although the two manifestos employ different concepts to articulate a national, anti-imperial subject, they similarly depend on the theatrical characteristic of the manifesto to communicate with the addressed reader/audience. So far we have seen how Martí creates the idea of Cuban people through the manifesto’s theatricality. On the one hand, the idea of “pueblo” is constructed based on the imaginary power of self-authorizing confidence. On the other hand, it performatively excludes some “non-national” Cubans and establishes itself in comparison to the peoples of Latin America. In Rizal’s manifesto, the theatrical aspect first appears in the proposal of the text itself. As the title suggests, his main concern is the country’s future and the possibilities of what can happen to the Philippines “within a century.” It is important to note that his prediction is founded on the idea that the future is an unavoidable consequence of the past events. As one of the passages of the manifesto reads, “podemos asegurar que dentro de algunos años, el actual estado de las cosas se habrá modificado por completo; *pero inevitablemente*” (my emphasis: II, 666). Rizal maintains that a change is inevitable as a result of more than three centuries of

colonization: it is not sufficient to say that a revolution *can* happen but it *must* happen undoubtedly. In my view, such an attempt to envision the future is possible only as a theatrical performance in which the author projects the utopian vision of the future. The theatrical space created in the manifesto is a hypothetical world that the author seeks to envision based on his historical analysis. At its peak of what can be called “futurity”—the condition of seeing the future as an inevitable consequence of the past—, Rizal provides a desirable meaning to the representation of an ideal Filipino community. Without theatricality, there would be no image of the future, no project of anti-colonial resistance, and no prospect of an independent nation in the Philippines. It is perhaps for this reason that some critics have read Rizal’s manifesto as a work of prophecy that stems from the performative narrative of the country’s future.⁷⁵

“Filipinas dentro de cien años” consists of four sections (or “scenes” as in a theatrical show), and each of them describes different aspects of the Filipino reality. The first part of the manifesto is dedicated to rewriting the history of Spanish colonization. As I pointed out earlier, Rizal was the first writer to take up this task from the colonized perspective. He narrates how the Filipino identity gradually faded away as the Spaniards conquered the archipelago in the sixteen century:

[Los Filipinos] Perdieron poco á poco sus antiguas tradiciones, sus recuerdos; olvidaron su escritura, sus cantos, sus poesías, sus leyes, para aprenderse de memoria otras doctrinas, que no comprendían, otra moral, otra estética, *diferentes de las inspiradas á su raza por el clima y por su manera de sentir*. Entonces rebajóse, degradándose ante sus mismos ojos, avergonzóse de lo que era suyo y nacional, para admirar y alabar cuanto era extraño é incomprensible; abatióse su espíritu y se dobló (my emphasis: I, 582).

On the surface level, Rizal seems to simply highlight the lost memories of the Philippines’ cultural heritage (“su escritura, sus cantos, sus poesías, sus leyes”) in opposition to the imported ideas of the imperial “other” that he criticizes (“otras doctrinas” and “otra moral, otra estética”).

⁷⁵ See, for example, Pocock (1997) and Delmendo (1998).

However, his narrative goes beyond the mere articulation of the country's vanished memories as it grapples with the identity of the Filipino "race." He argues that, unlike the foreign models, ancient traditions of the colonized race are inspired by the climate ("por el clima") and, more importantly, by "their way of feeling" ("por su manera de sentir"). This abstract "feeling" of Filipino identity is described more generally in a later part of the manifesto (II, 660). Rizal's attention to the "way of feeling" reveals a critical gesture to characterize the Filipino race in terms of their sensitivity. In rearticulating the past history of the country, he suggests that Filipinos should return to their own "manera de sentir" in order to recuperate "lo que era suyo y nacional." It is this sensitivity that represents one of the basic characteristics of the Filipino race in Rizal. As Blanco notes, "this sensibility, this way of feeling, however innocuous, nevertheless provides the key to the colonial subject's racial transformation to the national, Filipino one" (2009: 254).

However, Rizal's conceptualization of the Filipino race is more complex than a pronunciation of feeling. At first sight, "Filipinas dentro de cien años" does not seem to define the idea of "race" in a systematic way. For example, Rizal refers to the plural "razas filipinas" in comparison to other races of the world when he writes, "[I]as razas filipinas, como todas las malayas, no sucumben ante el extranjero, como las razas australianas, las polinésicas y las razas indias del Nuevo Continente" (II, 668). Here, the country's multiple races are identified with Malays and depicted as subjects of resistance, similar to Australians, Polynesians, and the Indians of the New World. Through such comparison, Rizal attempts to place the Filipino races in a larger picture of resistance. In other parts of the manifesto, his allusions to Filipino races are more multi-layered: he mentions the potential existence of conflicts between distinct "razas" in the Philippines (II, 662) or briefly discusses the significance of the enlightened class in those

“razas filipinas” who will serve as the country’s “brain” once a revolutionary war is proclaimed (II, 666).

Despite these diverse definitions of “races” in the manifesto, there is a moment in which ambiguities are replaced with a clear-cut declaration. It is when he evokes the singular “raza filipina” in claiming the impossibility of destroying the Filipinos. According to him, “Dijimos, y la estadística lo prueba, que es imposible destruir la raza filipina” (IV, 42). We can read this assertion as a performative statement insofar as the notion of “indestructible race” represents an imaginary subject rather than the fact of race: the author only *hopes* that the Filipino race is somehow “indestructible” and also that “it” exists. By presenting the affirmation through the manifesto’s theatrical characteristic, Rizal intends to convince the reader that what he declares is a “truth,” when it is actually based on mere speculation. In fact, nowhere in the manifesto provides “la estadística” that he claims to prove his declaration. In other words, Rizal *performs* the Filipino race instead of *describing* it. What his manifesto presents is not an accomplished identity, one that exists in reality, but an invented identity, one that is found in idealism. From the author’s viewpoint, the Filipino race is believed to be “indestructible,” and the act of utterance in the manifesto gives legitimacy to this claim and makes it plausible to the reader. By announcing the indestructible characteristic of “la raza filipina,” Rizal actually makes the race indestructible in the ideological realm. This is similar to Martí’s earlier pronouncement of “invincible people” in “Manifiesto de Montecristi.” Like Martí, Rizal uses the performative act of invocation to construct a desirable subject: this time the invented subject is called “unbeatable Filipino race.” His manifesto turns the theatrical force into a source of legitimacy upon which the nationalized race is based. The text’s theatricality creates a particular stage from which a new subject emerges as a response to Rizal’s call for national independence.

In this theatrical stage, the Filipino race is represented by the Filipino “karabaw,” or water buffalo. By articulating the characteristics of the country’s domestic animal, Rizal attempts to imagine the resistant nature of Filipinos as well as their indestructibility. He writes that:

El español es bravo y patriota, y lo sacrifica todo, en favorables momentos, al bien de la Patria: tiene el arrojo y la decisión de su toro; el filipino no ama menos la suya, y aunque es más tranquilo, pacífico y difícilmente se le excita, una vez que se lanza, no se detiene, y para él toda lucha significa la muerte de uno de dos combatientes; conserva toda la mansedumbre y toda la tenacidad y la furia de su karabaw (IV, 44).

“Karabaw” (or “carabao” in English) is a large animal of the cow family that is often used for plowing rice fields or moving vehicles and various farm instruments. The animal is generally known to be docile and loyal to farmers: some popular folk tales depict it as a powerful and hardworking creature. However, when it is irritated or attacked by a predator, the carabao unveils its rebellious nature and turns the opponent down with absolute ferocity. Its two horns can inflict massive damage to the enemy, and to stop the animal under such condition is almost impossible. In the manifesto, Rizal describes this potential resistant power of the carabao as the preserved strength of the Filipino race. Like the animal, the national race never hesitates to attack the opponent when it feels threatened. And as he shows in the text, the adversary of “karabaw,” the Filipino race, is “toro,” the Spanish race.

The relationship between “karabaw” and “toro” suggests a conflict between a national symbol and an imperial one, between the colonized race and the colonizing race. The recognition of these two races is a necessary element of Rizal’s anti-imperial project. In order to achieve the Philippines’ national independence, his manifesto provokes a war between the Filipino race and the Spanish race. According to the autor,

en países dominados por una raza extranjera, el acto de severidad más justo se interpreta por injusticia y opresión, por aquello de que lo dicta una persona extraña que no tiene

simpatías ó que es enemigo del país; y la ofensa no sólo ofende al ofendido, sino á toda su raza, porque no se suele considerar personal, y el resentimiento, naturalmente, se extiende á toda la raza gobernante y no muere con el ofensor (IV, 44)

Rizal argues that if a single race constitutes a certain country, any social injustice committed by the government is ascribed to a specific individual or a group of individuals who try to exploit the population for their personal interests. On the contrary, if a country is dominated by a foreign race, which is the case in the Philippines, then the injustice is attributed to the entire governing race and is committed against the whole victimized race. As Vincente R. Pilapil notes, the Filipino leader “showed in all logical force how in a country that is dominated by another there will be an inevitable race conflict” (264). For Rizal, the question of Spanish colonialism in the Philippines is not simply a personal concern but necessarily involves the whole Filipino race. With this idea, he calls for a collective struggle against the Spanish race. In other words, by writing “Filipinas dentro de cien años,” Rizal symbolically participates in a war between two races, a kind of war that Michel Foucault calls “race war.”

The notion of “race war” is theorized by Foucault in his lecture series known as “Society Must Be Defended” (1975-76). In the lecture, he pays particular attention to the way in which the first instance of “historico-political discourse” (as opposed to the traditional “philosophico-juridical discourse”) emerges as a discourse of “race war” during the seventeenth century as a challenge to sovereign power (60-62). According to Foucault, “race war” represents “[t]he war that is going on beneath order and peace, the war that undermines our society and divides it in a binary mode” (59-60). It perceives society not only as a binary structure but also as a permanent war between two or more races that are determined by “ethnic differences, differences between languages, different degrees of force, vigor, energy, and violence; the differences between savagery and barbarism; the conquest and subjugation of one race by another” (60).

The most important aspect of “race war” is its possibility to produce “counterhistory” through this binary vision (66). Indeed, Foucault “praises” the discourse of race war because of its “counterhistorical function” (65-66). With the idea of “race war,” he proposes an alternative narrative of history that challenges the perspective of those in power. Unlike the traditional discourse which articulates “the untarnished and uneclipsed glory of the sovereign,” this new historical discourse represents “a direct challenge to the history of sovereignty and kings” (71). Therefore, Foucault argues, the counterhistory “will of course speak from the side that is darkness, from within the shadows. It will be the discourse of those who have no glory, or those who have lost it and who now find themselves, perhaps for a time—but probably for a long time—in darkness and silence” (70). It is a story about dominated subjects and about the possibility of their struggle against the power of hegemony. The discourse of “race war,” through its counterhistorical function, allows one to speak the language of resistance, the language of revolution.

The relevance of Foucault’s concept to my analysis is this alternative mode of history-writing that exposes the counterhistory of a subjugated race. I have already mentioned that Rizal was concerned about rewriting the country’s history from the Filipino perspective when he annotated Sucesos de las islas Filipinas and published “Filipinas dentro de cien años” in 1890. Quibuyen argues that “this national view of history [in Rizal] would counter the colonialist view of the Philippine history written by Spaniards, as well as provide the historical orientation to the present crisis” (211). In order to achieve his national project, authoring a manifesto is an effective way to provoke a “race war” between the colonized race and the imperial race. As Lyon suggests, “to write a manifesto is to participate symbolically in a history of struggle against dominant forces; it is to link one’s voice to the countless voices of previous revolutionary

conflicts” (4). Rizal’s text speaks from the position of the exploited and produces a new historical discourse against the dominant power. From this perspective, there is a certain link between the concept of “race war” and the manifesto genre. We can even go so far as to say that Foucault articulates his view on race and counterhistory in terms of the manifesto, which symbolizes a modern, ideological perspective of the defeated. In this sense, it is notable that the manifesto genre emerges in seventeenth-century Europe, around the same time as the rise of “race war” discourse.

One of the ways in which Rizal’s manifesto narrates the counterhistory of the Filipino race is by constructing a unified, collective subject as a viable response to the colonial project. “Filipinas dentro de cien años” seeks to politicize the national race through the idea of unity. Rizal explains that a shared abasement and misfortune under Spanish colonialism enables Filipinos to become integrated into one single race, wiping away the conflicts that previously existed in various provinces: “antiguas enemistades entre diferentes provincias las ha borrado una misma llaga, la afrenta general inferida á toda una raza” (II, 204). The basis for the Philippines’ collective community is a common indignation against a mutual oppressor, and this is precisely the concept of “race” that Foucault perceives in his discourse of “race war.” In Rizal’s manifesto, the invocation of “race war” leads to the production of a unified subject of the Filipino race. He describes how “naturalmente las comunicaciones y el cambio de impresiones aumentan, y viéndose todos amenazados de un mismo peligro y heridos en unos mismos sentimientos, se dan las manos y se unen” (II, 668). It is the shared feeling of threat caused by the imperial race that facilitates communications among the inhabitants of the Philippine islands and brings them together under the shelter of the nation. Renato Constantino points out that the term “Filipino” originally alluded to the Spaniards born in the colonized Philippines but

nineteenth-century *ilustrados* turned it into “a class concept” until it “finally embraced the entire nation and became a means of national identification” (4-11). I argue that Rizal takes this question of Filipino identity even further and understands “Filipino” through the nexus between race and nation. Writing “Filipinas dentro de cien años,” then, means not only to expose the untold history of Spanish colonialism, but also to claim the solidarity of a unified Filipino race. In fact, his concept of “unified race” (which connotes a political community) as opposed to “anthropological races” (which connotes distinct cultures) emerges, or *can only emerge as thinkable*, within the context of the nation. Therefore, the invocation of one race in the manifesto is a direct way to call upon the Philippines’ national liberation.

The unification of the Filipino race becomes a concrete goal of nationalism when Rizal announces the figure of the collective subject in the manifesto. By returning to the history of previous revolts that attempted to disturb the Spanish empire, he claims that those uprisings in the past were merely the works of “unos cuantos fanáticos ó descontentos militares” who neglected the popular characteristic of a revolution and the need to form a single race (II, 664). According to him, “[n]inguna insurrección tuvo carácter popular ni se fundó en una necesidad de toda una raza, ni luchó por los fueros de la humanidad, ni de la justicia” (II, 666). On the contrary, Rizal’s manifesto seeks to construct a resistant force that emerges from the united Filipino race and its national spirit: “Hoy existe un factor que no había antes; se ha despertado el espíritu de la nación, y una misma desgracia y un mismo rebajamiento han unido á todos los habitantes de las Islas” (II, 666). Like Martí’s manifesto, Rizal’s article underlines the importance of creating a new history at the moment of enunciation: the emphasis is placed on the present time “hoy.” For Rizal, “today” is when the unified “toda una raza” emerges as a concrete political subject because it crystallizes as it is pronounced in the essay itself. His

speech demands that the invented national subject take immediate actions for a rebellion against the oppressor. By stating “*today* is different” and “*now* is the time for change,” history is not merely recorded as a past event but also transformed into something original. In other words, the manifesto both recuperates an old history and builds a new future. To borrow Claude Abastado’s words, Rizal simultaneously “undoes time and redoes history,” meaning that his text positions itself between the practice of history-writing and future-making (6). His proclamation of “*hoy*” aims at going beyond the failures of the past and to spotlight the present need to establish a nation based on racial solidarity.⁷⁶

The idea of future-making is related to the “futuraity” of Rizal’s discourse that I discussed earlier. “*Filipinas dentro de cien años*” produces the ideal vision of a unified Filipino race and announces its futurity through theatrical performance. The theatricality of the manifesto form gives Rizal a discursive space in which he positions his discourse on race between what has been accomplished and what will be done, between what is (or is not) already accomplished and what is achievable. In other words, theatricality makes history malleable in the manifesto which at once seeks to recuperate past history and to generate a future history as an inevitable consequence of the past and the present. Rizal insists that, “*podemos asegurar que dentro de algunos años, el actual estado de las cosas se habrá modificado por completo; pero inevitablemente*” (II, 666). It is through the transparent space of this future perfect construction—“*se habrá modificado*”—that Rizal calls for the potential change his revolution seeks to produce as well as the subject of the Filipino “race,” which will realize such a change in

⁷⁶ Lyon explains the importance of the present moment in the manifesto as follows: “The past has been barbarically deforming, but it has led at long last to this millennial present; the inevitable violence that must attend the present moment of action is part of the painful but necessary parturition that issues in the birth of a utopian future of political equality” (30).

the future. His performative declaration makes the imaginary subject seem believable so that the reader would be persuaded into thinking that the construction of a unified country is achievable.

Moreover, theatricality also appears in the exclusive characteristic of Rizal's "race" construction. The manifesto's theatrical performance provides Rizal with a discursive space in which he can invent a non-existent subject of nationalized race that erases the differences between diverse ethnic groups that inhabit the Philippines.⁷⁷ Here Balibar's notion of "fictive ethnicity" is once again productive. Balibar reminds us that the process of nationalization always involves the elimination of a set of social-class distinctions that are considered non-national. When we examine Rizal's writings, the notion of "race" is regarded not as a manifestation of existing ethno-cultural specificities but as the effect of the naturalization of such diversity in the Philippines. In short, not all "races" in the country constitute what he identifies as the Filipino "race." Filomento V. Aguilar Jr. observes two distinct layers in Rizal's view on Filipinos: "[o]n one hand were 'the civilized Filipinos' (*los Filipinos civilizados*), who did not resist conversion to Catholicism; on the other were 'the mountain tribes' (*las tribus montaÑesas*), who resisted and therefore were not civilized" (612). For instance, Rizal omits such local tribes as "Negritos" and "Moros" from his picture of the united racial community. Around the time he first published "Filipinas dentro de cien años" in 1889, he also wrote a proposal for a conference of Philippine studies that was to be organized by the Asociación Internacional de Filipinistas in Paris. Although the conference never actually happened, it would have been a timely opportunity for Rizal and his allies to present the "genuine" representation of the Filipino race. In his program draft, Rizal initially suggested some panels on the "origen," "clasificación," and "civilización" of the islands' inhabitants before the arrival of Spaniards and other sections on

⁷⁷ Some of the largest ethnic groups in the Philippines include the Visayan, the Tagalog, the Ilocano, the the Bicolano, and the Kapampangan.

“the influence of Spanish civilization on the social life of the Philippines” (Aguilar 620). It was only after his friend Ferdinand Blumentritt’s advice that he decided to include a new panel on “[r]azas y regiones independientes,” which refer to “the sultanates and independent tribes (Moros, Negritos, and so on)” (620). This sudden change indicates the exclusive nature of Rizal’s conceptualization of the Filipino “race”: he would not have added “independent races and regions” of Negritos and Moros in his conceptualization of the Filipino race if this new idea had not been suggested by Blumentritt. His attempt to define the solidarity of the Philippines’ single *race* is a way to underline its superiority over other *races* in the country. As Aguilar puts, “‘Filipino’ stood for the internally superior and dominant ‘race’ led by an ‘enlightened class,’ whose members, although charged as inferior by racist outsiders, were equal to Europeans in their being civilized and civilizable, deserving liberty and indeed their own independent nation” (631).

Hence, writing “Filipinas dentro de cien años” is a strategy to defend the privilege of the unitary, nationalized “race” and to circumvent the possible regionalism that would make individual races exist separately in the Philippines. This characteristic of the restricted “race” can be compared to the equally limited category of “people” in “Manifiesto de Montecristi.” Whereas Martí’s Cuban “people” seeks to silence “aquellos cubanos menos venturosos” and “los cubanos sedentarios y parciales,” Rizal’s Filipino “race” excludes “razas independientes.” In both cases, we can perceive the erasing of the country’s socio-cultural multiplicity. That is to say, the two writers’ attempt to create a unified agent against Spanish imperialism represents the idea of reconciling differences in their respective colonies and thereby marginalizing certain groups of people who are not classified as “authentic” nationalists. The theatricality of the two manifestos at once delineates the specific contour of a political community and determines what

is relevant or irrelevant to the project of nation building. The official entitlements of “people” and “race” are performatively pronounced and constructed in both texts as the only legitimate inhabitants of an ideal Cuba and Philippines. Consequently, Martí and Rizal employ theatrical performance of the manifesto genre to expose the border between inclusion and exclusion. Their task, then, is not just to proclaim a revolution against the Spanish empire and to call for national independence. It is also to effectively educate readers and convince them to participate in the development of nationalization and naturalization without causing any disturbance that may result in the destruction of such imaginary solidarity.

As I have shown in this chapter, the manifesto has a peculiar characteristic that allows the writer to produce a hypothetical space from which he/she delivers a discourse to the audience. Its purpose is to make the public believe that the subject being pronounced in the text is capable of creating a desirable future. Understanding this feature as a “theatrical performance,” I have explored its critical functions and limitations through my analysis of Martí’s “Manifiesto de Montecristi” and Rizal’s “Filipinas dentro de cien años.” Though both writers equally turn to the manifesto form to declare the beginning of a new war of independence against the Spanish empire, they take different approaches to articulate the central figure of the emerging anti-imperial struggle. Martí’s manifesto focuses on the notion of “people” in describing the ideal condition of nationhood in Cuba, whereas Rizal’s text emphasizes the idea of “race” as a protagonist of the Philippines’ future. Moreover, they use the manifesto’s theatricality to delineate the restricted contour of a national community and to legitimize the exclusion of those they consider “non-national.” Their manifestos become effective political instruments to determine the extent to which an individual can or cannot belong to the national sphere.

The performative conceptualization of a collective subject in Martí and Rizal contributed to the development of nationalist ideologies in their respective countries toward the end of the nineteenth century. As a result, the ideas introduced and propagated by these two writers made possible, at least partially, the emergence of direct interactions between political actors from Cuba and the Philippines who expressed their mutual support for each other's independence based on the shared consciousness of revolutionary movement and nationalization (e.g. Ponce and Izquierdo). In this way, Martí and Rizal laid an ideological basis for the history of global resistance, and their manifestos played an important role in the creation of such foundation. The shared struggle against the Spanish empire in Cuba and the Philippines is somehow reflected in how Martí and Rizal equally turn to the manifesto form to make a case for their respective national collective subjects.

However, their discourse on the ideas of “people” and “race” in “Manifiesto de Montecristi” and “Filipinas dentro de cien años” essentially represents a national concern rather than a symbolic force of anti-imperial resistance. In order to examine the significance of their political thoughts in a larger picture, their nationalist texts must be read along with their more explicitly anti-imperialist writings. It is for this reason that the next chapter will focus on their novels. If the manifesto form gives Martí and Rizal a performative function to produce a desirable subject of a primarily national characteristic, the narrative form provides them with a tool to create a subject of anti-colonial resistance. With this idea in mind, I will now analyze the possibility of a resistant and counter-hegemonic force in Martí's Lucía Jerez (1885) and Rizal's Noli me tangere (1887).

**3.0 WRITING THE MELODRAMA: GENDER RELATIONS AND THE
DISCOURSE OF RESISTANCE IN NOLI ME TANGERE (1885) AND LUCÍA JEREZ
(1887)**

In the previous chapter, I examined the formation of nationalist ideologies in Martí and Rizal's manifestos, particularly focusing on how the two writers employ the notions of "people" and "race" as unified, counter-historical subjects. For them, writing a manifesto is analogous to producing a theatrical drama because the utopian vision articulated in "Manifiesto de Montecristi" and "Filipinas dentro de cien años" derives its force from the art of performance. Through the idea of "theatrical performance," I discussed how their texts create the ideal condition of national politics to confront the Spanish empire and to construct a desirable, homogenous subject that can constitute the future of Cuba and the Philippines. Their project of homogenization, however, reveals a similar issue of political exclusion because it deliberately establishes a fixed border between the national and the non-national.

Whereas the second chapter discussed the form of the manifesto in Martí and Rizal, this chapter turns to the genre of the novel. Unlike their manifestos which emphasize the constitution of collective identity as a central project of nation building against the Spanish empire, their novels—Lucía Jerez (1885) and Noli me tangere (1887) respectively—focus on a different theme to formulate national, anti-imperial politics. What they have in common is a particular way of delineating the condition of colonialism through the question of gender relations. Written around

the same time, the two novels similarly present interactions between female and male characters who, in their unique manners, symbolize imperial power as well as the possibility of anti-imperial resistance. The concept of “gender” appears to be a complicated one for both authors because the conventional gender roles attributed to men and women are often inverted in the texts, with female characters exhibiting “masculine” aggressiveness and male figures showing “feminine” submissiveness. Indeed, it is this complex relationship between “masculine” women and “feminine” men that I intend to highlight first in Rizal’s novel.

To explore the issue of gender relations, I purposely betray the chronological order of the two works, analyzing Noli me tangere (popularly known as the Noli) before Lucía Jerez. By doing so, I attempt to read the Filipino text as a critical platform upon which to examine the Cuban novel. The Noli and Lucía Jerez share certain narrative style and rhetorical elements that can be examined along with, and in opposition to, some of the canonical narratives that Doris Sommer has famously called “foundational fictions.” What are some of the characteristics that help us situate the two texts within the larger context of nineteenth-century Latin American literature? What role does desire play in the production of different fictional characters? And finally, how do Rizal and Martí seek to articulate the potential condition of anti-imperial resistance through the narrative form?

3.1 RIZAL, MARTÍ AND THE NARRATIVE OF MELODRAMA

It can be argued that both the Noli and Lucía Jerez follow the European (particularly French and German) tradition of romanticism. In many ways, love affairs and moral qualities determine the course of character development in both stories. Constant struggles between good and evil are

shown by presenting the protagonists who tirelessly fight against their enemies or by dramatizing the psychological dynamics experienced between couples. Although written in different socio-historical contexts and with distinct political purposes (the Noli is more overtly “political” than Lucía Jerez), Rizal and Martí’s texts equally take the particular form of *melodrama* in order to articulate the force of virtue and morality through the issues related to romance, gender and power. I employ the term “melodrama” in the sense used by Peter Brooks who argues that “the melodramatic mode of conception and representation may appear to be the very process of reaching a fundamental drama of the moral life and finding the terms to express it” (12). According to Brooks, the melodrama, as a concept derived from romanticism and opposed to naturalism, represents a modern form that “starts from and expresses the anxiety brought by a frightening new world in which the traditional patterns of moral order no longer provide the necessary social glue” (20). Because of their similar focus on moral values, critics have placed Rizal and Martí’s novels alongside classic European melodramas: some compare the Noli with Dumas’ The Count of Monte Cristo (Santillan-Castrence 1960), while others recognize similarities between Lucía Jerez and Goethe’s Wilhelm Meister’s Travels (Ette 1986; Uribe 1989).

Melodrama was indeed a prevailing narrative style adopted by many Latin American writers during the nineteenth century. Francine Masiello goes so far as to claim that “es imposible narrar el caos del fin de siglo [XIX] de América Latina *sin* el melodrama” (460). One of the most prominent studies of the nineteenth-century novels in recent years is Doris Sommer’s Foundational Fictions: The National Romances of Latin America (1991). In the book, Sommer compellingly demonstrates how Latin American writers in the nineteenth century employ narrative styles and metaphors taken from the romantic literature of Europe and the United

States. Drawing on Michel Foucault, Benedict Anderson and Fredric Jameson, Sommer explores the ways in which the heterosexual love relationship in Latin American “national romances” allegorizes political desire for the creation of a unified republic. As she describes in the introduction, her goal is “to locate an erotics of politics, to show how a variety of novel national ideals are all ostensibly grounded in ‘natural’ heterosexual love and in the marriages that provided a figure for apparently nonviolent consolidation during internecine conflicts at midcentury” (6). Some of the texts she studies include Gertrudis Gómez de Avellaneda’s Sab (1841), Jorge Isaacs’ María (1867), and Rómulo Gallego’s Doña Bárbara (1929). Using sexual love as “the trope for associative behavior, unfettered by market relationships” (35), these romantic narratives show how an amorous union between individuals from distinct regions, classes and ethnicities is meant to resolve in symbolic terms the conflicts that reside in the emerging Latin American nations. As a result, these novels produce national ideologies and propose a dynamic process of state consolidation. According to Sommer, “[e]rotic interest in these novels owes its intensity to the very prohibitions against the lovers’ union across racial or regional lines. And political conciliations, or deals, are transparently urgent because the lovers ‘naturally’ desire the kind of state that would unite them” (47).

The specific relevance of Sommer’s theory to my analysis of Rizal and Martí will be discussed later in this chapter, but for now suffice it to say that neither the Noli nor Lucía Jerez is mentioned in her study of “foundational fictions,” in spite of the two novels’ explicitly melodramatic language and “national” characteristic. At first sight, these omissions seem explicable because of their tragic endings: unlike most of the narratives assessed by Sommer, the Noli and Lucía Jerez do not demonstrate couples who are capable of achieving reconciliation or

productivity, which determines the possibility of national founding.⁷⁸ In other words, the two novels do not present the allegorical vision of unified republics that are idealized through the construction of a nationalized couple. In fact, I will argue that both texts demonstrate the *impossibility* of a “naturally” heterosexual union, and this impossibility is precisely what creates the condition of possibility for anti-imperial resistance in the Philippines and Cuba. What I am proposing here is, then, that the discourse of resistance in the Noli and Lucía Jerez is articulated not by celebrating Sommer’s “national allegory” but instead by offering an alternative model. The romance in these two texts is not so much a way to imagine national conciliation through sexual desire as to expose the crisis of such conciliation and to frustrate the power of Spanish colonialism.

3.2 THE (NON)NATIONAL ASPECT OF NOLI ME TANGERE

Published in 1887, Rizal’s Noli me tangere is one of the two novels he completed during his life.⁷⁹ The title of the book, which means “do not touch me” in Latin, is originally taken from the Gospel of St. John in which Jesus, upon rising from the dead, warns Mary Magdalen not to touch him (John 20: 17). Following the Bible passage, Rizal’s political intention is to warn the Spanish authority to stop harassing the Philippines and to end the colonial exploitation. Written in Spanish rather than the local vernacular Tagalog, the novel is principally intended for the

⁷⁸ The only tragedy in Sommer’s study is Isaacs’ María in which the female protagonist dies at the end of the story and thus makes her romance impossible. However, this tragic end still represents an instance of national allegory for Sommer because María’s Jewish and Christian identities are inappropriate for a productive marriage to the hero and, consequently, she inevitably has to be killed for the sake of national progress. See Sommer’s chapter on María (172-203).

⁷⁹ Towards the end of his life, Rizal began to write his third novel, Makamisa, in Tagalog, but he never finished it. See Ocampo (1992).

Spanish-speaking readership in the metropolis as well as the friars in the Philippines. After its publication, the novel was immediately censored by the colonial government who believed that it was “heretical, impious and scandalous in the religious domain, and antipatriotic, subversive of political order, offensive to the Government of Spain and to its method of procedure in these Islands in the political domain” (Retana, 128-129).

The novel’s main plot is set against the background of colonial politics in nineteenth-century Philippines. Many of the characters are thought to be existent individuals in Rizal’s life (Caudet, 585). The story begins with Juan Crisóstomo Ibarra’s return from Europe to the Philippines, which mirrors Rizal’s own experience during his youth. Together with other Filipino *ilustrados* residing in Spain, the protagonist Ibarra is engrossed in absorbing the liberal ideologies of the period and develops a revolutionary vision concerning the independence of his country. Inspired by European Enlightenment, he decides to initiate social reforms upon his return to the country. However, he is soon confronted by the abusive Spanish friars—the principal agent of exploitation in the colonial Philippines—who attempt to wipe out any spark of revolution and independence movement. Ibarra is excommunicated by the Archbishop of the Catholic Church when he assaults the high priest, Padre Dámaso, after learning that the priest previously caused the death of his father. The persecution further continues in such a way that his plan to build a school is rejected by the clerical authority. His desire to marry his childhood love María Clara—an embodiment of femininity in Filipino literature—also appears to be futile when she rejects his proposal under the influence of Padre Dámaso. Despite his constant efforts to improve the colonial condition and to transform the country into a free republic, Ibarra and his associates succumb to defeat in the end either by being killed or having to restrain oneself in a secluded convent.

One of the highlights of the novel is a conflict between two male protagonists, Ibarra and Elías, who in different ways seek to bring progress and change into the colony. Unlike Ibarra who grows up in an upper middle-class Spanish mestizo family, Elías is a native Filipino who belongs to the lower social class. While Ibarra prefers a non-violent means—principally education—to fight against the colonial system, Elías, who is a symbol of revolutionary consciousness, believes that deploying violence is the only way to eradicate problems in the Philippines. For some critics, this tension between the two “heroes” of the novel is indicative of the author’s dilemma as a pioneer of Filipino nationalism. On the one hand, Rizal-as-Ibarra attempts to bring social reforms to the Philippines through peaceful means. On the other hand, however, Rizal-as-Elías hints at the idea of a violent revolution as a possible way to terminate the colonial situation. Describing the Filipino author’s internal tension, Victor Sumsky claims that “Rizal is not so much an agitator for either peaceful or violent change as a witness to the drama of choice between reform and revolution, a student of this desperately confusing situation” (240).

Indeed, Rizal’s attitude toward Filipino independence is ambivalent. In his introduction to the novel entitled “A mi patria,” the author claims that the goal is to expose the nature of colonialism which he describes as a “malignant cancer”: “Regístrase en la historia de los padecimientos humanos un cáncer de un carácter tan maligno, que el menor contacto le irrita y despierta en él agudísimos dolores” (IX). When an individual is diagnosed as “un cáncer de un carácter tan maligno” that causes pain even with the slightest move, one would imagine that the cancer must immediately be cured. However, what Rizal proposes in the novel is not the eradication of the illness but rather a clinical diagnosis intended to disclose the imperceptible problem of the colonial society. Both his professional experience as a doctor and the nineteenth-

century turn to the concept of “degeneration,” used as a common trope of social critique, allow him to employ symbols related to disease when depicting the colonial condition of the Philippines.⁸⁰ He undoubtedly perceives the serious damage done to the Filipino population, but the *Noli* does not present effective remedies to resolve the problem. In this sense, Francisco Caudet is correct to assume that “Rizal habla de <<cáncer social>>, de unos <<males>>, de unas <<verdades que ha de desvelar>>, pero su denuncia no va encaminada a extirpar, sino a remediar, a reformar” (598).

We should also remember that Rizal was not a radical revolutionary desiring a permanent separation from Spain.⁸¹ While Martí was an *independentista* who explicitly rejected autonomy and assimilation as alternatives to Cuba’s liberation, Rizal was a *reformista* who preferred a gradual process of socio-political reforms to an immediate confrontation with the Spanish colonizers. Rizal scrutinizes the “cancer” in the novel, but the disease is never healed either symbolically or literally. As he explains in the “Introduction,” he only “wishes” the country’s “good health” (i.e. freedom):

Deseando tu salud [la de la patria] que es la nuestra, y buscando el mejor tratamiento, haré contigo lo que con sus enfermos los antiguos: exponíanlos en las gradas del templo, para que cada persona que viniese de invocar á la Divinidad les propusiese un remedio. Y a este fin, trataré de reproducir fielmente a tu estado sin contemplaciones (IX).

As a writer (and not as a political activist like Martí), his essential task is to “expose” the illness through literature and to “reproduce faithfully” its malignant condition so that someone will *perhaps* “propose” (note the use of imperfect subjunctive “propusiese,” which implies

⁸⁰ During his stay in Spain, Rizal studied medicine at the Universidad Central de Madrid where he earned a degree *Licentiate* in Medicine.

⁸¹ For example, scholars have questioned Rizal’s “nationalistic” stance because he clearly discouraged the idea of insurrection in 1896, which was led by a militant Filipino leader Andrés Bonifacio. In his “Manifiesto a algunos filipinos,” Rizal wrote that “Desde un principio, cuando tuve noticia de lo que se proyectaba, me opuse á ello, lo combatí y demostré su absoluta imposibilidad. Esta es la verdad, y viven los testigos de mis palabras. Estaba convencido de que la idea era altamente absurda, y, lo que era peor, funesta” (Retana, 374).

probability) a remedy in the future. The novel seems to illustrate the problematic reality without proposing a solution. In Joan Torres-Pou's view, Rizal's narrative "se caracteriza por una serie de fórmulas y estrategias que confieren un cierto halo de ambigüedad a la propuesta ideológica del autor" (7). An example of this ambiguity manifests itself in the tension between Ibarra and Elías, both of which fail to accomplish their anti-imperial projects in the end of the novel.

Nevertheless, the Noli represents one of the first indications of national literature in the Philippines, and scholars have traditionally emphasized the novel's contribution to the formation of nineteenth-century nationalism. For Leon M. Guerrero, "one of the most extraordinary things about the *Noli* is that withal it changed the history of a nation" (148). Guerrero famously calls Rizal the "First Filipino" because he "taught his countrymen that they could be something else, Filipinos who were members of a Filipino Nation" (496). In the same way, John Schumacher perceives in the Noli a "charter of nationalism for Filipino," which functions as a catalyst of a revolutionary movement (1991, 91-101). According to him, the novel articulates a "new direction in Filipino art and literature in relation to nationalism" (122). The novel's national space becomes apparent in the frequent use of regional slang and idiomatic expressions. Rizal serves as both an insider (one who is aware of the locality of the colonial Philippines) and an outsider (one who is educated by the European, liberal perspective). It is this dialectical vision that enables the articulation of a nationalistic gesture alongside a European viewpoint. As Caroline Hau notes, "the narrative derives its nationalizing impulse not from a single speaking voice, but from the *differential* cognitive standpoints generated and claimed by the insider-outsider stance" (79-80). For Benedict Anderson, the Noli is one of the case studies for his theory of "imagined communities." He argues that the novel shows "a hypnotic confirmation of the solidity of a single community [which is] embracing characters, authors and readers" (1983,

27). From this perspective, what Rizal offers the reader is a particular experience of simultaneity; the *sine qua non* of the consolidation of the nation form in nineteenth-century Philippines.

Though the presentation of a national impetus is one of Rizal's central concerns, the interpretation should not be limited to the framework of Filipino nationalism. It is important to recognize that Sommer's invocation of "national romance" does not work for Rizal since the Noli rejects any model of love affair as a symbol of national unity. The central romance between Ibarra and María Clara is doomed to be a complete fiasco, and other characters' struggles to create productive love relationships cannot be fulfilled either. From the perspective of "foundational fiction," then, Rizal's novel is an "unfinished" work because it lacks the traditional notion of a "happy ending," that is, the final moment of victory or resolution, as it were. Consequently, Rizal's characters are detached from Sommer's concepts of "foundational narrative" and the "erotics of politics."

What I am suggesting here is not that the national is never allegorized in the Noli. Rather, I seek to highlight an alternative form of foundational narrative that is different from Sommer's theory. The kind of model I have in mind is the one that focuses on *disarticulation* rather than *reconciliation*—similar to what Joshua Lund calls "foundational disarticulation" (95).⁸² According to Lund, this idea "allegorizes the national as profoundly fractured" (95). In other words, the basic premise of national allegory does not reside in the *realization* of a unified couple but in the *failure* of an ideal romantic relationship. In my view, the idea of "foundational disarticulation" is useful because Rizal's narrative also shows how a failed attempt at

⁸² Lund introduces the term "foundational disarticulation" in his critical analysis of the Mexican writer Heriberto Frías's Tomoche (1906). See chapter 6 of his book, The Impure Imagination: Toward a Critical Hybridity in Latin American Writing (2006).

reconciliation represents an essential feature of the Filipino national project. Moreover, by disarticulating the image of a unified and “natural” couple, characters in the *Noli* propose a different agenda, which is related to the author’s anti-colonial politics. In the following pages, I intend to examine the significance of this apparent “failure” in the novel.

Specifically, my analysis involves two female characters and their interactions with other male figures: Doña Victorina and Doña Consolación. Both women are native Filipinos who decide to marry Spaniards in their middle age. Generally, critics tend to juxtapose these two women in equal terms, describing them as hideous and frivolous women who show a pretentious nature in their marriages. For example, Pura Santillan-Castrencia considers them identical, “both with their absurd pretensions of greatness and aristocracy, and both presenting ludicrous pictures of middle-aged ugliness, ignorance, and vulgarity (50-51). On the other hand, Lilia Quindoza Santiago argues that the most important aspect of the two characters lies in their shared ability to question the values associated with the colonial, patriarchal society. According to Santiago, Doña Victorina epitomizes “an expression of the absurdity of the entire colonial experience and of how she, the woman, has successfully parodied it all to the limits of our imagination and disbelief,” while Doña Consolación should be equally praised because “[b]y inventing herself with the most absurd notion of authority, she singlehandedly conducts a domestic coup d’état and challenges the power of the *alférez* [her husband]” (qtd. in Flores 44).

Following these readings, Alma Jill Dizon also situates Doña Victorina and Doña Consolación on the same plane. For her, however, the convergence point between them is their negation of the Filipino national consciousness. Dizon claims that “these characters deny their native backgrounds and try to separate themselves from indigenous life” (24). It is the “desire to disassociate oneself from the colonized” (32)—the desire to *denationalize* themselves—that

makes the two women somewhat similar. Consequently, Doña Victorina and Doña Consolación are transformed into non-national subjects who abandon their native characteristic in order to Europeanize themselves through marriage. Dizon equally portrays them as egocentric, abusive, and undesirable figures: “they belong to the same pattern of forgetting [the national] language and pasts in favor of the colonizer’s privileges” (37).

Rizal indeed presents the two characters as nationally artificial and inauthentic women. They do not represent the “normal” female image determined by the Filipino colonial society which seeks to construct a new identity in terms of an “authentic” nationalism. Put differently, Doña Victorina and Doña Consolación exist outside the framework of a “natural” nation, and perhaps this is one of the reasons why the novel cannot be read through Sommer’s theory of “national romance.” The project of *denationalization* can be understood as the process of *denaturalization*.⁸³ In the case of these two female figures, the desire to denaturalize oneself indicates the detachment from an organic, national identity (the fact of being a native Filipino). As we shall see later, however, it is this denaturalized subjectivity that enables the construction of anti-imperial discourse in the novel.

My argument takes a certain cue from Dizon’s analysis regarding the process of denationalization/denaturalization. My emphasis, however, is different than hers. In my view, two important aspects are not sufficiently discussed by Dizon: first is the idea of “resistance” that would highlight the way in which Doña Victorina and Doña Consolación interact with their Spanish husbands, and second is the crucial difference between the two women’s treatment of

⁸³ Both terms—denationalization and denaturalization—may invoke Giorgio Agamben’s well-known argument concerning the European history of ethnic cleansings during the first half of the twentieth century. For Agamben, the process of denationalization and/or denaturalization symbolizes a state-sponsored project of mass destruction which produced many refugees in various European nation-states. While he refers to these notions in order to highlight the “exceptional” nature of those stripped of their national status, I employ the terms in order to indicate the process in which an individual seeks to disassociate him or herself from the organic, natural, and national subjectivity. For more information on Agamben, see *Homo sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life* (1995).

other natives. Whereas Dizon's interpretation depends on the tendency to disassociate oneself from the national, I attempt to read these characters through the idea of anti-imperial resistance. In a sense, my analysis establishes a dialogue with Francisco Caudet whose analysis of the novel attempts to explain how resistance can be revealed if one pays attention to the political aspirations emanating from the Filipino natives and peasants. According to him, "esta novela deja espacio abierto asimismo a otras opciones y aspiraciones que estaban empezando a surgir entre los de abajo, *los indios y campesinos*, a quienes las reformas de los ilustrados no lograban satisfacer" (my emphasis, 586). What Caudet leaves out, however, is the essential role of women in the construction of resistant force. In the Noli, Doña Victorina and Doña Consolación are important figures who manage to frustrate the power of Spanish imperialism through their respective love relationships.

3.3 THE POSSIBILITY OF RESISTANCE IN DOÑA VICTORINA AND DOÑA CONSOLACIÓN

On the surface level, the marriage between Doña Victorina and her Spanish husband Don Tiburcio seems to embody the archetype of the colonial system. An officer from the Spanish empire comes to the Philippines in search of greater fortune and meets a native woman who supposedly provides comfort to his solitary life in the remote colony. In Santillan-Castrence's words, he is "a modern Ulysses wandering about the world wearily for years and finding at last on the island of Luzon the hospitality of a withered Calypso to tempt him out of his celibacy" (32). While still in Spain, Don Tiburcio has a utopian romantic vision in which he searches for "una buena mujer, hacendosa, trabajadora, que le pudiese aportar una pequeña dote, consolarle

de las fatigas del trabajo” (236).⁸⁴ In the beginning of their married life, Doña Victorina indeed serves Don Tiburcio as an ideal, caring woman: she orders the city’s best tailors for his dresses, arranges his new carriages and luggage, and purchases two horses for his next racing season (237). Shortly after, however, the situation starts to change and he soon realizes that his vision of matrimony was a mere fantasy. As the narrator describes Doña Victorina, “Ella ya no era pasable, era pasada; su abundante cabellera se había reducido á un moño [...] grande como la cabeza de un ajo; arrugas surcaban su cara y empezaban á movérsele los dientes” (235). Although Don Tiburcio hesitates to appreciate her physical features, he nevertheless perceives a certain goodness in her character. After all, he exclaims, “¡Aquello era un sueño y en el mundo no se vive soñando!” (236).

As we learn more about each character, we realize that their marriage is far from what he had anticipated or dreamed of. Doña Victorina is a rather pretentious, defiant woman who looks for any means to satisfy her desires and to protect her public image. For instance, she deceives the other villagers with a cunning lie about her age so that the people would believe she is younger than she actually is (233-34). Wearing luxurious garments and disguising herself with a lot of makeup—“los polvos de arroz”—, she also claims to be more Spanish than other Filipino women (234). She detests the silk skirts and pineapple-fiber shirts, often associated with local clothing, in favor of European attire (236-37). With these clothes and her ambition to Europeanize herself, her presence disturbs the normally quiet environment of the local neighborhood (237).

More importantly, her ostentatious nature leads her to desire certain power over her husband. The novel describes their interactions in comical terms. After the wedding, Doña

⁸⁴ In this study, I use the 1995 edition of the novel published by the Instituto Nacional de Historia.

Victorina purchases false teeth for her husband because he has lost some in the past. Her true intention is, however, to obtain control over his daily behavior. One day Don Tiburcio tells his wife that he thinks her makeup is “artificial” and “not natural.” What he does not realize is that the denaturalized characteristic is precisely what constitutes her strength. In response, “Da. Victorina frunció las cejas y le miró en la dentadura postiza. El se calló y ella comprendió su flaco” (237). From that day on, whenever he makes her upset or displeased, she would remove his dentures, leaving him terribly disfigured for a few days (238, 264). When she is insulted by a Spanish lieutenant, for example, Doña Victorina orders her husband to challenge the opponent to a duel with weapons:

– Debes desafiarme á pistola ó á sable, ó sino...sino...

Y Da. Victorina le miró en dentadura.

– ¡Hija, no he cogido nunca...

Da. Victorina no le dejó concluir: con un sublime movimiento le arrancó la dentadura en medio de la calle y la pisoteó. El, marido llorando, y ella echando chispas, llegaron á casa (264).

Crying and not knowing what to do, Don Tiburcio remains silent and disappears from the scene. For her part, Doña Victorina tells people in the house that it was actually the lieutenant who destroyed her husband’s teeth, hoping to receive their sympathy and support for her personal revenge. The management of his false teeth thus becomes a strategic way to manipulate his social conduct and especially his attitude toward her.

Furthermore, Doña Victorina also succeeds in controlling Don Tiburcio by inventing his imaginary profession and by changing his name. Discontented with the way in which the townspeople usually treat her and her husband, she proposes that he should call himself “Doctor of Medicine and Surgery,” although it is a false designation. She completely ignores his fright of arrest and declares, “¡No seas tonto y déjame arreglarlo! contestó; no irás á curar á nadie, pero quiero que te llamen doctor y á mí doctora, ea!” (238). Hence, a new title is engraved in a

marble: “Dr. DE ESPADAÑA, ESPECIALISTA EN TODA CLASE DE ENFERMEDADES” (238). On another occasion, she tells him to change his name by adding another “de” before his last name. When she signs her name, she writes “Victorina de los Reyes *de de* Espadaña” and forces Don Tiburcio to do the same (237). She insists that “el *de* no costaba nada y daba *categoría* al nombre” and then reminds him, “¡Si no pongo más que un *de* puede creerse que no lo tienes, tonto!” (emphasis in original, 237). Through this peculiar act of designing a name or a “category,” Doña Victorina successfully possesses the new identity of her husband. Or, to borrow Dizon’s words, “she has effectively emasculated him” (30). Both the invention of his profession and the acquisition of his identity give her certain authority in the household, allowing her to call him “tonto.” As a result, she goes beyond the status of a traditional “colonized, submissive woman” and turns herself into the one capable of controlling the colonial other: “Cuanto [ella] decía se tenía que hacer; había llegado á dominar completamente á su marido, que por su parte no ofreció gran resistencia, llegando á convertirse en una especie de perrito faldero para ella” (238).

Described as “una especie de perrito faldero,” this newly created Don Tiburcio “de” de Espadaña who supposedly represents the Spanish authority (note his family name “Espadaña”) appears to be a submissive subject. He is afraid of his wife’s scolding, which he depicts as “una tormenta,” and obeys her commands all the time (262). Doña Victorina, on the other hand, no longer symbolizes an exploited native who is trapped in the yoke of colonialism. Rather, she manages to reverse the power relationship and frustrate the imperial project that attempts to abuse the Filipino inhabitants. As Nick Joaquín observes, “Doña Victorina may ape the Westerner and wear preposterous costumes and false curls: but she’s *not* slavish, she does *not* cringe [...] It’s her poor devil of a Spanish husband who does the cringing—at her feet. She

rules him with a terrible fist” (1955: 266). I would add that she also rules him with her intelligence, that is, the ability to successfully invent Don Tiburcio’s new identity for her own benefit. By denationalizing and denaturalizing herself, she is able to acquire the knowledge that she can apply to make her husband obedient and fearful.

Because of her ostentatious characteristic and her intelligence, Doña Victorina is portrayed as more powerful than her husband whose weakness represents the dissolving condition of a colonial society in the Philippines. While she articulates her thoughts clearly in her discourse, Don Tiburcio has a speech impediment. As the narrator describes, “pues era algo tartamudo” (13). His friends make fun of his stutter that sometimes prevents them from comprehending his utterances. The difficulty of communication makes him hopelessly pathetic and vulnerable, which once again reveals his powerlessness in the face of his wife’s prevailing influence. Consequently, he can never disagree with her decisions even when her behavior seems outrageous: “El marido sabía que algunas de estas cosas eran barbariedades pero se callaba para que no le chillase y le echase en cara su tartamudez” (238). He is thus shackled in a double sense: his inability to speak properly derives from a physical (stutter) as well as a psychological problem (fear of being scolded by his wife).

Doña Victorina’s resistant gesture toward the Spanish husband can be understood in terms of what Paul Smith calls “agent” or “agency.” In Discerning the Subject (1988), Smith seeks to articulate a difference between the notions of “subject” and “agent” within critical theory. His principal concern is that most of the modern discourses on power and ideology construe the term “subject” with an unwarranted confidence and leave little room for the possibility of resistance (xxx). Different from the “subject,” he proposes the idea of “agent” as an alternative space from which to confront the force of domination. For Smith, “agent”

indicates “the idea of a form of subjectivity where, by virtue of the contradictions and disturbances in and among subject-positions, the possibility (indeed, the actuality) of resistance to ideological pressure is allowed for” (xxxv). Smith further argues that what distinguishes an “agent” from a “subject” is “the capacity to *choose* one discourse with which to counter another” (38). One’s ability to make a choice is indeed significant because “[c]hoice implies a *conscious* agent and it may well be that one form of resistance to a particular discourse or form of representation would be a conscious scanning and rejection of its message” (38).

Returning to Doña Victorina, then, the fact that she consciously “chooses” her husband’s new identity is indicative of her new “agency,” which represents the capacity to manipulate the colonizer and to defend herself against any constraint imposed by the imperial power. Her denationalized aspect presents the opportunity to become a powerful “agent,” while Don Tiburcio remains a compliant “subject.” In this picture, she no longer plays the conventional role of a weak, docile woman. Instead, people recognize in her “a strong spirit” that is virtually absent in the country. One of the characters tells her, “¡Créame V., señora, es V. el único *espíritu fuerte* en este aburrido país!” (238). This potential force in Doña Victorina suggests an alternative entry into the narrative of nineteenth-century Latin American novels. Rather than celebrating Sommer’s model of national romance, the *Noli* creates a different kind of allegory. Doña Victorina’s denaturalized identity symbolizes a move toward national disarticulation. For her, the *failure* of a “natural” romantic relationship is what defines the *success* of anti-imperial agenda, because it is through her confrontation with the Spanish husband that the possibility of resistance emerges. By disassociating herself from the native, national reality, Doña Victorina registers herself in the production of her own agency and frustrates Spain’s colonial vision.

Similar to the way in which Doña Victorina establishes herself as an anti-imperial “agent,” Doña Consolación also demonstrates a challenge to Spanish colonialism through her relationship with her husband, the *señor alférez*. When the couple is introduced in the novel, the narrator first describes the traditional power structure between a dominant Spanish man and a subjugated Filipino woman. We learn that the *señor alférez* tries to dominate Doña Consolación by locking her up in the house, even when she wishes to go to the church. His claim is that her dress looks ridiculous and that she smells terrible (215). Concerned about the impact of Doña Consolación’s untidiness upon his own public image, the *señor alférez* decides to confine her to the room. For him, “no convenía esponerla á las miradas de los personajes de la Cabecera ni de los forasteros” (215). Moreover, the despotic husband always resorts to violent abuses when he forbids her actions: “la prohibición iba acompañada como siempre de dos ó tres insultos, juramentos y amenazas de puntapiés” (215). She has to constantly endure the pain and humiliation in a secluded space that is too dark and dirty to be considered inhabitable (214).

Nevertheless, Doña Consolación is able to disturb her husband’s imperial program through her (mis)use of language. Like Doña Victorina, Doña Consolación seeks to disassociate herself from the Filipino cultural origin. She achieves the task by abandoning the local language of Tagalog and by trying to speak it as badly as possible. According to her belief, this will make her “una verdadera *orofea*,” which is how she pronounces the word “*europa*” (216). It turns out, however, that her plan of linguistic denationalization is a difficult task. No matter how much she forgets the native language, she is unable to master Spanish in terms of grammar and pronunciation. In his authoritarian manner, then, her husband attempts to teach her the imperial language, especially the correct pronunciation of the term “*Filipinas*” which she has the hardest time remembering.

The story goes as follows. During their honeymoon, Doña Consolación makes reference to the word “Pilipinas.” Disturbed by her wrong pronunciation, her husband, who at that time has the position of *cabo*, tells her with a slap, “¡Dí, Felipinas, mujer! no seas bruta. ¿No sabes que se llama así á tu p— país por venir de Felipe?” (217). Since she wants to maintain peace during the romantic trip that she had dreamed of for a long time, she is willing to obey his order and says “Felepinas.” Convinced that his education is starting to work, he tells her, “Pero mujer, ¿no puedes pronunciar: Felipe? No lo olvides, sabe que el Rey Don Felipe...quinto.... Dí Felipe, y añádele *nas* que en latin significa islas de indios” (217). In response, she impatiently articulates, “Fe...lipe, Felipe...nas, Felipenas, ¿así *ba*?” (217). The *cabo* is in a complete daze: why does she say “Felipenas” instead of “Felipinas”? After this incident, he decides to consult books on the Philippines and realizes, much to his surprise, that all the publications allude to the term “Filipinas.” In other words, “ni él ni su mujer tenían razón” (217). He even goes to discuss the matter with another Spanish officer who informs him that people used to say “Filipi” rather than “Felipe” in the old days and that the country must be indeed called “Filipinas” as an official title. Upon returning to his house, he tries to teach the last lesson to his wife:

- Consola, ¿cómo llamas á tu p— país?
- ¿Cómo lo he de llamar? como me lo enseñaste: Felipenas!
- ¡Te tiro la silla, p—! ayer ya lo pronunciabas algo mejor, á la moderna; pero ahora hay que pronunciarlo á la antigua! Feli, digo, Filipinas!
- ¡Mira que yo no soy ninguna antigua! ¿qué te has creído?
- ¡No importa! dí Filipinas!
- ¡No me da la gana! Yo no soy ningun trasto viejo...apenas treinta añitos! contestó remangándose como disponiéndose al combate (218).

Hence, the husband’s lecture finally ends with a fight that involves punches, scratching, and slaps from both sides. As the narrator depicts the scene, “El cabo la cogió del cabello, ella á él de la perilla y de otra parte del cuerpo [...] el cabo dió un grito, soltóla pidióle perdón” (218).

This scene shows how Doña Consolación's attempt to learn Spanish frustrates her husband's colonial agenda by revealing its incompleteness. That she is unable to articulate the term "Filipinas" not only reflects the colonizer's inability to teach the language correctly, but it also leads him to recognize his own ignorance. In fact, even after learning the correct form, the *cabo* still makes a mistake when he reiterates it ("Feli, digo, Filipinas!"). On the contrary, it is the exploited woman who can pronounce the word in the closest way (her first word "Pilipinas" is closer to the correct form than the *cabo*'s "Felipinas") and produce exactly what is taught (she is finally able to say the given "Felipenas," as instructed). In other words, Doña Consolación exposes holes and cracks in the condition of colonialism represented by her husband. Moreover, her previous identity (the one confined in the house and beaten up by the colonizer) is transformed into a rebellious image whose defiant characteristic allows her to declare "¡No me da la gana!" against his order. Here, she is no longer a submissive "subject" under the domination of the *cabo* but a powerful, anti-colonial "agent" who is ready to fight against the committed abuse. When he attacks her, then, she fiercely attacks him back: as a result, he becomes the one who ends up asking for her forgiveness. With this gesture, as we saw in the earlier example of Doña Victorina, Doña Consolación undermines the supposed authority and superiority of her colonial husband.

Despite their similarity, however, there is also a crucial distinction between the two female characters, and this is why they cannot be analyzed from the same perspective, as suggested by such critics as Santillan-Castrencia and Dizon. This difference may be exposed by examining Doña Consolación's relationship with another Filipino woman, Sisa. While Doña Consolación resists her husband's imperial project by means of linguistic stratagem, her anger and hatred against the colonizer are also directed toward other individuals. The narrator

compares her indignant gaze with “la pupila de una serpiente cuando, cogida, va á ser aplastada”: it is “fría, luminosa, penetrante” and reflects “algo de viscoso, asqueroso, cruel” (215). Such vicious nature manifests itself in a scene where she tortures Sisa who represents the sufferings experienced by native Filipino women during the colonial period. The novel describes Sisa as a “mujer de un hombre sin corazón, que procura vivir para sus hijos mientras el marido vaga y juega al gallo [...] débil de carácter, con más corazón que cerebro, ella sólo sabía amar y llorar” (74). Sisa only lives for her children, Basilio and Crispin, and becomes mentally insane when she learns that she has lost them, which leads to her tragic, solitary death in the novel.

Doña Consolación’s mistreatment of Sisa takes place when the *señor alférez* forces Doña Consolación to stay in the house instead of going to mass. Already frustrated by her husband’s behavior, she directs her anger and irritation toward Sisa. She tries to make Sisa sing and dance in the barracks, pitilessly whipping her naked body and enjoying the spectacle. The only problem is, however, that the native girl is incapable of understanding the orders because she never had the opportunity to learn Spanish. By this time, Doña Consolación has abandoned her native language completely and truly become “una orofea” (218). The difficulty of communication further enrages the torturer, and her whipping becomes even harsher. The victim’s pain is now intolerable. Finally, “Sisa dejóse caer al suelo llevándose ambas manos á las piernas y mirando á su verdugo con ojos desencajados. Dos fuertes latigazos á la espalda le hicieron levantarse: ya no fué un quejido, fueron dos ahullidos lo que la desgraciada exhaló. Rasgóse la fina camisa, la piel se abrió y brotó la sangre” (220). The sign of blood excites the tormentor’s monstrous nature, which is portrayed as that of “a tiger” (220). Content and victorious, Doña Consolación shows a smile of satisfaction as she sees Sisa collapse: in her smile, one finds “odio, desprecio, burla y crueldad: más no habría dicho una carcajada” (220).

The transformation we perceive in Doña Consolación from a resistant, anti-colonial figure to a cruel torturer reveals the way in which a colonized woman who initially attempts to disturb Spanish imperialism is somehow converted into another colonizer. Different from Doña Victorina, therefore, she appropriates the power of resistance to the extreme and becomes a monster who seeks to dominate other Filipino women. As Santillan-Castrence claims, then, the name “Consolación” does not symbolize the colonial gesture inscribed in the character’s personality: “Her softly-sounding, sweet-meaning name was an unhappy misnomer, for she was not only no man’s consolation, but she was also the cause of the grief of the victims which [sic] fell prey to her cruel, sadistic nature” (42). Through different characters, Rizal demonstrates how power can be *transitional* in multiple ways: supposedly dominant male characters appear to be submissive “subjects,” while previously colonized people are transformed into powerful “agents.” Moreover, the anti-imperial individual can also become the next colonizer, as seen in the case of Doña Consolación. The *Noli* presents this unstable nature of power relationships between different couples, and this is also one of the central themes in José Martí’s *Lucía Jerez*.

3.4 LUCÍA JEREZ AND LATIN AMERICAN *MODERNISMO*

While *Noli me tangere* is staged exclusively in the colonial Philippines, *Lucía Jerez* involves not only Cuba but also the larger framework of Latin America. Nevertheless, both works attempt to problematize Spanish colonialism through the interactions between female and male characters. Two years prior to the publication of Rizal’s novel, Martí wrote *Lucía Jerez*, originally entitled *Amistad funesta*, when he was exiled in the United States. It was around the time when Martí was experiencing numerous problems in his political as well as personal life. In 1884, he

decided to maintain certain distance from the other two central figures of the Cuban independence movement, Máximo Gómez and Antonio Maceo, after perceiving characteristics of *militarismo* and *caudillismo* in their attitudes. With the internal split between the leaders, the revolutionary government underwent one of the most static moments. In the following year, his wife, Carmen Zayas Bazán, abandoned him in New York to return to Cuba with their son, José “Pepito” Martí Zayas Bazán. The absence of “Pepito” left permanent anguish in Martí’s life, as expressed in his collection of poetry known as “Ismaelillo.” According to some critics, these tragic experiences in Martí’s life are somewhat embodied in various characters in Lucía Jerez; the most notable example is the representation of his wife as the female protagonist, Lucía.⁸⁵

Compared to Martí’s more “canonical” texts, it seems that Lucía Jerez has not received the adequate scholarly attention that it deserves.⁸⁶ Traditionally, critics tend to analyze the novel from two primary perspectives: the first approach explores the novel’s relation to the nineteenth-century literary movement of *modernismo* and its (des)articulation of Latin American modernity, while the second reading emphasizes the role of gender politics in the narrative.⁸⁷ Different from these approaches, though not ignoring their significance, my study attempts to examine the novel through the question of colonialism, proposing a reading that is almost entirely absent in the contemporary analysis of Martí’s narrative.⁸⁸

⁸⁵ For the analysis of autobiographical elements in the novel, see Manuel Pedro González’s preface to Lucía Jerez in the Gredos edition (1969). As González M. points out, “[e]n cuanto a caracteres, carece del tiempo necesario para imaginarlos y desarrollarlos adecuadamente. Acude, pues a su experiencia vital y ‘copia’ los más cercanos y mejor conocidos: sus propias familiares, y algunos amigos que ocuparon lugar importante en sus afectos” (42).

⁸⁶ As Ivan Schulman notes, “se consideraba que [Lucía Jerez] era una obra de segunda importancia en comparación con los tres libros de sus versos originales (ISMAELILLO, VERSOS LIBRES, VERSOS SENCILLOS) o las crónicas sobre Cuba, Estados Unidos y Europa” (xv). The lack of critical study, at least in U.S. academia, is also evidenced by the fact that the novel has not been translated into English.

⁸⁷ See, for example, González M. (1969), Morales (1994), Martínez-San Miguel (1996), and Schulman (2005).

⁸⁸ The only exception I have found is David Luis-Brown’s analysis of the novel. I am following his assessment that “[n]o critic of the novel has read Lucía Jerez as an allegorical figure of the greed of Spanish colonialism” (264, n.77).

Perhaps the lack of criticism can be partly attributed to the fact that Martí himself considered his novel (and the narrative creation in general) insignificant. As he tells the reader in the preface to the book, “[l]ean, pues, si quieren, los que lo culpen, este libro; que el autor ha procurado hacerse perdonar con algunos detalles; pero sepan que el autor piensa muy mal de él. – Lo cree inútil; y lo lleva sobre sí mismo una grandísima culpa” (46). For Martí, fictions are unimportant and useless because they are detached from the reality that he attempts to transform through political means. He pays little attention to the genre of the novel because “hay mucho que fingir en él, y los goces de la creación artística no compensan el dolor de moverse en una ficción prolongada; con diálogos que nunca se han oído, entre personas que no han vivido jamás” (45-46).⁸⁹ His insistence on the absence of “real” conversations and people leads him to proclaim that Lucía Jerez is the only novel he intends to produce during his life (45). In fact, he wrote the novel only because one of his friends, Adelaida Baralt, requested him to do so, and he used the pseudonym “Adelaida Ral” for its publication as if to deny the authorship of the text.

Nonetheless, Martí’s negative affirmation about the role of fiction should not prevent us from studying his work, because the author’s intent is one thing and the text in its completed form is another. What he distrusted was not the narrative genre per se, but the mode of literary production during his time. Besides, his criticism of the general characteristic of the novel by no means indicates a denunciation of what he considers “literature.”⁹⁰ An important cultural value of Lucía Jerez begins to appear when we examine the historical period in which it was produced. During the 1880s, Latin America was experiencing transformations in many different spheres.

⁸⁹ However, Martí’s criticism against the artificiality of the novel seems to contradict his own affirmation that he has actually met some of the characters in Lucía Jerez in his real life: “ni a Sol ni a Lucía, ha conocido de cerca el autor. A don Manuel, sí. Y a Manuelillo, y a doña Andrea, así como a la propia Directora” (47).

⁹⁰ As he writes elsewhere, “Acercarse a la vida—he aquí el objeto de la Literatura: —ya sea para inspirarse en ella; —ya para reformarla conociéndola” (O.C.: vol. 21, 227).

One of the driving forces for these changes was the process of modernization. The expansion of capitalism and the principles of bourgeois society enabled a rapid shift toward a modern system based on industrialization. The traditional values of Latin American countries were replaced by a new dynamic of socio-political interests, which were promoted by those who sought prosperity through the development of a capitalist economy. The issue of modernization was also articulated by a new generation of writers who deployed the practice of writing as a political instrument to advance progress in their respective countries. Influenced by European positivism—one of the guiding philosophies in nineteenth-century Latin America—, some writers attempted to establish a progressive, modern society by overthrowing the conservative, traditional socio-political system (e.g. Sarmiento, Alberdi, Rabasa).⁹¹

Facing the frenzied force of modernization, Martí's primary concern was the debasement of aesthetics and spirituality driven by industrialism. In this sense, we can argue that Lucía Jerez emerged as a critical response to the process of modernization in Latin America. As Susana Zanetti points out, "*Lucía Jerez* integra el amplio corpus de novelas cuya marca significativa procede, sobre todo, de los desajustes que la acelerada modernización produjo en América Latina a fin del siglo XIX" (187). In the novel, the narrator illustrates the modern crisis of spirituality in the following manner: "Todo en la tierra, en estos tiempos negros, tiende a rebajar el alma, todo, libros y cuadros, negocios y afectos, ¡aún en nuestros países azules!" (67). For Martí, the problem of "tiempos negros" is a propensity to contaminate traditional moral values, and a potential solution to such problem lies in the recuperation of the "alma." Moreover, it is important to note that Martí defines Latin American countries in terms of "nuestros países azules." Here, the "blueness" is defined in contrast to the "blackness" of corrupt modern times.

⁹¹ For more information on the influence of positivist ideologies in nineteenth-century Latin American intellectuals, see Larraín (2000).

It also invokes the assertion made by Victor Hugo—“L’Art c’est l’azur” (“The art is blue”)—whose influence on Martí is evident in many of his writings.⁹² Thus Martí’s reference to “nuestros países azules” can be understood as the indication of aesthetic values in Latin America.

In fact, to resist the project of modernization by emphasizing the role of aesthetics is one of the central premises of Latin American *modernismo*, of which Martí was a founding author. Against the widespread notion of modernity as panacea for political problems, Martí and other *modernistas* turn to the aesthetic to envision an alternative way to construct Latin America’s cultural identity. It is traditionally established that such writers as Manuel Gutiérrez Nájera (1859-1895), Julián del Casal (1863-1893), José Asunción Silva (1865-1896) and Rubén Darío (1867-1916) used poetry as a principal form of expression to celebrate art in opposition to industrial capitalism.⁹³ However, recent studies have emphasized the influence of narrative style in the development of *modernismo hispanoamericano* (Goic [1991], González A. [1987], Jiménez and Morales [1998]). Some examples of these narratives include Nájera’s Por donde se sube al cielo (1882), Silva’s De sobremesa (1896), Manuel Díaz Rodríguez’s Ídolos rotos (1901), and Tulio Arcos’s Sangre patricia (1902). Among them, Lucía Jerez stands out as one of the first *modernista* novels published in Latin America. According to Ivan Schulman, “Martí, sin darse cuenta de la novedad del estilo y del discurso de su obra (conjuntura natural), logró crear una de las primeras y más significativas novelas modernistas” (ix-x). As we shall see later, this *modernista* focus on the role of art appears to be a crucial factor for Martí’s anti-colonial discourse in the novel.

⁹² Martí’s admiration for Hugo is evidenced in many of his writings, including his translation of Hugo’s *Mes Fils* (O.C.: vol. 24, 15-18). For his other references, see O.C.: vol. 14, 423-433, 489-496; vol. 15, 189-194; vol. 21, 410-413.

⁹³ See José Olivio Jiménez’s “Introducción a la poesía modernista hispanoamericana” in Antología crítica de la poesía modernista hispanoamericana (1985).

The brief outline of Latin American modernization and its relation to *modernismo* serves us to locate Lucía Jerez within its particular historical and socio-political context. In the novel, Martí employs the form of melodrama to describe the crisis of the modern world. To reiterate Masiello's proposal, "es imposible narrar el caos del fin de siglo de América Latina *sin* el melodrama" (460). Similar to the way in which Rizal portrays his characters in the Noli through the melodramatic terms of love and hatred, then, Martí creates a story that involves ardent romances and betrayals in order to illustrate how desire constructs the discourse of late-nineteenth-century Latin American literature. His preface explains how "en la novela había de haber mucho amor; alguna muerte; muchas muchachas; ninguna pasión pecaminosa; y nada que no fuese del mayor agrado de los padres de la familia y de los señores sacerdotes" (47). Love and passion are the two elements that determine the complex interactions among Martí's fictional characters. The form of melodrama in Lucía Jerez provides a particular rhetoric that effectively represents these emotions and their impact on different gender relations.

The main story revolves around the relationship between two cousins, Lucía and Juan Jerez, who, growing up in the same upper-middle class family, discover their love for each other in their early youth. As an advocate of indigenous rights, Juan's moral principles are respected by his friends in the community, while Lucía is an impetuous and vain woman who wants to receive her cousin/lover's entire attention. They are surrounded by other equally young characters (Ana, Adela, and Pedro). The relationship between Lucía and Juan is unexpectedly disturbed by another female figure, Sol del Valle, who loses both her father and brother during her childhood. Since her mother alone cannot support Sol financially, the only way she can receive education is through the generosity of her high school director who allows her to live as an intern in the school. Despite her economic difficulty and family problem (her mother

becomes mentally ill after the deaths of her husband and son), Sol is transformed into a beautiful woman whose modesty and virtue are admired by everyone in the village. When the high school director asks Lucía to befriend Sol after graduation, Lucía gladly accepts the request but soon becomes jealous of Sol's immaculate beauty. While Juan also finds Sol attractive, no romance occurs between these two. Juan not only helps Sol's family economically, but also supports her social life as much as possible, which intensifies Lucía's envy toward her new friend. At the end of the story, Lucía abruptly shoots Sol with a gun and collapses on the floor with a hysterical shriek as other characters remain in shock.⁹⁴

Martí characterizes his novel as "la novela hispanoamericana" (45), and his reference to Latin America is evident throughout the text. One of his goals is to rearticulate the collective identity of the continent and transmit it to other parts of the world through the New York based newspaper, El Latino-Americano, in which the novel appeared from May through September of 1885. The story is set in an unnamed country in Latin America, and the narrator's frequent allusions to such phrases as "nuestros países" (54), "nuestras cabezas hispanoamericanas" (57), and "nuestras tierras" (122) suggest that the book is not a mere fiction but reflects Latin America's particular historical reality.⁹⁵ Moreover, the presence of *indios* is another indication of the novel's Latin American characteristic. In Lucía Jerez, indigenous figures appear as marginalized subjects, literally placed in the edge of the scene. One of the scenes depicts how "[y]a suenan gratas músicas, que los indios de aquellas cercanías, colocados en los extremos del

⁹⁴ According to Luis-Brown's interpretation, Lucía "commits suicide" after shooting Sol (89).

⁹⁵ Morales argues that many characters and events in the novel represent different aspects of the Latin American societies that Martí had opportunities to visit. According to him, "[a]unque nuestro escritor no alude a ningún país concreto, la profusión de detalles y la consistencia del espacio novelesco nos hacen pensar en un país hispanoamericano que fuese ampliamente conocido por el autor y que hubiera suscitado en él una fascinación admirada y memorable" (65). For his part, Enrique Anderson Imbert mentions Cuba as a possible setting for the novel: "La trama, con su historia de amor trágico, entreteje hebras románticas. Es un paradisíaco país que no se nombra, pero que bien podría ser Cuba, resplandecen por su gracia y belleza tres amigas: Lucía, Ana y Adela" (134).

colgadizo, arrancan a sus instrumentos de cuerdas” (163). Situated in “los extremos del colgadizo,” the indigenous people are only given a limited space to play their music. In another passage, the narrator alludes to “los indios” who “en verdad, descalzos y mugrientos, en medio de tanta limpieza y luz, parecen llagas” (50). Indigenous servants walk “descalzos” (50, 142) and diligently decorate a room for Ana’s party without uttering a single word (161). Although various figures of indigenous origin are present in the novel, they are almost always nameless and depicted as plural “indios” rather than singular “indio,” which suggests that the specificity of each individual history is never seriously considered.⁹⁶

These Latin American aspects in Martí’s narrative can be compared to another nineteenth-century melodramatic novel, María, written by the Colombian Jorge Isaacs. In fact, María makes a brief appearance in Lucía Jerez as one of the two Latin American texts mentioned by the characters. Toward the end of the story, Sol’s friend Pedro “era con la mayor tranquilidad puesto por Sol, ya a que leyese la Amalia de Mármol o la María de Jorge Isaacs, que de la ciudad les habían enviado” (149-150).⁹⁷ It is known that Amalia and María were among Martí’s favorite novels.⁹⁸ Whether or not Isaacs had a direct influence on Martí, their novels share some notable similarities. Equally interested in articulating a collective Latin American identity through the melodramatic narrative, both authors present cousins as the protagonists of romantic stories. The figure of *indio* in both stories is a typical representation of the subaltern subject

⁹⁶ The only named *indio* in the novel is Petrona Revolorio who is a respected servant in Adela’s family. Although her status is higher than other unnamed *indios* (Adela treats her as a “friend”), Petrona still belongs to the marginalized space in the novel since her willingness to serve Adela is never put into question. As she talks about her mistress, “yo me muero por servirla: mire que yo soy como las tacitas de coco, que dicen en letras muy guapas: ‘yo sirvo a mi dueña’” (147).

⁹⁷ In this passage, the way Pedro reads Amalia and María to Sol is similar to how Efraín studies Chateaubriand with María in Isaacs’ novel (Zanetti, 191).

⁹⁸ According to the note of the edition of Centro de Estudios Martianos, “tanto Amalia como María permanecían en su librero—junto a otras creaciones latinoamericanas—de su oficina de 120 Front Street, Nueva York, y estaban entre sus volúmenes más preciados” (149, n. 28).

portrayed by writers of the nineteenth-century Latin American narrative. The sick Ana in Lucía Jerez plays the same role as María who suffers from incurable epilepsy, while Juan's friend Pedro can be compared with Efraín's friend Carlos. Juxtaposing Martí and Isaacs' texts, Zanetti claims that "*Lucía Jerez* es una suerte de bisagra en una línea importante de novelas hispanoamericanas en la cual podemos otorgar a *María* la función de fundadora, dados su caudalosa recepción en todo el continente y sus valores estéticos" (191).

As I mentioned earlier, María is one of the novels Sommer examines in her theory of Latin American national romance. In spite of similar points of reference in Isaacs and Martí, however, such a comparison is never discussed by Sommer. Nor does she even refer to Lucía Jerez in her analysis.⁹⁹ Perhaps this omission is due to the fact that Martí's novel is not as explicitly "allegorical" as the other romances she is interested in. Or maybe the tragic end represented by Sol's death does not coincide with the premise of "foundational fictions" for which "[t]he rhetoric of love, specifically of *productive sexuality* at home, is notably consistent" (my emphasis, 6). While Sommer suggests that the bourgeois project of national hegemony is determined through reconciliatory love affairs, such a model does not exist in Martí's novel. Just like we saw in Rizal's Noli me tangere, Lucía Jerez presents no unified couple capable of overcoming racial or regional differences in order to produce an ideal nation form. Quite the contrary, Martí creates love relationships in terms of *unproductive sexuality*: the failed romance between Lucía and Juan is far from the project of cohesive national consolidation, and Sol is abruptly killed by her "friend" without experiencing any romance. Here, the opposite of Sommer's characterization of allegorical, romantic love seems to be at work. Whereas

⁹⁹ In Foundational Fictions, the only time Sommer makes reference to Martí is when she mentions his general admiration for European romantic novels and the way in which he celebrates Manuel de Jesús Galván's novel Enriquillo (1882) as a model for Latin American writers (9).

foundational fictions emphasize how “the coherence comes from their common project to build through reconciliations and amalgamations of national constituencies cast as lovers destined to desire each other” (24), Martí’s novel highlights the relational conflicts and tensions between lovers; the idea of “foundational disarticulation.” Put differently, the author announces the impossibility of romance as the basis of Latin American identity. The emphasis is placed not on harmonious reconciliation, but rather on the divergence from such a love affair.

My intention is not to analyze Lucía Jerez as another “foundational fiction” according to Sommer’s definition. I do suggest, however, that the novel can be read as a text that defines an important characteristic of nineteenth-century Latin American writings. I contend that Martí produces a different kind of foundational narrative, one that emphasizes the idea of resistance against the power of Spanish imperialism. The unfulfilled love affair between Lucía and Juan in the novel is not a sign of “incomplete” national romance. Rather, it is *supposed to* fail because such failure is what makes the author’s anti-colonial vision possible. In order to explore the possibility of resistance in the novel, the subsequent section first examines Lucía’s attempt to colonize Juan and Sol and then discusses the meaning of the ultimate failure of such an imperial project.

3.5 LUCÍA’S IMPERIALISM AND ITS FAILURE

The first part of this chapter illustrated how Doña Victorina and Doña Consolación in Rizal’s Noli me tangere revealed defiant, anti-imperial “agents” in contrast to their husbands’ powerless “subjects.” At first sight, this peculiar gender relationship is also at work between Lucía and Juan in Lucía Jerez. First of all, the narrator describes the female protagonist in terms of her

insatiable sexual desire: “Lucía, en quien *un deseo se clavaba como en los peces se clavan los anzuelos*, y de tener que renunciar a algún deseo, quedaba rota y sangrando, como cuando el anzuelo se le retira queda la carne del pez” (my emphasis, 60). Desire is indeed completely “stuck”—“se clava”—in her body, like a fish caught in a hook. It is what defines Lucía as a living creature because she would be lifeless without it. More than anything else, what we see is a desire to possess Juan’s love, a desire to dominate him. Every time he looks at other women, she feels profoundly jealous and cannot stand the scene. At one point, she frantically yells at him, “¡Yo no quisiera que tú conocieses a nadie!” (120). In order to capture Juan’s attention, she wishes to amalgamate all the beauty in the world. Her ambition is revealed when she declares that “[q]uisiera reunir yo en mí misma todas las bellezas del mundo, y que nadie más que yo tuviera hermosura alguna sobre la tierra” (120). The only thing that matters to Lucía is her ideal romance with Juan, and she puts all her energy into achieving this goal throughout the novel.

The question of desire determines the power structure as well as the relationship between Lucía and Juan. Her unrestrained thirst for love places her in a position where she exercises certain authority over Juan, allowing her to constrain the ways in which he can perform his actions. The novel describes how she attempts to manipulate Juan’s public life by watching over his every move: “ella lo fijaba en todas partes con su voluntad y su mirada como los obreros de la fábrica de Eibar, en España, embuten los hilos de plata y de oro sobre la lámina negra del hierro esmerilado” (60). Her obsession is compared with the image of Spain—its colonial project to exploit Cuba and Latin America—and exposes her power to control her boyfriend. Contrary to Lucía’s authoritative nature, Juan appears to be a passive individual whose identity is constructed only through the eyes of people around him. As the narrator illustrates, Juan’s relationship with Lucía leads him to believe that he is merely “a property of others”: “[Juan] se

veía a sí mismo como una propiedad de los demás que guardaba él en depósito” (59). Here, Lucía’s assertiveness is defined in opposition to Juan’s submissiveness and vulnerability. The control imposed by Lucía is so intense that “[l]levaba Juan Jerez en el rostro pálido, *la nostalgia de la acción* [...] y en los ojos llevaba como una desolación” (my emphasis, 55). Since he cannot do anything of his own will, he feels “nostalgia for the action.” In this picture, the conventional gender roles assigned for women and men are reversed, similar to what we saw in the relationships between Doña Victorina and Don Tiburcio and Doña Consolación and the *señor alférez*.¹⁰⁰ Juan somewhat appears to be Lucía’s sexual object which, stripped of his will for actions, only functions to satisfy the female protagonist’s desire (Martínez-San Miguel 34). While she seeks to control Juan’s body, he is incapable of resisting her possessive love. He desperately asks her at one point, “¿Cómo entenderte, Lucía? [...] ¿qué te hago yo que explique esas durezas tuyas de carácter?” and then remains silent, which indicates the impossibility of understanding her desire (116-117). Perplexed and anguished, the “effeminate” Juan ultimately loses consciousness when Lucía murders Sol at the end of the novel (165).

Even though the dominant image of Lucía seems analogous to Doña Victorina in terms of their power to control men, Martí’s female protagonist possesses a more threatening nature than Rizal’s character (in this sense, Lucía can be more closely associated with Doña Consolación than with Doña Victorina). With her unrestricted desire, Lucía is converted into a colonial figure who attempts to dominate other women (Adela, Ana, and Sol). The novel describes the quality of an oppressor in her whose eyes are characterized as “dos ojos imperiosos y negros” (53) and “ojos llameantes, como dos amenazas” (66). She is a menacing woman who is powerful and

¹⁰⁰ Paulette Silva Beauregard considers that the feminine aspect of Juan’s character represent “las nuevas representaciones del héroe”: “la novela se asocia a una cultura sentimental, doméstica, ligada a la feminidad, para examinar dentro de este contexto las nuevas representaciones del héroe, convertido según Martí, en ‘mero galán de amores,’ o las desviaciones femeninas que también son una amenaza” (138).

self-conscious of her own sexual desire. Her imperial nature further manifests itself in her clothing and furniture. She wears “un sombrero arrogante y amenazador” (51-52), while “la mecedora de Lucía” looks like “obediente a un gesto enérgico y contenido de su dueña” (52). That Lucía’s “arrogance” is reflected in her belongings shows that she possesses a monstrous power and will to consume her environment. In the same way, the ribbons of Lucía’s hat are winded around another person’s hat, just as a boa constrictor (a large, autochthonous snake in Latin America) attempts to hunt its prey (52).¹⁰¹ Her menacing characteristic is also highlighted in comparison with other female characters who carry beautiful flowers on their dresses:

Adela, delgada y locuaz, con un ramo de rosas Jacqueminot al lado izquierdo de su traje de seda crema; Ana, ya próxima a morir, prendida sobre el corazón enfermo, en su vestido de muselina blanca, una flor azul sujeta con unas hebras de trigo; y Lucía, robusta y profunda, que no llevaba flores en su vestido de seda carmesí, ‘porque no se conocía aún en los jardines la flor que a ella le gustaba: ¡la flor negra!’ (50)

The significance of this passage is twofold. First, the fact that Lucía’s preferred color is *black* corresponds to her sinister and oppressive nature. For Adela and Ana who wear “roses” and “a blue flower,” Lucía appears to be an eccentric, unnatural woman because she desires an unusual, inexistent “black flower.” Consequently, she cannot belong to the symbolic space of the garden in which traditional femininity and morality are preserved. The nonexistence of a “black flower” indicates the lack of feminine qualities in Lucía, as we saw in her relationship with Juan. At the same time, her body is further depicted as “robust” as opposed to Ana’s “sick heart.” The vitality and physical strength in the female protagonist represent the authority of colonialism, while the figure of Ana personifies Latin America, as her favorite “flor azul” coincides with Martí’s earlier allusion to “nuestros países azules.” In allegorical terms, then, Lucía embodies an

¹⁰¹ From Lucía’s hat, “se salían por el borde del consturero las cintas carmesíes, enroscadas sobre el sombrero de Adela como un boa sobre una tórtola” (52).

imperial Spain that attempts to exploit Cuba and Latin America (she is indeed from a family of Spanish origin).

Lucía exercises her imperial power most explicitly through her relationship with Sol who possesses “esa hermosura de la autora, que arroba y ennoblece” (110). The two women demonstrate opposing characteristics. While Lucía is defined through the image of “la flor negra,” Sol is represented by “las grandes flores blancas de la magnolia” (49). Unlike the self-reliant Lucía, Sol’s life is almost completely based on her friends’ support. For instance, she has to depend on the school director for her education and on Juan for her family’s economic situation. With regard to her social life in general, Sol relies on Lucía’s plans (116). For her, “[u]n dueño le era preciso, y Lucía fue su dueña” (129). Hence, what the two women have is not so much a friendship as an uneven relationship of power between the colonizer and the colonized. In fact, the subjugated Sol is physically situated at the other’s foot: “A los pies de Lucía está Sol del Valle” (113). Moreover, Lucía plays the role of authoritarian “owner” in such a way that “Lucía, ardiente y despótica [...] ejercía, por lo mismo que no lo deseaba, un poderoso influjo en el espíritu de Sol, tímido y nuevo” (129). Similar to the way in which Rizal’s Doña Consolación is transformed into a cruel colonizer when she confronts Sisa, Lucía attempts to dominate Sol with her power, which results in the final moment of assassination.

Critics have examined Lucía’s relation to Sol from various perspectives. María Fernanda Lander claims that the conflict between them is principally related to class differences and the specific social responsibilities imposed on each social class. According to her, the novel demonstrates a tension between “una mujer rica que no se adapta a su condición de ángel del hogar y una mujer pobre que sí lo hace, pero cuya marginalidad social la incapacita en la tarea de mantener la solidez del poder económico de la aristocracia” (756). On the other hand, Yolanda

Martínez-San Miguel maintains that the essential difference between these two women is found in the image of the “natural” woman: she recognizes in Lucía “an act of counter-nature,” while attributing the quality of “natural woman” to Sol (35). Invoking the terms that I discussed earlier, we can claim that Lucía represents a *denaturalized* figure as opposed to Sol’s *natural* identity. For his part, David Luis-Brown articulates Lucía’s relationship to Sol in terms of colonialism. After exploring the ways in which Lucía exercises authority upon Juan and Sol, he suggests that “the title *Amistad funesta*, fatal friendship, refers both to Lucía’s creation of a lethal love triangle with Sol and Juan and to the oppressive colonial ‘friendship’ between Spain, embodied by Lucía, and Cuba, embodied by Juan and Sol” (89). According to Luis-Brown, the uniqueness of Martí’s novel resides in what he calls “anti-imperial messianism,” the notion that he draws from Giorgio Agamben’s account of Walter Benjamin’s messianism theory (75-77). Contrary to the traditional “romantic racialism” that tends to emphasize the Christian inspiration of sympathy toward the oppressed subject (e.g. Uncle Tom’s Cabin), the concept of “anti-imperial messianism” focuses on the possibility of rebellion against colonial aggression and exploitation. In Luis-Brown’s words, “whereas romantic racialism privileges white witnesses and agents of redemption, anti-imperial messianism upends white privilege and the imperial foundations of the world order” (77).

However, the possibility of “anti-imperial messianism” does not stem from the relationship between Lucía, Juan and Sol. Rather, Luis-Brown argues, the key to understand resistance against imperialism in the novel is the concept of “the homosocial” represented by the friendship between different male characters (90-91). As he claims, the tragic end in Lucía Jerez reveals Martí’s “preference for homosocial politics over the heterosexual erotics present in popular melodramas in the *romance* mode” (90). An example of such a homosocial bond is

shown through Sol's father, Don Manuel, and her brother, Manuelillo, who is exiled in Spain due to his criticism of the colonial regime. Spain's imperial project provides only limited opportunities for Creole families in the colony and thus prevents the country's national development. Luis-Brown points out that "[c]olonialism literally unmans Latin America by crippling its patriarchs and sending its sons abroad" (91). Although both Don Manuel and Manuelillo experience difficulties under the colonial government, the fact that their connection is never destroyed by Spanish colonialism demonstrates the power of revolutionary fraternity in the novel. Put differently, the undisturbed relationship between father and son symbolizes a counterforce against the empire that attempts to "unman" its colony: "homosocial bonds provide one gendered strategy of decolonizing resistance to colonialism's unmanning of Latin America" (91).

Luis-Brown's reading is suggestive insofar as it highlights the link between Lucía and Sol in terms of a colonial relationship. Nevertheless, his discussion of "the anti-imperial" seems to place too much emphasis on the role of "homosocial politics" and consequently overlooks the centrality of Lucía's dominant nature in the novel. While he considers the bond between male characters essential to the possibility of decolonization, I contend that the idea of resistance only emerges when we pay attention to the collapse of Lucía's imperial project. Martí's tragic romance does not allegorize "the failure of national formation in Cuba," as Luis-Brown puts, but rather the success of anti-colonial resistance (89). The romance between Lucía and Juan *needs to be* unproductive because this tragedy represents an essential condition to effectively challenge the empire. In other words, by presenting Lucía's ultimate failure to dominate other characters, the novel reveals the defective aspect of her imperial agenda, thereby establishing criticism against the Spanish empire.

First of all, despite her numerous attempts, Lucía is never able to fully conquer Juan's love throughout the novel. With her beauty and grace, Sol plays an important role in complicating Lucía's plan. In its description of Sol's impact upon Lucía, the narrator illustrates how "sus ojos grandes, limpios y sencillos, que cada vez que se lavantaban, ya sobre Juan, ya sobre otros donde Juan pudiese verlos, se entraban como garfios envenenados por el corazón celoso de Lucía" (157). Sol's "eyes" torment Lucía as they provoke uncontrollable jealousy. Her "vision" produces a challenge to the colonial power for it penetrates into the colonizer's inner realm without any warning. Even when Sol is not directly looking at Juan, such a permeable "vision" never ceases to torture Lucía who cannot bear the internal turbulence, and she gradually begins to lose control of herself. In one scene, the reader finds Lucía in a confused and disturbed state of mind because of Sol: "¿la querrá Juan? ¿la querrá Juan? ¿Por qué no soy como ella? Me rasgaría las carnes: me abriría con las uñas las mejillas. Cara imbécil, ¿por qué no soy como ella? [...] ¿Qué es lo que tengo, que me parezco fea a mí misma? Y yo no lo soy, pero lo estoy siendo" (150).

In the above scene, the previously colonized Sol incites doubt in Lucía's mind concerning her colonial project. This marks an important moment in the development of the story because from this point on the female protagonist no longer feels certain about the power she used to enjoy in her romantic relationship. In other words, Lucía's imperial agenda to conquer Juan begins to fall apart. When she later catches a glimpse of Juan cheerfully talking to Sol and Ana, she gets terribly upset and runs away to her room. Juan, who was planning a secret visit to surprise her, presumes that she is ill and decides to leave the house. On his way, he once again finds Sol selflessly taking care of the sick Ana in her bed. He says, "Sol, gracias por lo buena que es Vd. con Ana. Vd. tiene fama de hermosa, pero yo le doy a dar fama de buena" (154).

Juan's statement is significant for it symbolizes the moment when he unshackles the chain of Lucía's possessive love. Recuperating his own subjectivity of "I" that was previously absent, he tells Sol "I give you the fame of goodness." It is no longer possible for Lucía to maintain control over the liberated Juan. Her colonial project fails and consequently, "algo se le había roto en lo interior" (155). The relationship between these lovers suggests a gesture of anti-imperial resistance: she loses the authority she used to enjoy, while he acquires the ability to act on his own and to free himself from the earlier "nostalgia de la acción."

Lucía thus fails to dominate Juan, but Sol constantly attracts his attention. Lucía's unattractiveness can be contrasted with Sol who "está destinada por su hermosura a llamar la atención de una manera extraordinaria" (99). Different from the "masculine" characteristic we find in Lucía, Sol manifests her "feminine" qualities traditionally valued in Latin America. It is not the imperial Lucía but the colonized Sol who "by nature" possesses an attractive quality: as the novel illustrates, "[e]ra Sol como para que la llevarsen en la vida de la mano, más preparada *por la naturaleza* para que la quisiesen que para querer" (my emphasis, 129). Once again, Lucía's denaturalized aspect is characterized in opposition to Sol's "natural" beauty and morality. In this sense, their respective names possess symbolic connotations: "Lucía"—"Luz" (light)—used to shine brilliantly before but now begins to fade away, while "Sol" (sun) represents the one that is never extinguished (Lander 755). Hence, even though Sol dies in the end of the novel, she is surrounded by people who want to give their life to her ("¡Todos queriendo darle su vida!"). Lucía, on the other hand, remains all alone without anyone's attention (¡A ella nadie se acercaba a ella!) (165). Because of Sol's "natural" presence, Lucía is unable to accomplish her project of conquering Juan's love.

Moreover, there is another female figure capable of exposing the impossibility of Lucía's imperial view. It is the artist Ana whose works enable her to perceive and resist colonialism. First, the narrator describes how Ana's artistic skills represent the power to make other characters comfortable and content: "Si cantaba, con una voz que se esparcía por los adentros del alma, como la luz de la mañana por los campos verdes, dejaba en el espíritu una grata intranquilidad [...] aquellas musicales claridades que solo en las horas de hacer bien, o de tratar a quien lo hace, distingue entre sus propias nieblas el alma" (62-63). Her songs invoke goodness in the human spirit, inspiring the listener to "do good deeds." Through the act of singing, Ana reaches "the inside of one's heart" and disperses the "mists" that may trouble people's lives. The world she creates is a symbolic moment of "morning light," which ironically suggests that she shines more brightly than Lucía ("Luz"). In short, art is what determines Ana's moral characteristic that seems to make positive contributions to the surrounding environment, and, to a certain extent, the illustration of her skill indicates Martí's emphasis on art as an important component of national community.¹⁰²

In the novel, Ana's creativity involves an ability to portray the world through drawings, depicted as "cuadros que parecen música" (75). Since her sick body restricts physical activities, she devotes most of her time to painting, which provides a means to both observe the outside world and preserve the internal realm of spirituality. Everyone loves Ana because of her artistic skills, except for the denaturalized Lucía who becomes deeply jealous. In one scene, Lucía attempts to steal Ana's "secret" about how to attract people's attention: "Mira, mi Ana, dame el secreto que tú tienes para que te quiera todo el mundo; porque ese caballero [Juan], es necesario que me quiera" (52). However, the sick woman manages to resist Lucía's plan to penetrate into

¹⁰² For Martí, art plays a significant role in the definition of national politics. As he writes, "[e]l arte, como la sal a los alimentos, preserva a las naciones" (O.C.: vol. 13, 482).

her interior, and this is made possible because art gives Ana a kind of shelter to protect herself. What she paints is not a mere reflection of the external world but, perhaps more importantly, “son pedazos de entrañas mías en que he puesto con mi mejor voluntad lo mejor que hay en mí” (79). The performance of painting allows her to preserve a private, internal space that can never be invaded by others. The reader realizes that Ana usually doesn’t show her works in public until they are complete. The reason is, she tells us, “desde que los imagino hasta que los acabo voy poniendo en ellos tanto de mi alma, al fin ya no llegan a ser telas, sino mi alma misma [...] como yo sola siento cómo me duele el corazón, o se me lleva todo el pecho de lágrimas o me laten las sienes, como si me las azotasen alas, cuando estoy pintando” (79). Through the act of painting, she can freely express her emotions and reveal the spiritual sphere of her life, “mi alma misma.” Even the threat of Lucía’s colonialism cannot occupy her interior realm, as shown by Ana’s refusal to share the “secret.” In other words, her artwork constructs a particular place in which she is able to defend herself from the imperial power. While the other characters such as Juan and Sol are controlled by Lucía in one way or another, Ana appears to be the only one who is capable of avoiding such menace.

For Ana, painting also becomes a critical tool to capture the true nature of Lucía’s imperialism, which is nearly imperceptible to the other characters in the novel. At one point, Ana decides to paint a black monster: “Sobre una colina voy a pintar un monstruo sentado [...] toda la negrura de su cuerpo, el monstruo, con cabeza de mujer, estará devorando rosas” (76). In a strange way, this depiction of a monster sitting on a hill reflects the image of Lucía. I have already mentioned that Lucía’s favorite flower in the garden is an inexistent “black flower,” and the reference to *blackness* parallels the color of the monster that has indeed “a woman’s head.” On the other hand, the idea of the monster eating away “roses” also reminds us of the way in

which Lucía attempts to colonize Juan and Sol. In other words, the above passage illustrates the power of Ana's painting, which is the ability to strip the imperial subject naked on a piece of canvas. The artist skillfully exposes the hidden truth about Lucía's colonialism, making it noticeable in the public eye. As Zanetti notes, "el personaje de Ana está presentado, más que como aficionada, como una verdadera artista, capaz de expresar en sus pinturas un saber (no censurado) sobre el mundo" (188-189). Through art, Ana is able to recuperate the "knowledge" about Lucía's imperial vision, and she seeks to transmit that knowledge by showing the picture to the rest of the world. Far from being a self-absorbed artist who hides oneself in a secluded place in order to create his or her work, Ana directly confronts the reality of colonialism, exposes it to the viewer, and therefore strives to frustrate Lucía's imperialism. As a result, Lucía fails to accomplish her goal of dominating Juan and becomes insane—or "commits suicide," as Luis-Brown interprets (89)—when she abruptly murders Sol in the final moment of the novel.

In a sense, Ana's project of disturbing Lucía represents Martí's attempt to claim Latin America's resistance to Spanish colonialism during the nineteenth century. According to Rosa Pellicer's assessment, "Ana representa otro tipo del siglo XIX, la mujer enferma, su dolencia cardiaca y su extraordinario carácter la elevan a un plano superior" (293). As a representative figure of *fin-de-siècle* Latin America, Ana serves to articulate the possibility of a certain anti-colonial agency. In particular, the significance of her creative skills indicates Martí's attention to art as a place in which aesthetic and spiritual values can be preserved. As I discussed earlier, celebrating these values is a central premise of Latin American *modernista* movement. From this perspective, Ana's function as an anti-imperial artist is perhaps one of the characteristics that make Martí's novel pertinent to the basic principle of *modernismo*. The possibility of resistance symbolized by Ana not only represents an effective defense against colonialism (Lucía/Spain)

but also a task of recuperating aesthetics and spirituality in the context of nineteenth-century Latin America.

Comparing Rizal's Noli me tangere and Martí's Lucía Jerez has shown some important ways in which the two writers employ the form of melodrama in order to frustrate the Spanish imperial project in the Philippines, Cuba, and Latin America. First, I have demonstrated how Doris Sommer's theory of romantic narrative as a necessary platform for national allegory does not work for Rizal and Martí. Indeed, the rejection of such a model is precisely what makes their novels comparable. By focusing on a kind of "foundational disarticulation," the two writers create fictional characters who similarly problematize the colonizers' desire for exploitation. At the same time, these characters construct a productive paradigm for a new agency from the viewpoint of the colonized. Nevertheless, Rizal and Martí take a different route in producing their respective anti-imperial discourses: while Rizal articulates the potential force of resistance by demonstrating how Doña Victorina and Doña Consolación reverse the power relationship with their husbands/colonizers, Martí describes the failure of Lucía's colonial project in order to expose the problematic Spanish empire.

The interactions between different couples in the Noli and Lucía Jerez also reveal that the themes of gender and power are significant aspects when we juxtapose the two novels. In diverse ways, Rizal and Martí address the question of gender relations in an attempt to criticize imperialism, and their shared emphasis on the melodramatic form points to the idea of global resistance against the common enemy. Their narratives portray a complex system of relationships between men and women and between the colonizer and the colonized. This complexity partially stems from the fact that the qualities of "femininity" and "masculinity" do not necessarily correspond to "natural" women and men in the Noli and Lucía Jerez. I have

examined, for example, how “feminine” male colonizer (Don Tiburcio) is controlled by his wife (Doña Victorina), while the “masculine” female colonizer (Lucía) is disturbed by other women (Sol and Ana). In an attempt to construct an anti-imperial and denaturalized identity in their respective novels, Rizal and Martí wrestle with this complicated dynamic of gender relations and strive to write against the Spanish imperial power in the late nineteenth century.

Moreover, these authors must confront another hegemonic force at the turn of the century when the economic power and the political interests of the United States begin to establish considerable impact on the rest of the world. Both Rizal and Martí are astute observers of this historical shift, expressing the feeling of attraction as well as repulsion toward the emerging superpower. Their ambivalent attitude is manifested in such a way that they celebrate positive features of the new empire, while simultaneously perceiving the potential danger of U.S. expansionism. Although the degree to which the two revolutionaries discern the reality of the American empire is quite different, they take a similar approach to construct their political views. By analyzing various texts that deal with the United States, the next chapter will examine Rizal and Martí’s articulation of the Filipino, Cuban, and Latin American identities in relation to the modern imperial “other.”

4.0 TIME FOR FILIBUSTEROS: RIZAL AND MARTÍ CONFRONT THE MODERN EMPIRE

It is May, 1888, in New York. Spring has spread everywhere in the metropolitan city after a long period of winter, providing comfort and new energy to the immigrants from all over the globe. After eight years of his exiled life, Martí continues to busy himself as the leader of El Partido Revolucionario Cubano, tirelessly preparing for the Cuban independence movement, collecting funds for expeditions, organizing meetings to disseminate the party's patriotic ideas, and writing articles for different journals and newspapers in Latin America. The city seems to give him a decent life, though not a happy one, as he would remain there for the next seven years.¹⁰³ It is at this moment when Rizal arrives in the same city traveling from the other side of the world.¹⁰⁴ It is his first and only trip to the country, and he stays there less than a month. Nevertheless, Rizal observes and writes about different aspects of modern life in the United States, as Martí does more extensively in his Escenas norteamericanas. Situating themselves in the same city, however, Martí and Rizal never see each other in person. Only their patriotic and anti-imperial ideas traverse and interact in a peculiar way, connecting the Caribbean and Asia in

¹⁰³ As I pointed out in chapter 3, one of the significant incidents that led to Martí's "unhappy" life in New York was his separation with Carmen Zayas Bazán and his son "Pepito" in 1885.

¹⁰⁴ Rizal travels to the U.S. between April 28 and May 16, 1888, visiting such major cities as San Francisco, Chicago, and New York.

the late-nineteenth-century metropolitan city which would soon become the hub of a modern U.S. empire.

While my previous chapters focus on Martí and Rizal's critical perspectives on decaying Spanish colonialism, this chapter will concentrate on their distinct views on emerging U.S. imperialism. Both Martí and Rizal spend important time in the U.S. before the untimely end of their lives, although the former ends up staying there for a much longer period than the latter. To different degrees, their experiences within the modern empire influence their worldview. In this chapter, I attempt to examine the ways in which the U.S. and the larger framework of "America" come to shape the two writers' political ideas. A particular emphasis will be placed on their symbols of anti-colonial resistance, namely Rizal's notions of "indios bravos" and "filibustero" and Martí's articulation of "naturaleza" and "hombre natural." I will study both the possibilities and limits of these concepts through the analysis of several texts, most centrally, the Filipino's second novel El filibusterismo and the Cuban's well-known essay "Nuestra América," both of which are published in 1891. My intention is to show how the idea of global resistance symbolized by the shared anti-colonial gesture of Martí and Rizal is defined not only in their struggle for national independence from the old Spain empire, but also in their critique and strategic appropriation of the new U.S. empire.

4.1 THE NINETEENTH-CENTURY UNITED STATES

At first sight, Martí and Rizal reflect upon the United States in both positive and negative terms. Positively, they admire the country's principle of freedom and realization of modern urbanism. Negatively, they present critical perceptions of domestic racism and economic inequality. And

they denounce the creeping project of expansionism directed toward Latin America and Asia. Even though coming from seemingly disparate political and socio-economic circumstances, the two figures articulate parallel views on these positive and negative elements of U.S. society. Perhaps most importantly, their premonitions concerning the imminent threat of American expansionism would later manifest itself in the wake of the Spanish-American War in 1898, the event that neither Martí nor Rizal is able to witness during their lives.

As I mentioned in chapter 2, Rizal's manifesto "Filipinas dentro de cien años" presents his hypothesis that one day the United States may attempt to annex the Philippines. This consideration of the potential danger of U.S. imperialism from the Asian perspective is often not recognized by scholars of American and Latin American Studies. In the article, Rizal declares that "Acaso la gran República Americana, cuyos intereses se encuentran en el Pacífico y que no tienen participación en los despojos de África, piense un día en posesiones ultramarinas" (IV, 48). Arguing that "[I]a América del Norte sería una rival demasiado molesta, si una vez practica el oficio," he settles on the idea that the U.S. may seek to dominate the Philippines when the Age of European Imperialism comes to an end (IV, 48). As Blanco notes, Rizal's seemingly prophetic stance represents "the first critique of U.S. institutions by a native-born, self-proclaimed Filipino intellectual toward the end of the nineteenth century" (2006, 21). However, Rizal is not insightful enough to accurately predict the future of his homeland. Despite the potential annexation, he claims, the U.S. does not involve itself in the conquest of other colonies because it would be "contra sus tradiciones" (IV, 48). We now know that his assessment proved incorrect when the U.S. purchased the Philippines from Spain for \$20 million only eight years after the publication of his essay.

On the other hand, those familiar with the history of modern Latin America should remember that Martí similarly foreshadows the rise of U.S. hegemony at the turn of the century. In 1894, for example, he alerts that “es preciso que se sepa en nuestra América la verdad de los Estados Unidos,” (O.C.: vol. 20, 290), attempting to prevent “que se extiendan por las Antillas los Estados Unidos y caigan, con esa fuerza más, sobre nuestras tierras de América” (161). When we look at his earlier oeuvre, however, we begin to see another side of his worldview. During the first period of his stay in New York (roughly between 1880 and 1884), Martí shows an optimistic perspective toward the country. His life in this period can be described as that of a dazzled spectator: he views the U.S. as a country of genuine freedom and democracy, capable of providing an ideal model for Latin American republics. Upon his arrival to the metropolitan city, for instance, he writes (in English) that “I am, at last, in a country where everyone looks like his own master. One can breathe freely freedom being here the foundation, the shield, the essence of life” (O.C.: vol. 19, 103). In the same way, Martí’s depiction of the newly constructed Brooklyn Bridge reveals his excitement at discovering a symbol of America’s freedom and modernization: “imáginate ver sentada en mitad del cielo, con la cabeza radiante entrándose por su cumbre, y con las manos blancas, grandes como águilas, abiertas en signo de paz sobre la tierra,—a la Libertad, que en esta ciudad ha dado tal hija. La Libertad es la madre del mundo nuevo,—que alborea” (O.C.: vol. 9, 423). He further articulates his positive impressions of North America in various other texts, while gradually recognizing the imminent threat of U.S. imperial power. His copious writing on the U.S. is a terrain of contradiction and ambivalence, revealing seduction as well as repulsion toward this modern empire. He is impressed by the country’s democratic tradition and the right of freedom putatively available for

all citizens, but at the same time he also becomes aware of the minority groups who are being marginalized by the dominant classes.

Like Martí in his early years of exile, Rizal remarks upon his admiration for the modern life and technology in the U.S. As he writes to his friend, Mariano Ponce, during his trip, “[v]isitó las más grandes ciudades de América, con sus grandiosos edificios, sus luces eléctricas y sus concepciones grandiosas” (“Diarios y memorias,” 225). His travel diaries and personal letters reveal his positive impressions of America’s natural environment: the serene countryside of New England, the expanse and wilderness of Utah, Colorado and Nebraska, the modern landscape of Chicago, the immeasurable beauty of the Missouri River, Niagara Falls and the Hudson River, and the magnificence of such modern architectural works as the Brooklyn Bridge and the Statue of Liberty (217-220). However, the correspondences also show his understanding of the other side of the country. While acknowledging the U.S. as “un gran país” which “ofrece una patria para el pobre que quiere trabajar,” Rizal nevertheless discerns its negative features, including the absence of civil liberties and the racial discrimination against the African-Americans and Chinese immigrants. His critical assessment of the problems of U.S. society is described as follows: “La América es indudablemente un gran país, pero tiene aún muchos defectos. No hay verdadera libertad civil. En algunos estados el negro no puede casarse con una blanca ni una negra con un blanco. El odio al chino hace que otros extranjeros asiáticos, como los japoneses, sean confundidos por los ignorantes y sean también mal mirados” (225-226).¹⁰⁵

In fact, Rizal experiences this racial discrimination first-hand upon his journey in 1888. To his surprise, he and other passengers are quarantined for almost a week before setting their foot in San Francisco. According to the government officials, the quarantine is issued because

¹⁰⁵ This last sentence can be understood as an expression of Rizal’s own racism against the Chinese. In a sense, the problem is not really “el odio al chino” but the fact that Rizal associates “el chino” with “los ignorantes.”

they fear that the travelers have brought some disease from the foreign countries. In one of his letters, Rizal expresses his discontent and offers his interpretation of the *real* reason for the segregation:

Estamos anclados en este puerto bajo cuarentena. No sabemos cuanto tiempo durará esta, a pesar de no tener enfermos a bordo y de no haber venido el barco de ningún puerto sucio. La causa de eso son los 643 chinos que vienen con nosotros; los americanos no quieren a los chinos y como las elecciones están por celebrarse, el gobierno desea congraciarse con la gente (“Diarios y memorias,” 216).

Rizal suspects that the quarantine is due to the presence of 643 Chinese emigrants toward whom many U.S. citizens, especially those in California, have shown a strong feeling of xenophobia since the early 1880s.¹⁰⁶ Knowing that a political election is to be held in San Francisco, he presupposes that the government strategically attempts to gain people’s support by claiming that they are taking strict measures against the admission of Chinese immigrants. Through his own observation and experience, he comes to understand the meaning of racism in the U.S. The degrading treatment of the quarantine and surveillance in San Francisco leaves such negative impressions of the country in Rizal’s mind that he would later refer to the experience again during his trip to Europe in 1889 (“Diarios y memorias,” 230).

4.2 RIZAL’S “INDIOS BRAVOS”

How does Rizal’s view of the U.S. change after his 1888 trip? To what extent does the U.S. influence his way of thinking about his country’s national independence? In what way does he

¹⁰⁶ Two of the most infamous phenomena related to this history include the creation of the Chinese Exclusion Act in 1882, which prohibited Chinese immigrants from entering into the U.S. territory, and the massacre of twenty Chinese in Rock Springs, Wyoming, in 1885. For more information on this theme, see Saxton (1971) and Choy (1994).

view the problem of this modern empire alongside the old Spanish empire? When discussing the relationship between Rizal and the U.S., some scholars do not seriously consider these questions and instead prefer to focus on the period subsequent to his life, that is to say, after the Spanish-American War of 1898. One of the themes frequently brought to the discussion is whether Rizal's status as a national hero is part of America's colonial project. The Filipino scholar Renato Constantino suggests that "we must accept the fact that his formal designation as our national hero, his elevation to his present eminence so far above all our other heroes was abetted and encouraged by the Americans" (128). According to Constantino, the idea of making Rizal a national hero was first proposed by Governor William Howard Taft during the Philippine Commission of 1901. He cites the periodical of the time, Free Press, to demonstrate this point:

'And now, gentlemen, you must have a national hero.' In these fateful words, addressed by then Civil Governor W. H. Taft to the Filipino members of the civil commission, Pardo de Tavera, Legarda, and Luzuriaga, lay the genesis of Rizal Day [...] In the subsequent discussion in which the rival merits of the revolutionary heroes were considered, the final choice—now universally acclaimed a wise one—was Rizal. And so was history made (qtd. in Constantino 128).

The plan to place Rizal within the Filipino national pantheon was further reinforced by the consequent Acts of the Philippines Commission: Act No. 137 represented the production of a new province named after Rizal "in honor of the most illustrious Filipino and the most illustrious Tagalog the islands had ever known"; Act No. 243 approved the construction of Rizal's monument in Luneta Park, Manila; and Act No. 345 proclaimed the day of Rizal's death, December 30, as a day of observance (128-129). The American project of hero making had a clear political objective. It was meant to direct the Filipinos' hatred toward the Spaniards who had killed their "hero" during the war, and thereby gaining the opposite reaction of respect for American newcomers who sought to recognize the importance of their "hero." At the same time, Rizal's figure as a non-military reformist was perfectly convenient for Taft and other colonial

officials who “favored a hero who would not run against the grain of American colonial policy” (129). Consequently, Constantino argues, “his [Taft’s] choice was a master stroke by the Americans” (130).¹⁰⁷

While the aforementioned claim regarding America’s active participation in the post-1898 canonization of Rizal remains polemical, I am more interested in highlighting the influence of the U.S. on the Filipino writer *prior to* 1898. As Sharon Delmendo rightfully points out, “José Rizal was deeply influenced by America and [...] the American influence played a significant role in Rizal’s conceptualization of Filipino nationalism” (36). One of the examples of such influence can be found in Rizal’s formation of a political group in 1889 when he was exiled in Europe. He and his associates established a proto-nationalist organization and called themselves “los indios bravos.” Even though the group only existed for a short period of time, it was considered a precursor to the revolutionary association known as “Liga Filipina,” which Rizal later created together with another important Filipino anti-colonial figure, Andrés Bonifacio.¹⁰⁸ A significant characteristic of “los indios bravos” was that they drew inspiration from two Native American tribes they had witnessed during the Paris Universal Exposition, namely the Lakota and Cheyenne, who were the symbols of Indian triumph over the American General George Custer at the battle of “Little Big Horn” (Blanco 2006, 21).

The history is as follows. Rizal and his compatriots saw Buffalo Bill’s Wild West in the Paris Exposition held in May 1889. The performance showed some Native American Indians riding their swift horses, managing their weapons, and elegantly wearing colorful regalia for

¹⁰⁷ Nonetheless, Americans were certainly not the first ones to make Rizal a national hero of the Filipino nation. According to Ambeth Ocampo, “although the Americans encouraged the hero-worship of Rizal, the man was already a national hero to the Filipinos long before the Americans sponsored him as such” (2008 [1990], 3).

¹⁰⁸ David Haekwon Kim suggests a parallel between Rizal’s “Liga Filipina” and Martí’s organization “La Liga” which he found in 1890 with the goal of promoting nationalist causes for Cuba and Puerto Rico (86, n.35).

such a special occasion. The Filipino audience was impressed by the strength of those “Wild Indians” and amazed by the rapturous applause they were receiving. The event had a considerable impact on Rizal who then decided to imitate the Native American warriors and to translate their image into the context of Filipino “indios.” As one of Rizal’s biographers Gregorio Zaide notes, the Filipino reformist was deeply enthralled by the American performance and proclaimed, “Why should we resent being called Indios by the Spaniards. Look at the American Indians. They were not ashamed of their race. Let us be like them. Let us be proud of the name *Indio* and make the Spaniards revise their conception of the term. We shall become *Indios Bravos!*” (Zaide, 138).¹⁰⁹

The formulation of “los indios bravos” is indeed a crucial turn in the development of Rizal’s anti-colonial thought because it represents a prerequisite for the ethno-politicization of a Filipino national identity. During the colonial period in the Philippines, the term “indio” symbolizes a disparaging category used by the Spanish colonizers and friars to emphasize the inferior status of native Filipinos. It is against this colonial mentality that Rizal seeks to define a Filipino nationalist consciousness. His proposal is the politicization of “los indios bravos” as a subject of resistance intended to subvert the negative, racist connotation of “indio.” Delmendo highlights that “[w]ith *Los Indios Bravos* Rizal turned the Spanish-imposed derogatory term into a term of pride and ethnic unity,” producing an important step toward the nationalist conceptualization of a particular Filipino identity (41).

What is notable here is that Rizal’s conceptualization of Filipino nationalism through the image of “los indios bravos” depends on his appreciation of certain aspects of the United States. Though the romanticized figure of “Wild Indians” can only be imagined within the restricted

¹⁰⁹ Unfortunately, in his biography of Rizal, Zaide does not provide the source for this citation.

framework of the nineteenth-century elite literary culture (like the European notion of the “noble savage”), it still works for Rizal as a positive American factor that provides a critical instrument to formulate an alternative notion of the resistant Filipino being. The author appropriates and translates the marginalized subject of the Native American into the colonized Filipino “indio.” For him, the image of the valiant Indian in America’s Wild West suggests the condition of possibility for both an anti-colonial subject and a new sense of nationality. Rizal’s articulation of an alternative Filipino identity is then somehow based on an ethnic reality of U.S. culture. In other words, he strategically integrates the modern empire into his own political discourse of resistant “indio,” thereby turning its force against the Spanish empire.¹¹⁰

His expression of “los indios bravos” as a symbol of anti-colonial resistance manifests itself in the novel we studied in the previous chapter, *Noli me tangere* or the *Noli*. In one of the most striking scenes, the narrator describes how the clerical authority imposes their religious, imperial ideas on the uneducated native Filipinos during a sermon. The Spanish Padre Dámaso begins his usual prayer as follows: “Esplendoroso y relumbrante es el altar; el aire es el vehículo de la santa palabra divina que brotará de mi boca” (169). The speech is described as “la santa palabra divina,” which exposes the priest’s haughty gesture in front of the native Filipinos. What is notable is the audience’s reaction, a Tagalog response, to Dámaso’s bombastic sermon. Since the natives barely understand the priest’s imperial language, they end up recognizing only a few words: “Los rudos indios, según expresión del corresponsal, no pescaron del párrafo otra cosa

¹¹⁰ However, if we consider the ambivalent intention of Buffalo Bill’s Wild West, we can perceive a different aspect of Rizal’s representation of “indios bravos.” The truth is that this American show symbolizes one of the crudest forms of propaganda and marketing during the nineteenth century. When Buffalo Bill initiated the spectacle in 1872, the West was no longer “Wild” or a threat to the public audience, because the Indians had already been largely defeated by the U.S. Army. The show was not really meant to celebrate the fearless nature of Native Americans. More importantly, it was a circus-like entertainment for white people who desired to see their glorious history of conquest and national unity. From this perspective, it is ironic that the identity of “indios bravos” that Rizal seeks to appropriate depends on a highly stylized performance of the Indians’ defeat, put on display at the heart of Europe (Paris) by an emissary of the new imperial power.

que las palabras *guardia civil, tulisán, San Diego y San Francisco*” (170). However, rather than showing their ignorance and inferiority, this supposed lack of understanding reveals the natives’ extraordinary ability to transform the colonizer’s discourse into an element of their local narrative. The friar’s anticipated meaning, the superiority of Christianity and the Spaniards, is not internalized by the native audience. Instead, they appropriate fragments of his imperial speech and deflect the power inherent in the colonial authority.

In the above scene, the veritable flood of Spanish words during Dámaso’s sermon is almost completely indecipherable to “los rudos indios.” Nonetheless, they manage to create their own narrative by “fishing out” (“pescaron”) parts of the speech. They relate their local reality (“una pintura, existente en el convento de Manila”) to the discourse, and in doing so, create a unique story that involves the bandits, the civil guard, San Diego and San Francisco:

[los indios] observaron la mala cara que había puesto el alférez, el gesto belicoso del predicador y dedujeron que le regañaba á aquél porque no perseguía á los tulisanes. S. Diego y S. Francisco se encargarían de ello, y muy bien, como lo prueba una pintura, existente en el convent de Manila, en que S. Francisco con sólo su cordon había contenido la invasión china en los primeros años del descubrimiento (170).

As a result of this transformation, the audience is able to appreciate the colonial discourse: “Alegrándose pues no poco los devotos, agradeciendo á Dios esta ayuda y no dudando que una vez desaparecidos los tulisanes, S. Francisco destruiría también á los guardias civiles” (170). The natives, whom the friar derogatorily calls “cautivos de los moros del alma que infestan los mares de la vida eterna en poderosas embarcaciones de la carne y del mundo” are no longer subjugated to the religious authority (170). On the contrary, they seek to harness the power of the imperial discourse and integrate it into an original narrative, transforming their marginality into that which they can enjoy themselves (“alegrándose”).

Vicente Rafael interprets this scene from the perspective of “translation” and “conversion.” He argues that the peculiar interaction between the Spanish friar and the native listeners indicates “an instance of the failure of authority to legitimize its claim to power in a stultifying colonial regime” as well as “a distinctive Tagalog strategy of decontextualizing the means by which colonial authority represents itself” (1988, 3). For me, the scene is important insofar as it reveals the crucial moment in which the resistant “indios bravos” or “indios rudos” invert their subjugated positionality as a means of counteracting Spanish colonialism. They listen to the imperial speech only to turn it against the colonizer. Put differently, the scene reveals the author’s anti-imperial gesture as manifested in a parody of the religious authority.¹¹¹ Rizal’s “indios” are capable of creating an alternative space from which to frustrate the colonial power, one that inverts the position of subordination imposed by Dámaso. In Rizal’s narrative, the Spanish imperial discourse is transformed into a critical position through which the ferocious “indios bravos” create their own cultural subjectivity against the hegemonic authority.

4.3 THE FILIPINO FILIBUSTEROS

In a larger picture, Rizal’s resistant “indio bravo” can be juxtaposed with the figure of the “filibustero” which is the protagonist of his second novel El Filibusterismo, popularly known as the Fili. In the following section, I attempt to examine this novel with the purpose of studying how Rizal integrates certain element of the U.S. empire into his own national project, namely the Philippines’ independence from Spain. Published in 1891, the Fili is a sequel to his first novel

¹¹¹ Cf. Rafael (1988, 2).

the Noli. While the previous work is mainly composed of events and the romantic description of the characters' emotions, the Fili is dominated by dialogue, ideology and critical denunciations of the Spanish colonial regime in the Philippines. The immediate thing that strikes the reader is the term “filibustero” as well as the title “filibusterismo.” Who is this “filibustero”? What function does he or she have in the Filipino context? And how does Rizal use that image in his anti-colonial discourse?

The historical origin of the term is the Dutch “vrijbuitter” which alludes to banditry in the 16th century. The word is then modified into the French “filibustier” before entering into Spanish as “filibustero” in the 17th century, referring to certain pirates in the Spanish colonies—West Indies in particular—during the 17th century. Adopted from the Spanish form, the English word “filibuster” is now commonly used as a synonym for “freebooter.” According to the Oxford English Dictionary, “filibuster” has three primary meanings: 1) one of a class of piratical adventurers who pillaged the Spanish colonies in the 17th-century West Indies; 2) in a wider sense, one who engages in unauthorized and irregular warfare against foreign states; 3) in the United States, one who practices obstruction in a legislative assembly. Besides these meanings, the Diccionario de la Lengua Española published by the Real Academia Española explains that the word “filibustero” also contains the connotation of “hombre que trabajaba por la emancipación de las que fueron provincias ultramarinas de España,” which can be applied to both Rizal and Martí. Similar to a pirate, the filibuster intends to steal something valuable, thereby violating established laws and ignoring social hierarchy. At the same time, it represents the one who interrupts during a parliamentary meeting in an attempt to impose his or her own discourse upon others. The practice of filibustering, then, seeks to undermine existent boundaries whether they indicate geographical, governmental or metaphorical spheres. In other

words, it symbolizes certain resistance to fixed borders. From this perspective, Rafael rightfully assumes that Rizal's understanding of the filibuster is "an intruder, breaking and entering into where she or he does not properly belong, doing so by surprise and often in disguise" (2005, 41).

When we look at the specific context of the Philippines, the filibuster appears to be the one capable of frustrating the Spanish colonial system. According to Rafael, the same figure "also insinuates its way to the top of the colonial hierarchy, inserting itself where it does not belong and causing authority to act in ways that go against its interests" (2005, 42). In this sense, we can perhaps view the "filibustero" alongside the earlier "indio bravo." As we saw in the Noli, Rizal's "indio" participates in the act of resistance as he or she skillfully translates the dominant friar's sermon in order to pronounce an original narrative. The "filibuster," on the other hand, attempts to undermine fixed boundaries and disturb the established, colonial order by changing his or her appearance. Although the logic of "indio bravo" and "filibustero" may seem different (e.g. the former is an object of conquest, while the latter represents an object of law), what I want to highlight here is their shared ability to problematize the imperial project by secretly entering into the colonizer's discourse. Both figures represent Rizal's symbols of anti-colonial resistance, and in different ways their identities are constructed and idealized through the image of the United States.

In El Filibusterismo, the image of "filibustero" first emerges as a ghostly wizard that comes to cast a spell on the novel as well as the entire Filipino nation. Rizal opens the text with an epigraph credited to his Austrian friend Ferdinand Blumentritt:

Facilmente se puede suponer que un filibustero ha hechizado en secreto á la liga de los fraileros y retrógrados para que, siguiendo inconscientes sus inspiraciones, favorezcan y fomenten aquella política que sólo ambiciona un fin: extender las ideas del filibusterismo

por todo el país y convencer al último filipino de que no existe otra salvación fuera de la separación de la Madre-Patria (VII).¹¹²

Written as an explicit denunciation of the Spanish colonial system in the Philippines, the novel intends to spread the author's patriotic ideologies. Here, the key to this nationalist project seems to reside in the idea of "spell." The filibuster's function is to "bewitch" ("hechizar") the friars and reactionaries so that they "unconsciously" ("inconscientes") follow his or her revolutionary inspirations and disseminate the notion of emancipation in the country. The filibuster is capable of using certain magical force to penetrate into and manipulate other people's minds, controlling their consciousness in order to accomplish his or her own goal. Moreover, all of this takes place in secret so that no one realizes when or how the magic is exercised. Under the unidentifiable spell of the mysterious filibuster, one is unable to act on his or her own mind.

Is the "filibustero" a villain or a hero? A monster that devours one's life or a soldier who kills the enemy? Rizal's answer to these questions remains ambivalent. In the novel's preface which follows the above epigraph in the original manuscript, entitled "Al Pueblo Filipino y su Gobierno," he writes that "[t]antas veces se nos ha amedrentado con el fantasma del *Filibusterismo* que, de mero recurso de aya, ha llegado a ser un ente positivo y real, cuyo solo nombre (al quitarnos la serenidad) nos hace cometer los mayores desaciertos" (Appendix, 1). While he depicts Filipino filibusterism as "positive" and "real," its "phantom" has continuously haunted the nation by not only removing people's "serenity" but also leading them to commit "the biggest mistakes." How can it be "positive" and at the same time produce "the biggest mistakes"? The ambivalent nature of Rizal's "filibustero" lies here—invisible to one's eyes and

¹¹² In this essay, I use the edition of the Instituto Histórico Nacional (Manila, 1996). Unless otherwise noted, all the citations are from this edition.

capable of constantly transforming his or her characteristic like a chameleon. In other words, the filibuster can be either positive or negative, a hero or a villain, depending on circumstances.

The most representative figure of “filibustero” in the Fili is the central character Simoun, a mysterious and wealthy jeweler, who comes to the Philippines from an unidentified place. With his abundant wealth and power, he quickly makes acquaintance with the Philippines’ ruling class (for example, he becomes an adviser to the Spanish Governor-General), helping them achieve their political and economic ends. However, the novel soon reveals that his ultimate purpose is to destroy the colonial authorities. Through his wealth and political influence, Simoun spreads corruption in the government and incites the country’s moral degradation so that the Filipino people become desperate and determined to organize a violent uprising against the corrupt system. In a sense, he seeks to regenerate the society through subversion and what we might now call a terrorist attack. Moreover, there is an important link between Simoun and Rizal’s previous novel. Upon reading the first few pages, the reader discovers that Simoun is in fact the other protagonist Juan Crisóstomo Ibarra from the Noli who is thought to be killed by the Spaniards. It turns out that Ibarra has escaped from the Philippines after his unsuccessful attempt to overthrow the colonial regime. He has acquired wealth, gained fame among the officials, and returned to his homeland with a new identity in order to accomplish his two goals: to rescue his lover María Clara and to instigate a violent revolution. In the end, however, his vengeance fails to achieve its objectives. María dies in the convent, while Simoun’s uprising ends up being a complete fiasco. Dejected and frustrated by the failure, Simoun ultimately commits suicide before the authorities come to arrest him.

Several aspects of the protagonist are worth mentioning. First, his image as a filibuster clandestinely attempting to destroy the colonial society is defined in terms of his ability to

disguise himself. After thirteen years, Ibarra returns to the Philippines as Simoun, and his mysterious identity is not easily captured or perceived by other people. For example, the narrator describes Simoun's multifarious features. The man is "indio inglés, portugués, americano, mulato, el Cardenal Moreno, la Eminencia Negra, el espíritu malo del Capitán General como le llamaban muchos, no era otro que el misterioso desconocido cuya aparición y desaparición coinciden con la muerte del heredero de aquellos terrenos" (44). He literally possesses numerous faces, and his unexpected appearance and disappearance symbolizes a double identity that entails both the dead (Ibarra) and the living (Simoun). Furthermore, his disguise is also shown through his unusual glasses: "Para evitar la luz del sol usaba constantemente enormes anteojos azules de rejilla, que ocultaban por completo sus ojos y parte de sus mejillas, dándole un aspecto de ciego ó enfermo de la vista" (6). These enormous glasses that "completely cover his eyes" allow him to not only avoid the sunlight but also conceal his true identity. More importantly, however, they give him the power to "see" the other person without being "seen" by him or her, to penetrate into the other's mind without being recognized. The look of "a blind man" or "one of defective eyesight" is then a deliberate camouflage. As an ominous "filibustero," Simoun vigilantly seeks a chance to accomplish his revenge without anyone noticing it. By means of his wealth and power, he incites greed and promotes corruption among the colonizers who are totally unaware of such project. In one of his dialogues with Basilio, a native Filipino medical student, Simoun reveals his real identity and the purpose of his return. He proclaims that "Ahora he vuelto para destruir ese sistema, precipitar su corrupción, empujarle al abismo á que corre insensato, aun cuando tuviese que emplear oleadas de lágrimas y sangre..." (46). Similar to the defiant pirate unwilling to follow the social norms, Simoun disobeys the rules created by Spanish colonialism and instead seeks to construct his own law and

order: “Yo soy el Juez que quiero castigar á un sistema valiéndome de sus propios crímenes, hacerle la guerra halagándole” (49). The image of “filibustero” gives him the authority to resist the colonial structure and to recuperate the idea of a new Filipino nation.

Another notable aspect of Simoun is his peculiar link to the United States. He is described as a fourth-generation Filipino who has spent some time in the U.S. Similar to the figure of “indio bravo,” Rizal’s resistant “filibustero” is defined through his connection with the U.S. modern empire. To some extent, Simoun’s anti-colonial vision and his project of nation building stem from his American identity. In the opening scene of the novel, Ben Zayb, a Spanish journalist, describes his idea as “yankee” (6), and toward the end Zayb once again relates him to the term “yankee” (242). The truth is that the Filipino filibuster lived in the U.S. for a long time before returning to his country: “El joyero había estado mucho tiempo en la América del Norte” (6). While residing in North America, Simoun seems to have witnessed the reality of what he calls “political deceptions.” In one of the scenes, he criticizes the United States because “allí está el Norte con su libertad egoista, su ley de Lynch, sus engaños políticos” (250).

Despite this critical view of U.S. society, which reminds us of Rizal’s earlier description in his travel diaries, what is ironic is that Simoun commits a similar kind of “deception” against the Filipino masses. And this is the limitation of his national project based on filibusterism, which seems to highlight the personal rather than the collective. In the beginning of the novel, he appears to exploit native Filipinos by stealing their money (8). Later on he skillfully manipulates the bandit known as Cablesang Tales and the group of thieves in order to advance his own revolutionary project, making them organize murders and crimes in the country. Does the reality of “engaños políticos” in the U.S. somehow shape Simoun’s anarchist thought and action?

Does he practice the same “libertad egoista” by using the Filipino masses for his personal revenge? What is clear is that Simoun, the “yankee” filibuster, seeks to appropriate every means to accomplish his goals, including the imperial power of the United States.¹¹³ Though some U.S. elements help him to become an anti-colonial “filibustero,” he may also incorporate the negative aspect of the emerging empire.

In addition to the potential influence of the United States, Simoun also maintains connections with South America. That is to say, his mysterious disguise reveals an “American” identity in a hemispheric sense (Lifshey 1439-1440). The result is, as Blanco notes, that the novel makes the reader “examine the colonial question in the Philippines through the lens of the Americas” (2004, 100). In the *Fili*, the reader finds Simoun using a strange accent, “un acento raro, mezcla de inglés y americano del Sur” (5). Other characters refer to him as “un mulato americano” or simply “Americano” (8). Another important Latin American factor is his close relationship with the Caribbean. The novel demonstrates that the source of his wealth and political influence is found in Cuba because the Spanish Governor-General first meets him in Havana before bringing him to the Philippines (8). The narrator recounts that Simoun “tomó parte en la guerra de Cuba, ayudando ya á un partido ya á otro, pero ganando siempre” (281). The fact that his plan to provoke a Filipino revolution begins in José Martí’s Cuba is noteworthy. In my view, this setting insinuates the author’s idea that the origin of the Filipino struggle against the colonial regime is in neither Europe nor nearby Asia, but rather in the remote Caribbean island. This is where the reformist Ibarra is transformed into the ominous anarchist Simoun. More specifically, it is during the Cuban war of independence when Simoun secretly prepares his

¹¹³ Adam Lifshey studies the U.S. influence not only in Simoun but also in another character of the novel, Mr. Leeds. See his recent article “The Literary Alterities of Philippine Nationalism in José Rizal’s *El filibusterismo*” (2008).

agenda for a future insurrection. In other words, Cuba provides a significant ground which somehow gives birth to Filipino nationalism in the novel. Does Rizal find some inspiration for his country's uprising in the Caribbean? Today, we can only speculate what might have been in the author's mind when he wrote the Fili since he did not talk about the issue in detail. However, recent study has shown that Rizal was indeed interested in studying the Cuban war of independence, which he thought could provide a model for his own people's struggle in the Philippines (Quibuyen 52).¹¹⁴

Furthermore, when discussing Simoun's possible links to Latin America, his name immediately reminds us of the *Libertador*, Simón Bolívar. The two figures similarly attempt to liberate their countries from the chains of Spanish colonialism, albeit in different ways.¹¹⁵ Nick Joaquín establishes a parallel between Rizal's idea of revolution and the history of independence movements in various Latin American countries. According to him,

Rizal also knew that Spain was overthrown in America by the various uprisings of the Creole there (Bolívar, San Martín, Iturbide). [...] During Rizal's youth, it looked as if what had happened in America would happen in the Philippines: the Creoles were restive, were rising, were apparently headed for an open clash with the Peninsula. 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 (1977, 67-68).

For Rizal (and for Simoun), Latin America's Creole legacy may have presented an example for the Filipino revolution. However, while Bolívar was successfully able to achieve Latin American independence, Rizal and Simoun ultimately fail to realize their promised goals. What occurs historically in Latin America does not take place in either the Fili or the Philippines at the

¹¹⁴ Toward the end of his life, Rizal had a chance to serve as a military doctor in Cuba in order to avoid his death sentence. According to his contemporary and friend Pio Valenzuela, Rizal "said that his intention in applying for the post of military doctor was to study the war in a practical way; go through the Cuban soldiery if he thought he would find there solutions which would remedy the bad situation in the Philippines" (qtd. in Quibuyen 52). However, the opportunity was turned down by the Spanish colonial authority, which led to Rizal's eventual death in 1895.

¹¹⁵ For a critical analysis of the relationship between Simoun and Bolívar, see Blanco (2004).

turn of the century. In the novel, Simoun's rebellion is doomed to fail because he does not realize the impossibility of integrating Latin America's model into a country where there is no substantial ground for the Creole population.¹¹⁶ In other words, his national project does not depend on the local people, the Filipino "indios," but rather on the nonexistent Creole class. Joaquín rightfully asks, "Why should the hero of the Great Filipino Novel be, not an Indio Filipino, but a Spanish 'Filipino,' with the quotes expressing our misgivings?" (1977: 66). This is probably the most contradictory aspect of Simoun: while acknowledging the importance of the native population, he nevertheless concludes that Filipino nationhood is founded only in the hands of Creoles.

Based on this analysis, we realize how Simoun occupies a profoundly ambivalent position within Rizal's anti-imperial ideology. As a resistant "filibustero" striving to disturb the colonial system through his "American" identity, Simoun at first appears to be a positive figure (like the "indio bravo"). However, he also manifests some negative characteristics in the novel, shown by his willingness to use violence as a means of regenerating the society, his exploitation of native Filipinos, and his proposal for a revolution led by nonexistent Creoles. With his mysterious disguise, then, Simoun represents an image that Rizal at once desires and fears. What is more, these conflicting aspects of Simoun's character also reflect Rizal's own enigma in terms of the possibility of insurrection in the Philippines. On the one hand, as I discussed in chapter 2, Rizal claims the necessity of an immediate revolution in "Filipinas dentro de cien años." On the other hand, it is well-known that he refuses to join the radical independence movement organized by Bonifacio's Katipunan in 1896. Hence, Simoun is like Rizal's ghost, symbolizing a potential

¹¹⁶ As Joaquín highlights, "A Creole class in the pure sense of the term never existed in the Philippines. The Spanish didn't come here in such numbers as to establish a large enough community that could intermarry within itself and keep the blood pure" (1977, 66).

force of anti-imperial resistance and simultaneously insinuating the impossibility of such a revolutionary project.

4.4 MARTÍ'S EMERSON AND THE IDEA OF NATURE

So far I have examined the ways in which Rizal incorporates the United States as well as the larger context of “America” into his articulation of resistant force against the Spanish empire. As I discussed, the U.S. influence plays an important role in Rizal’s conceptualization of “indios bravos” and “filibustero,” but such influence seems to function only within the impossible task of Creolization in the Philippines. After studying the relationship between Rizal and the U.S., I now turn to Martí’s perception of the “North” from a Latin American perspective. Compared to Rizal, Martí is able to gain a more thorough knowledge of what he calls “the monster” because of his longer stay in the country. Moreover, while the former is primarily concerned with the Philippines’ freedom from Spain, the latter is placed in a more complex situation, one that requires him to tackle the question of Cuban independence as well as the defense of Latin America against imminent U.S. imperialism. Consequently, many of Martí’s writings deal not only with the specific project of the Caribbean island but also with the broader politics of the continent. In order to examine Martí’s understanding of the United States and its relation to Latin America, my next sections analyze his chronicles that are written during his stay in New York, commonly known as Escenas norteamericanas (1880-1895). What concerns me in particular is Martí’s notion of “nature” in three seemingly unrelated articles: “Emerson” (1882),

“El terremoto de Charleston” (1886) and “Nuestra América” (1891).¹¹⁷ Partly indebted to the positivist ideology of his time, Martí emphasizes the symbol of nature in an attempt to define Latin American subjectivity *vis-à-vis* the U.S. empire.¹¹⁸ By reading these chronicles together, one of my goals is to demonstrate how Martí’s invocation of the Latin American “hombre natural,” which I understand as a figure resembling Rizal’s “filibustero,” comes to symbolize a certain force of anti-imperial resistance.

Susana Rotker holds that Escenas norteamericanas can be divided into two distinct stages (96-97). These shifts are due to the diverse ways in which the exiled Cuban writer perceives the modern lifestyle in the metropolitan city, on the one hand, and the country’s growing interests in the colonization of Latin America, on the other. According to Rotker, the first phase extends from 1881 to 1884 and includes such texts as “Coney Island” (1881), “Emerson” (1882), “Prólogo al Poema del Niágara de Pérez Bonalde” (1882), and “El puente de Brooklyn Bridge” (1883). One of the most distinguished characteristics of these pieces is the author’s attempt to articulate a universal harmony capable of reconciling oppositions. Martí’s initial experience of culture shock and homesickness turns the practice of writing into a particular discursive tool to bring together the material and the spiritual, the scientific and the aesthetic, and the modern and the traditional.

¹¹⁷ In this essay, I employ the term “nature” to indicate the natural world or environment that is not created by humans. My definition involves both objects (plants, animals, landscape, etc.) and phenomena (snow, flood, earthquakes, etc.) The assumption is that in Martí there is an ontological premise of the world, the premise that highlights the existence of an alternative reality independent from the human experience.

¹¹⁸ Sylvia Molloy shows that Martí, like other writers from nineteenth-century Latin America, is influenced by two European discourses of the period, namely decadentism and positivism (191-92). However, Martí’s perception of nature distinguishes itself from that of his contemporaries in a significant way. Unlike such figures as Domingo F. Sarmiento and Juan Bautista Alberdi, he does not perceive the natural world as an empty, barbarous space ready to be integrated into civilization. Rather, he finds in nature a dynamic force of creation as well as destruction which can be used to describe the essence of Latin American identity.

The second period, ranging from 1884 to 1892, can be defined by Martí's critical view of the U.S. government whose ambition to exploit Latin American countries is already revealed a few decades earlier in the wake of the Mexican-American War (1846-1848). Some representative chronicles from this period are "Congreso Internacional Americano de Washington" (1889), "Madre América" (1889), "Nuestra América" (1891), and "Conferencia Monetaria de las Repúblicas de América" (1891). Different from his earlier works, these essays are more overtly anti-imperial in nature and scathing about the threat of rising U.S. expansionism. After 1892, the year when Martí and other Cuban revolutionaries establish El Partido Revolucionario Cubano, he stops writing chronicles and devotes all his time for preparing the last rebellion against the Spanish colonial authority, which leads to his 1895 arrival in the native land.

As Rotker reminds us, one of Martí's most important chronicles from the first period is his essay on the American scholar, Ralph Waldo Emerson (1803-1882). Martí's discovery of Emerson's writings in the early 1880s marks a critical moment in the progress of his political and aesthetic thought. Anne Fountain claims that "the American philosopher's impact is the single most significant example of the way in which literature and literary figures imparted a positive reading of the United States in Martí" (27). In fact, Emerson's image appears recurrently in Martí's work. In addition to Martí's essay whose title contains the name of the American intellectual himself, he alludes to Emerson in numerous occasions since the early 1880s. The Cuban writer's affinity with him can be described on two levels. First, Martí is inspired by the Emersonian image of the universe as a web of analogies and a place in which the material world is intertwined with the spiritual realm. In the era of early modernization, Martí regards analogy's role as a potential counter-force to the mechanic and divisive force of modernity, and he

discovers a similar insight in Emerson. Second, he shares his anti-imperial view with the American intellectual who also seeks to develop a literature that would work against the system of capitalist industrialization in late-nineteenth-century U.S. society. Emerson's influence on Martí is thus unquestionable.¹¹⁹ The latter depicts the former as “el más grande de los poetas de América” and celebrates his capacity to perceive the material world in terms of the spirit, the capacity to see beyond the contradictions found in the modern space: “¿Y por qué no ha de ser todo el mundo como Emerson, que escribió en un lugar: *the world is mind precipitated*, y en otro, —como para probar que no veía contradicción entre que el mundo fuese espíritu, y el espíritu tomase formas graduadas crecientes” (O.C.: vol. 21, 408). Another example of Martí's admiration for Emerson is shown in one of his undated fragments. Upon contemplating the “supreme moments” (“momentos supremos”) of his life, Martí recognizes “The evening of Emerson” (“La tarde de Emerson”) as one of those extraordinary moments: since the two never actually met in person, Martí probably referred to the time when he read the American philosopher's texts for the first time (O.C.: vol. 18, 288).¹²⁰

Critics in both American and Latin American Studies have identified some ideological as well as stylistic similarities between these two figures. In fact, one scholar points out that this comparison “has recently entered the mainstream of American literary history along with a transnational turn in American studies” (Lomas 4). According to Esther Schuler, the Cuban writer assimilates the American poet “hasta que resulta difícil establecer donde acaba lo de

¹¹⁹ Laura Lomas goes so far as to suggest that Martí draws his fundamental concept of “Our America” from Emerson's late essay “Fate” written in 1860. She supports her argument with Emerson's following words: “Our America has a bad name for superficialness. Great men, great nations, have not been boasters and buffoons, but perceivers of the terror of life, and have manned themselves to face it” (qtd. in Lomas, 16).

¹²⁰ José Ballón calls this moment “el encuentro intelectual de Martí con Emerson” (1995, 3). According to him, “se trata de un tiempo espiritualmente intenso, agudizador de la conciencia de sí, mediante el cual el propio ángulo de visión quedó encuadrado dentro de una perspectiva emersioniana. En esos instantes de construcción interior, vemos al joven cubano reajustando la armazón intelectual por la cual se instala coherentemente en el mundo” (1986, 30).

Emerson y empieza lo de Martí” (175). The parallels between Martí and Emerson are perhaps most meticulously studied by José Ballón.¹²¹ For Ballón, an area of confluence is found in their shared articulation of “la necesidad de promover una expresión cultural autónoma americana, frente a la influencia europea en el siglo XIX” (1986, 13). He argues that Martí’s interaction with Emerson is of particular importance because “[e]n su obra no encontramos un recuento similar respecto a ningún otro autor, ni en ningún otro momento, ni en la misma intensidad ni recurrencia” (1995, 8). Ballón concludes that “Martí descubre en el norteamericano una visión afín aplicable a todo el continente (sólo una convicción tal justifica cabalmente el entusiasmo de Martí por Emerson)” (1995, 23).

More recently, Oscar Montero and Laura Lomas have approached this connection from different viewpoints. For Montero, what brings Martí closer to Emerson is not a particular style of writing or rhetoric but rather “a new cosmology that might sustain his own radical project,” which is the task of producing a democratic republic in his homeland (117). According to this perspective, Martí does not view Emerson as a sage but rather as a radical thinker of the time who offers an alternative vision concerning the politics of a modern world, a vision that Martí himself seeks to cultivate as he imagines a new Cuban nation (106). The Cuban writer strategically summarizes and paraphrases the American author’s ideas in order to integrate them into his own revolutionary blue print. Whereas Montero highlights the way in which Martí transforms Emerson’s concepts for his own political agenda, Lomas maintains that the former views the latter with a critical eye in terms of his inability to recognize the particularity of Cuba and Latin America. Lomas suggests that Martí does not *really* share Emerson’s views; in fact, he is skeptical of the Emersonian worldview. She argues that “[t]he interpretation of Martí as

¹²¹ See his Autonomía cultural americana: Emerson y Martí as well as his annotated edition of Martí’s “Emerson” in Lecturas norteamericanas de José Martí: Emerson y el socialismo contemporáneo (1880-1887).

influenced above all by Emerson facilitates the misattribution of attitudes and opinions to Martí that he in fact opposed” (2). By tracing the recent criticism of Emerson’s literature which illuminates a non-resistant gesture toward U.S. expansionism and Anglocentrism, Lomas reconsiders the “identical” relationship between Martí and Emerson that many scholars have previously discussed (6). For her, Martí’s “antagonism” toward Emerson stems from the fact that the American scholar fails to acknowledge the right of Cuba and other Latin American countries to legitimately claim their political agency independently from U.S. hegemony (10).

On the one hand, Montero and Lomas’s studies appropriately point to the critical distance between Martí and Emerson. On the other hand, they also discuss different ways in which the Cuban author translates and assimilates the American scholar in order to define a particular agenda of national and continental politics. My analysis is sympathetic with Montero and Lomas’s interpretations concerning Martí’s strategic appropriation of Emerson, but I believe that such discussion can be amplified further if we read Martí’s “Emerson” together with his other chronicles. I contend that Martí’s article on the American poet marks an important point of departure for his anti-imperial thought that is determined by different images of the natural world. In other words, the most important aspect of Martí’s appropriation of Emerson for me is not “a new cosmology” (Montero) or “antagonism” (Lomas) but the representation of nature as a particular force of political resistance.

Martí publishes the essay “Emerson” on May 19, 1882, in the Venezuelan newspaper La Opinión Nacional. It is written shortly after the American philosopher’s death, and the author “celebrates” the life of an individual who has left behind him “claridad pura, y apetito de paz, y odio de ruidos” (O.C.: vol. 13, 17).¹²² Although some of Martí’s descriptions reflect the

¹²² The essay can be found in O.C., vol. 13, 17-30. For the subsequent citations from this article, I will only indicate

customary praises that appear in the major U.S. newspapers and journals of the time, his essay also offers an original perspective. Throughout the article, Martí quotes, paraphrases, and interprets Emerson's writings for the Spanish-speaking readership. The first part of the essay discusses the figure of Emerson: his reputation in the U.S., his cultural background, his writing style, and his philosophy of life and death. The second section focuses on his ideas on nature and mentions his major works. Finally, the last section draws directly from Emerson's texts and highlights the relationship between humans and nature and between the natural phenomena and the spiritual realm, concluding with a tribute that declares "¡Anciano maravilloso, a tus pies de todo mi haz de palmas frescas y mi espada de plata!" (30).

Martí's article alludes to some of Emerson's texts, including "The Over-Soul," "Montaigne; or, the Skeptic," "Self-Reliance," and "Wealth" (Fountain 46). According to the Cuban's assessment, Emerson's most important writing is "Nature" written in 1836. Martí considers it "su mejor libro" (23) and makes a total of twenty three references in his article. Some of the sentences in "Emerson" are in fact almost exactly parallel to the lines in "Nature." Quoting Emerson's words, Martí writes that "la vida no es más que 'una estación en la naturaleza'" (24). The images of different natural objects and phenomena appear throughout the essay, and this abundance makes the reader wonder if the article is as much about the American poet as, perhaps more importantly, about nature. Martí is not only interested in depicting Emerson's life and philosophy, but also in illustrating the significance of the natural world.

For instance, in the first few pages of the chronicle, the portrait of Emerson is filled with symbols of the landscape and wild life: his figure is characterized as "águila joven, pino joven," his body "alto y endeble, como esos árboles cuya copa mecén aires puros," his nose "como la de

las aves que vuelan por cumbres,” and his forehead “ladera de montaña” (18). The images of “eagle,” “pine,” “trees,” “birds,” and “mountain slope” amount to the natural elements in Emerson to whom the author designates the title “mountain man” (“hombre montañoso”) (18). But the purpose of illuminating his cliff-like brow and aquiline nose does not simply indicate an attempt to define the American scholar in terms of nature. It is not any type of plant or animal that constitutes Martí’s Emerson: “[n]o fue cual bambú hojoso, cuyo ramaje corpulento, mal sustentado por el tallo hueco, viene a tierra; sino como baobab, o sabino, o samán grande, cuya copa robusta se yergue en tronco fuerte” (29). Instead of the leafy bamboo tree, Martí chooses specific plants—“baobab,” “red cedar,” and “saman”—that are known for their firm trunk. Martí characterizes Emerson as an embodiment of strength (“tronco fuerte”) and robustness (“copa robusta”). Here, the description of Emerson’s body can also be understood as an acknowledgement of nature’s vitality and energy. Besides celebrating the American scholar’s grandeur, the above passage recognizes the powerful feature of the environment through the symbol of “tronco fuerte.”

Martí further defines Emerson as an “observer” of nature rather than a “mediator” between the natural world and the human experience: “Era veedor sutil, que veía cómo el aire delicado se transformaba en palabras melodiosas y sabias en la garganta de los hombres, y escribía como veedor, y no como meditador” (22). To describe the transformation of “delicate air” into “wise, melodious words” is a complex task that requires three abilities: perceiving the imperceptible, speaking the unspeakable, and seeing the invisible. Here, the notion of “seeing” or “gaze” is of particular importance. Emerson’s eyes are depicted as “ojos cautivadores, como de aquel que está lleno de amor, y tranquilos, como de aquel que ha visto lo que no se ve” (18), and the essay “Nature” exemplifies the idea of “viendo lo invisible” (20). For Martí, Emerson’s

“gaze” enables the enunciation of the invisible, moral energy of nature: “Hay carácter moral en todos los elementos de la naturaleza” (25). Through the “gaze” that is capable of penetrating into the imperceptible sphere of the world, Martí seeks to articulate the value of the natural objects and to reveal Emerson’s association with them.

One of the most notable aspects of Martí’s chronicle is thus the attempt to contemplate the relationship between the American scholar and the natural world. He claims that a central aspect of Emerson’s life resides in how “vivió faz y faz con la naturaleza” (18) and “[s]e sumergió en la naturaleza, y surgió de ella radiante” (20). The author then brings this connection further and discusses the link between humans and nature in general. An individual would not be “complete,” Martí argues, without his or her “intimate relationship” to the natural sphere: “Y el hombre no se halla completo, ni se revela a sí mismo, ni ve lo invisible, sino en su íntima relación con la naturaleza” (26). Nature is an essential component of human life both in terms of exposing oneself and deciphering the invisible signs of the world. It appears to be a romanticized entity that produces virtue in people’s mind since “[l]a naturaleza inspira, cura, consuela, fortalece y prepara para la virtud al hombre” (25-26). What Martí discovers through Emerson is the meaning of an “intimate relationship” between individuals and their environment, especially as it evokes the ideas of human virtue and morality.

The critical tool that allows Martí to study this inseparable link is analogy. For Martí (and for Emerson), analogy functions to counter the perception of the material world as a realm of contradictions and to explain the way in which objects in the universe exist harmoniously without causing conflicts.¹²³ According to him,

¹²³ The comparison between Martí and Emerson in terms of their shared analogical impulse is discussed by Ivan Schulman (1960: 35-36, 52-64).

El [Emerson] no ve más que analogías: él no halla contradicciones en la naturaleza: él ve que todo en ella es símbolo del hombre, y todo lo que hay en el hombre lo hay en ella. El ve que la naturaleza influye en el hombre, y que éste hace a la naturaleza alegre, o triste, o elocuente, o muda, o ausente, o presente, a su capricho (23).

Martí proclaims that Emerson does not perceive contradiction because nature does not contain it. He then concludes that “[l]as contradicciones no están en la naturaleza, sino en que los hombres que no saben descubrir sus analogías” (29). The contradictions only exist when one fails to perceive analogies in the natural world. Humans and nature influence each other in such a way that they constantly create a symbolic unity. Through analogy, Martí seeks to transcend what at first sight seems to be opposing terms. This perspective leads him to analyze the world in terms of dialectical relationships (human/nature, material/spirit, politics/aesthetics, our/their etc.). The essay insists on underscoring unity and harmony through the formation of analogy.¹²⁴ From his interpretation and translation of Emerson, Martí recognizes the significance of the natural environment and its positive impact on human existence itself.

4.5 NATURE’S VIOLENCE IN “EL TERREMOTO DE CHARLESTON”

In a way, Martí’s chronicle about Emerson can be read as a starting point for his conceptualization of “nature,” because natural symbols begin to appear more frequently in

¹²⁴ Analogy is indeed an important concept in Martí, especially as it reveals a *political* significance when he conceptualizes “our” America in opposition to “their” America. He states that “Todo es análogo en la tierra, y cada orden existente tiene relación con otro orden. La armonía fue la ley del nacimiento, y será perpetuamente la bella y lógica ley de relación. Todo va a la par, y todo es semejante” (O.C.: vol. 14, 20) Schulman argues that “[l]a analogía como fundamento de la imagen es quizá el principio más significativo y más constantemente enunciado por Martí en su teoría del simbolismo” (1960: 34). For Julio Ramos, Martí’s analogical proceeding represents a powerful enunciation of universal harmony, on the one hand, and a figurative process against the divisive force of modernity, on the other (163-164).

Escenas norteamericanas after this article (Fountain 19-20).¹²⁵ Nonetheless, the way he approaches those images in his other essays differs from his initial descriptions. For example, while his perception of nature in “Emerson” is highly optimistic, idyllic, moralistic and romanticized, such views change in a crucial way when he authors “El terremoto de Charleston” in 1886. His illustration of nature’s invisible characteristic and its connection to human activity remains the same, but now Martí turns to a more destructive force of the environment: earthquake. The chronicle is published in the Argentinean periodical La Nación and recounts the story of an earthquake that shakes Charleston, South Carolina, in August, 1886. The article vividly describes the horror of the calamity that destroys the city in a mere instant: “Un terremoto ha destrozado la ciudad de Charleston. Ruina es hoy lo que ayer era flor” (O.C.: vol. 11, 65).¹²⁶ Unlike the U.S. newspapers of the time that simply present facts about the catastrophe, Martí’s text offers an original narrative that highlights the unbridled characteristic of nature and discusses how the material objects created by a civilization appears to be defenseless at the moment of a natural disaster (Rotker, 97-99).

Martí informs the reader that the earthquake occurs at night and causes 60 deaths in total, leaving the other 50 thousand people in the city forced to live on streets and in tents and hovels covered with their own clothes (66). The author gives a detailed account of what may have happened during the time of the quake as if he had actually been there to witness the incident (a characteristic of his writing style). He describes how the floors are shaking, the walls are being torn apart, the houses are swinging from one direction to another, the dust from the fallen buildings rises higher than trees or roofs, and fires are breaking out everywhere in the area (67).

¹²⁵ Some of the chronicles that directly deal with the representation of nature are “Nueva York bajo la nieve” (1888) and “Johnstown” (1889).

¹²⁶ The article can be found in O.C., vol. 11, 65-76. For the subsequent citations from this article, I will only indicate the page number.

Moreover, people's movements are carefully depicted as well: despaired parents are quickly returning to their house to look for their children; a young, beautiful mother is moving aside the ruins in search of something; brothers and husbands are carrying fainted women in their arms; an unfortunate man who falls down from a window is crying out loud with his arms and legs broken; and an elderly lady is crushed by the earthquake while the other person is killed by fear and in a spasm of agony (67-68). Despite different circumstances in which everyone finds themselves, what they share in common is the feeling of incommunicable anxiety. Tremors occur continuously without any warning, putting the survivors under extreme tension and uneasiness throughout the night.

When the sun rises, the consequence of the disaster becomes painfully visible to the author's eyes. Nature has bared its fangs on humans. As Martí writes,

Con el claror del día se fueron viendo los cadáveres tendidos en las calles, los montones de escombros, las paredes deshechas en polvo, los pórticos rebanados como a cercén, las rejas y los postes de hierro combados y retorcidos, las casas caídas en pliegues sobre sus cimientos, y las torres volcadas, y la espira más alta prendida sólo a su iglesia por un leve hilo de hierro (69).

The scene illustrates nature's capacity to ruin human civilization, which is symbolized by the image of "iron." Rotker suggests that "[i]n his text about the Charleston earthquake it is Nature—in this case the catastrophe—that literally unearths the roots of human existence and the truth about each man" (97). It is notable that the Emersonian vision of the idyllic, amiable nature that we examined earlier has disappeared completely in this picture. Rather, Martí illuminates a violent phenomenon caused by nature's uncontrollable force. Whereas "Emerson" states that "se siente el hombre un tanto creador de la naturaleza" (21), "El terremoto de Charleston" reveals that a human being is powerless in the face of a catastrophe, no more than "una de esas burbujas resplandecientes que danzan a tumbos ciegos en un rayo de sol" (66). The natural world appears

to be something unattainable and impossible to manage. What intrigues Martí is no longer the absence of contradictions in nature, as perceived by Emerson, but the uncontrollable violence that it manifests in an unexpected way.

If we compare the different views presented by these two chronicles, we begin to see how Martí understands nature as something he desires and fears at once, one that embodies both the harmonious and the destructive. This binary vision makes him move away from Emerson's unitary philosophy of nature. The separation can be explained in part by their different political positions. Martí's central concern lies in the protection of Latin America from the threat of the modern empire, while Emerson's stance facing U.S. imperialism is more ambivalent, as Lomas's study demonstrates. Put differently, the Cuban seeks to reach a different conclusion than the American, attempting to produce an original account of the natural world that is more suitable for his own cultural context. Through the analogical impulse between nature's serenity ("Emerson") and violence ("El terremoto de Charleston"), Martí develops a new symbol within the framework of Latin America. What is at the core of Martí's politics is not Emerson's universal nature but a Latin American nature. In order to understand his image of Latin America's natural landscape, the next section will examine one of his most frequently cited texts, "Nuestra América," published in 1891. After writing "Emerson" and "El terremoto de Charleston," the Cuban revolutionary further attempts to articulate the symbol of nature. This time, however, he discovers a form of resistance in the natural world, one that converts the landscape of "Our America" into a critical tool to challenge the menacing U.S. imperial project. The result is the emergence of an alternative discourse in which the natural is fused with the political in the process of governing Latin American republics. As Martí claims in "Nuestra

América,” the fundamental task is to recuperate “natural elements” of each country: “El gobierno no es más que el equilibrio de los elementos naturales del país” (O.C.: vol. 6, 17).¹²⁷

4.6 THE CREATION OF THE “HOMBRE NATURAL” IN “NUESTRA AMÉRICA”

Critics have interpreted the essay in many different ways. While José David Saldívar suggests that the text’s major contribution is the author’s “critique of imperial governing and his artistic repositioning of what he called the consolidation of the arts of ‘buen gobierno’” (147), Paul Giles insists that “Martí’s most pressing concern seems to be not so much imperialism, but globalization and displacement” (187). Julio Ramos, for his part, interprets Martí’s discourse as a manifestation of what he calls Latin American culturalism, which is related to the formation of “cierto latinoamericanismo culturalista que prolifera, en parte, a raíz del 98, como respuesta al impulso expansivo del imperialismo norteamericano” (205). According to Ramos, Martí’s article presents several binaries that are inherent in his discourse of Latin American particularity: “‘Nuestra América’ asume y *reescribe* las figuras, los dispositivos de representación de aquella retórica: civilización/barbarie, ciudad/campo, modernidad/tradición” (234). With his emphasis on the cultural politics of “our” America, Martí offers one of the first and most succinct expressions of the *idea* of Latin America—a “we”—in opposition to that of the U.S. empire—a “they”—thereby constructing the authority for an inclusive continental subjectivity.¹²⁸ In

¹²⁷ The article can be found in O.C., vol. 6, 22 15-23. For the following citations, I will only indicate the page number.

¹²⁸ Here I am indebted to Homi Bhabha’s idea that “the question of representation of difference is therefore always also a question of authority” (89), although I invoke it in a different register. While Bhabha discusses a kind of authoritarianism (the maintenance colonial difference), I employ the idea in the context of anti-colonialism (the *declaration* of a colonized difference).

Martí's vision, Latin America is determined not by itself but in relation to the United States. That is to say, his anti-imperial discourse depends on the premise that the essence of Latin American being is not *fixed* but rather *relational*.

For me, the principal theme of "Nuestra América" lies in the way in which Martí conceptualizes Latin America in terms of its relation to nature. Generally speaking, the article is suffused with the rhetoric of the natural or the organic. The author proclaims that "[v]iene el hombre natural, indignado y fuerte, y derriba la justicia acumulada de los libros" (18) and that "las formas de gobierno de un país han de acomodarse a sus elementos naturales" (20).¹²⁹ Jeffrey Belnap points out that in the essay, Martí emphasizes the opposition between two major social factors: the "artificial" intelligentsia and the "natural" nationalism represented by the figure of a native mestizo (199). While Belnap sees the function of nature in the construction of a national and continental mestizaje, I propose to study Martí's use of Latin American nature as a symbol of his anti-imperial gesture. What I am interested in analyzing are the possibilities and the limits of Martí's political program which depends on a Latin American subject determined by "ese ferviente espíritu de la naturaleza" (O.C.: vol. 8, 336).

The article makes it clear that a key to self-defense against the threat of U.S. expansionism is hidden in Our America's ability to manifest the spirit of nature. Martí declares that Latin American people must not be a "people of leaves" ("pueblo de hojas") who spend their lives floating in the air without actively creating history (15). Then he defines the natural world as a particular space which is forbidden to the enemy: "¡los árboles se han de poner en fila para que no pase el gigante de las siete leguas!" (15). Here, the colonized "trees" are capable of

¹²⁹ A similar idea can be seen in his other chronicle, "La verdad sobre los Estados Unidos" (1894), which states that "las ideas, como los árboles, han de venir de larga raíz, y ser de suelo afín, para que prendan y prosperen" (O.C.: vol. 28, 293).

forming proto-military barricades in order to prevent the U.S. empire, portrayed as “the seven-league giant,” from penetrating into the rest of the continent.¹³⁰ This anti-imperial struggle is a collective one and represents a local characteristic because “hemos de andar en cuadro apretado, como la plata en las raíces de los Andes” (15). With the image of “the roots of the Andes,” the author highlights the particular scenery of the Latin American land that is capable of producing a resistant force to avoid foreign invasion.

Moreover, Martí pays particular attention to the figure of “el hombre natural,” who serves as the principal agent for the creation of a resistant Latin America because he has overcome both “el libro importado” and “los letrados artificiales” (17).¹³¹ Rather than imitating the foreign models taken from “the imported books” or continuing the prolonged tradition of colonial mimesis, Martí’s “natural man” attempts to define the basis of Latin American identity through its original components. His fundamental task is the reclamation of “los elementos naturales” (18). For example, he plays an active role in reforming the university curriculum based on the principles dictated by Latin America’s own historical heritage: “La universidad europea ha de ceder a la universidad americana. La historia de América, de los incas acá, ha de enseñarse al dedillo, aunque no se enseñe la de los arcontes de Grecia” (18). Learning the particular history of the continent appears to be a crucial point of departure because it reveals Latin America’s cultural specificity. Autochthonous knowledge creates a stabilizing function through its postulation of nature, and it is this knowledge that intends to frustrate the hegemonic, institutionalized discourse of U.S. imperialism.

¹³⁰ According to Cintio Vitier, “el gigante de las siete leguas” alludes to “un personaje fabuloso de cuentos para niños (como *Pulgarcito* de Charles Perrault),” which Martí uses to “simbolizar la desproporción y el peligro de los países más poderosos (cuyo desarrollo es ‘siete veces’ más rápido)” (2005: 33).

¹³¹ Though the the phrase “el hombre natural” is often translated as “the natural man,” it can also be interpreted as “the man of nature” which emphasizes the relationship between man and nature.

By refusing the European and Anglo-Saxon education that tends to deform Latin America's self-conception, "the natural man" underscores the importance of the organic elements. Martí writes, "[i]njértese en nuestras repúblicas el mundo; pero el tronco ha de ser el de nuestras repúblicas" (18). The passage demonstrates that the man provides not just a critique of foreign models but also an anti-imperial discourse similar to the one created by what Roberto Fernández Retamar later called "Calibán."¹³² The education has taught Latin America's "hombre natural" the ability to assimilate the colonizer's knowledge into his own reality, allowing him to produce an original and autochthonous image of "el tronco." The *calibanesque* man seeks to consume "el mundo," including the U.S. empire, in order to establish a solid Latin American root. From this perspective, we can also argue that Martí uses his *calibanesque* strategy to integrate Emerson into his own anti-imperial program. The Cuban revolutionary does not simply translate the American poet's perception of the natural world: he secretly devours the Emersonian vision to construct the image of the resistant, rebellious figure of the Latin American "natural man."

It is here that the comparison between Martí's "hombre natural" and Rizal's "indio bravo" and/or "filibustero" proves meaningful. In a similar manner, these figures represent symbols of resistance that can penetrate into the colonizer's mind without being recognized. Like pirates, they steal something valuable—imperial knowledge—in order to turn it against the colonizers themselves. They seek to study the other's dominant ideologies and incorporate them into their own terrain with the purpose of disturbing the imperial power. Moreover, the three

¹³² In his classical work, *Calibán: Apuntes sobre la cultura en nuestra América* (1971), Fernández Retamar employs the term "Calibán" to portray Martí as a proto-Marxist Pan-American revolutionary. His discussion points to a particular gesture of Latin America's resistance to U.S. imperialism in which the colonized subject seeks to appropriate and harness the power of his/her colonizer. The book later becomes an important manifesto for many Latin American and Caribbean writers working against European and U.S. (neo)colonial discourses. See Carlos Jáuregui's *Canibalia: Canibalismo, calibanismo, antropofagia cultural y consumo en América Latina* (2008).

characters represent disguised interlopers who insert themselves into unfamiliar places which they are not part of. With mysterious identities, they can be either heroes trying to protect the colonized or monsters seeking to devour the empire.

In the case of Martí, the Latin American “hombre natural” is identified as one of the “natural statesmen” who attempt to examine the colonial situation through a direct study of nature: “Surgen los estadistas naturales del estudio directo de la Naturaleza. Leen para aplicar, pero no para copiar” (21). They do not “copy” the foreign but “apply” it to their particular needs and expectations, similar to the way in which Rizal’s “indios” incorporate the Spanish friar’s imperial discourse into their original narrative in the *Noli*. In Martí’s view, different people who constitute the group of “natural statesmen” seek to study foreign ideas and productively integrate them into their own world. While economists analyze “la dificultad en sus orígenes [naturales],” playwrights bring “los caracteres nativos a la escena” (21). The poet intends to transform the image of “melena zorrillesca”¹³³ into the characteristic of “árbol glorioso” in Latin America (21), emphasizing the symbol of nature—in this case a “tree”—as the glorious representation of Latin American resistance.

If the *calibanesque* gesture indicates certain aggressiveness in Our America’s “natural man,” such characteristic is further intensified in the depiction of his potential violence.

According to Martí,

El hombre natural es bueno, y acata y premia la inteligencia superior, mientras ésta no se vale de su sumisión para dañarle, o le ofende prescindiendo de él, que es cosa que no perdona el hombre natural, *dispuesto a recobrar por la fuerza el respeto de quien le hiere la susceptibilidad o le perjudica el interés* (my emphasis, 17).

The man is usually “good” and respects “superior intelligence,” but he reveals a destructive feature once his pride is put in danger. He does not “forgive” the offense committed against him,

¹³³ Allusion to the romantic style of Spanish poet José Zorrilla (1817-1893).

always ready to employ force in order to recover “the respect of anyone who wounds his sensibilities and threatens his interest.” Far from creating harmonious vibrations as in the Emersonian nature, the image described in the above passage illustrates a man who possesses intense hostility toward those who attempt to exploit him, just like Rizal’s “filibustero,” Simoun, who seeks to employ violent means to destroy the corrupt government in the Philippines. Once the fierceness is provoked in this defiant “natural man,” nothing can stop or control him. It reflects the violent force of the Charleston earthquake that we examined in the previous section.

Martí’s notion of “hombre natural” embodies the driving force for his political project designed to protect “Our” America from “Their” America. However, even though this figure symbolizes strategic resistance against the U.S. empire in terms of the relationship between South and North (the dichotomy of “us” and “them”), Martí’s conceptualization of nature turns ambivalent when it comes to the interior tension that separates the governing class from the lower classes in Latin America. For him, “the natural man” is essentially associated with Our America’s organic people whom he describes as “las masas mudas de indios” (16) and “los [pueblos] incultos” (17). These people are nonetheless *not* the protagonists of future progress and development in Latin America according to Martí’s agenda. What he suggests is a creation of “nuestra América mestiza” (19) governed by “the real man”: “Estos países se salvarán porque [...] le está naciendo a América, en estos tiempos reales, el hombre real” (19-20). The true agent that represents a Latin American subject is thus not “el hombre natural” but “el hombre real,” also known as “el mestizo autóctono” (17). It is the *mestizo* who triumphantly overcomes the exotic *criollo* and builds a foundation for the notion of “nuestra” America (17). In this picture, the “mute” and “uneducated” masses remain outside the category of a privileged “nosotros”: they only form the marginalized space of “the natural,” that is, “the non-real.” Put differently,

although Martí's invocation of "the natural man" points to the *calibanesque* move toward anti-imperial resistance, his Latin American vision can more problematically be understood as a project of internal colonialism created by individuals from the elite class.

What is notable here is that for both Rizal and Martí, their ideal anti-imperial metaphors seem to break down at some point. While Rizal's Simoun fails to accomplish his revolutionary project because he exploits native Filipinos to carry out his personal vengeance, Martí's "hombre natural" is deprived of his subjectivity and turned into a "non-real" entity that is unable to constitute Latin America's racial and cultural admixture. Neither writer includes the uneducated masses as vital components of the Filipino, Cuban, and Latin American identities. In other words, the future of these countries can only be constructed by "criollos" (Rizal) or "mestizos" (Martí). Here, we can perceive the limits of nineteenth-century Latin American intellectuals in terms of their relation to the subaltern. The program of anti-imperialism is possible and indeed thinkable only within the limited circuit of what Ángel Rama has famously called "la ciudad letrada." Under the authority of letters, *los letrados* seek to define their anti-imperial politics which do not necessarily concern the marginalized people in Latin America. Rizal and Martí are not exceptions in this picture. Confronting the modern empire at the turn of the century, they attempt to employ different rhetorical tools to address discourses of protest and resistance. However, those discourses seem to be produced by magnifying the role of the educated, on the one hand, and by diminishing the importance of the multitude, on the other. In different ways, then, the two writers' texts related to the U.S. expose these contradictory dimensions of their anti-imperial ideologies.

In this chapter, I have discussed both similar and distinct ways in which Rizal and Martí integrate the United States into their respective political discourses whose essential concern lies

in the potential force of national and continental resistance. Rizal formulates the concepts of “indio bravo” and “filibustero” based on some elements that he takes from the modern empire. In Noli me tangere, Rizal’s illustration of “indios” whose robust character is shaped by the image of Native American Indians reveals the way in which the native Filipinos are capable of harnessing the Spanish friar’s discourse and opposing his imperial force. In El filibusterismo, the “yankee” Simoun emerges as a disguised anti-colonial figure who attempts to destroy the yoke of Spanish colonialism through violent means. Despite the failure of his proposed revolution, Simoun’s impossible challenge itself reflects the author’s desire and fear for the ideal construction of Filipino nationalism led by a resistant filibuster. For Martí, on the other hand, the U.S. influence is perceived most apparently in his Escenas norteamericanas. My discussion of three of his chronicles has demonstrated that there is an ideological shift in Martí’s notion of “nature”: from the harmonious relationship between humans and their environment in “Emerson” to the depiction of violence in “El terremoto de Charleston” and finally to the possible force of resistance symbolized by “el hombre natural” in “Nuestra América.” Read together, these essays show how the Cuban writer skillfully translates the Emersonian vision of the natural world into the particular representation of nature that is more suitable for Latin America’s struggle for independence. That is to say, Martí discovers (as Rizal does in his own way) a critical source of resistance against U.S. imperialism *within* that very empire.

What conclusions can we draw from these comparisons? How might we rearticulate the history of anti-imperialism in the late nineteenth century? What differences can we discern between Rizal and Martí’s view of the old empire and their equally critical perception of the modern empire? Both figures are extremely perceptive observers of their time, individuals capable of placing the Philippines, Cuba, and Latin America within a larger historical and socio-

political context. If we look closely at this panorama, we begin to see the peculiar link between “The Pearl of the Orient” and “Our America.” The Asian country is not only a productive component of Spanish colonialism for over three centuries (as we saw in chapter 1), but it also helps the crystallization of U.S. expansionism in the years surrounding 1898. The same is true for Latin America, especially Cuba. The Pacific and Latin America are thus targets of both Spanish and U.S imperial projects, and the shift that marks the beginning of a new era of global imperialism is felt almost at the same time in the two regions. The political ideas that Martí and Rizal share suggest the possibility of a transnational, inter-colonial form of anti-imperial knowledge, which works not only against the Spanish empire but also against the rising U.S. empire. The two writers’ common insights regarding the United States’ relationship to other countries continue to remain relevant in our present time when the “empire” is losing the global power it once enjoyed. For this reason (among others), the concept of the “trans-Pacific” can provide a critical tool to describe a particular circuit in which the U.S. stands not as the hegemonic node, but one country among many that would define its trajectory.

CONCLUSION

I was in Manila on August 1, 2009. It was a historical day for many Filipinos since they lost their beloved former president Corazon “Cory” Aquino. I spent the whole day watching the massive procession in which more than one million people gathered on the street to send their last farewells to the protagonist of the well-known “People Power Revolution.”¹³⁴ The scene was quite overwhelming. Despite the heavy rain that seemed to reflect everyone’s grief, the march grew and grew as it moved from one corner of the city to another. It included the elderly and children, males and females, the rich and the poor, the Left and the Right. On that day, Cory, following Rizal’s path, came to join the national pantheon of great Filipino leaders of the past. A few years earlier, it had been reported that the former leader of Cuba, Fidel Castro, was seriously ill and on the verge of dying. Some questioned the veracity of the news, while others used it to advocate their anti-Castro propaganda. Whatever the case, that this man’s potential death had provoked international polemics demonstrated that his (in)existence remained central to imagining the future of the Caribbean island. As a self-proclaimed disciple of Martí, the *Comandante en Jefe* sought to create, like Cory herself, a history of people’s struggles against dictatorship and foreign domination in the twentieth century.

In a way, this dissertation constitutes an attempt to recuperate the legacies of Martí and

¹³⁴ The “People Power Revolution” was a three-day series of nonviolent protests against the authoritarian government of Ferdinand Marcos that occurred in 1986. More than two million civilians participated in the demonstrations, and the revolution later inspired numerous non-violent movements around the globe.

Rizal in the present day, ones that still “haunt” the land and the people of Cuba and the Philippines. Though written more than a century ago, their writings continue to influence the formation of national identities as well as the constitution of each country’s foreign affairs. In order to explore the long history of struggles against imperial powers, I focused on the political texts of Martí and Rizal that deal with the question of Empire and/or Imperialism in the late nineteenth century. Through a comparative approach, this study tried to establish a symbolic dialogue between the two authors. The concept of global resistance, both indicated by the direct communication between some Cubans and Filipinos (i.e. Mariano Ponce and José Alberto Izquierdo) and symbolized by the shared ideologies of Martí and Rizal, exposes the possibility of juxtaposing different colonial contexts under the same sphere of *fin-de-siècle* anti-imperialism. Underneath the moribund Spanish empire and the neophyte American one, there was a large scale circulation of anti-imperial thoughts and consciousness across the Pacific Ocean.

Martí and Rizal stand precisely at the center of this global network. As I have shown in this dissertation, they employ different literary forms to frustrate the imperial agendas of Spain and the United States. For instance, I examined how they turn to the narrative form to reveal the problem of Spanish imperialism, represented by complicated gender dynamics (Noli me tangere) and the staging of plans for interpersonal domination gone wrong (Lucía Jerez). In both novels, interactions between the individuals of different genders create the productive space upon which to enunciate a resistant force against imperial domination. In addition, I also considered the ways in which the two authors attempt to translate the U.S. empire into their own contexts of anti-imperial struggles. Rizal pays particular attention to the figure of the American Indian and integrates its resistant characteristic into the production of Filipino “indios bravos.” Moreover, another American factor contributes to his conceptualization of a “filibustero,” as the protagonist

of El filibusterismo spends a significant period of time in U.S. society contemplating the revolution he seeks to instigate. For Martí, the appropriation of the American empire takes place in the form of chronicles. My analysis of his Escenas norteamericanas highlights how the Cuban writer manages to incorporate the Emersonian view of nature in order to create the concept of “el hombre natural,” a subject that embodies the experience of anti-imperialism in Latin America.

The possibility of global resistance does not mean, however, that everything that constitutes such a transnational network is flawless. In fact, this dissertation also pointed to some limits of the idea of global resistance. My historical study attempted to reveal, for example, that the correspondence between Ponce and Izquierdo reveals a collective struggle against the Spanish imperial program only in so far as their concern represents the interest of the bourgeois class. In other words, these elite intellectuals propose the formation of an inter-colonial alliance based on the prestigious knowledge they acquire in Europe, rather than on the specific colonial conditions of Cuba and the Philippines. By discussing the meaning of the term “slavery” in their letters, I argued that Ponce and Izquierdo define their anti-imperial project in terms of a theoretical, ideological exercise (“slavery” as a metaphor) rather than a historical reality (“slavery” as a practice of exploitation).

Furthermore, the limits of global resistance also emerge in the anti-imperial discourse of Martí and Rizal. First, my analysis of “Manifiesto de Montecristi” and “Filipinas dentro de cien años” discussed how the two writers employ the manifesto form to define the national subjects of “people” and “race” in opposition to Spain’s colonial power. Nevertheless, their application of the “theatrical performance” of the manifesto leads to the exclusion of those who are not considered “national” and “anti-imperial.” Martí’s construction of a Cuban “people” in the text means leaving out the fainthearted, “false” individuals from the national sphere and rejecting the

model of Latin American “peoples.” On the other hand, Rizal’s conceptualization of a Filipino “race” indicates eliminating the singularities of what he calls “independent races” such as Negritos and Moros. His attempt to define the solidarity of a single, anti-imperial race can be understood as a strategic practice of homogenization intended to obscure the reality of the country’s multi-ethnic and multi-cultural characteristic.

In addition, I also discussed some problems related to the two writers’ texts on the American empire. Rizal’s character, Simoun, whose experience in U.S. society somehow helps him advance his anti-colonial agenda, ultimately fails to incorporate the presence of the Filipino masses into the construction of a new nation. For Simoun, as well as for the author himself, the principal agent of nationalization and anti-imperial struggle is not the group of local “indios” but the elite Creole class. Whereas Rizal’s articulation of the anti-imperial force idealizes a *criollización* of the Philippines, Martí’s project can be described as a *mestización* of Latin America. My discussion of “Nuestra América” showed that Martí’s creation of a Latin American identity is essentially limited within the idea of *mestizaje*, as seen in his enunciation of “nuestra América mestiza.” According to this vision, the resistant subject of the “hombre natural” is placed in the margin of an anti-imperial panorama. In other words, neither Rizal nor Martí includes the autochthonous subjects as central components of Filipino, Cuban and Latin American identities. What ultimately determines their projects of anti-imperialism is the educated, elite class of “criollos” and “mestizos.”

Through these examples, my dissertation explored both the possibilities and the limits of early global resistance. By comparing the histories of anti-imperial movements in the Caribbean and Southeast Asia, I have attempted to underline an earlier manifestation of international coalition against the Empires in the late nineteenth century. One of the essential goals of this

study was to participate in the ongoing debate concerning the transnational circuit of cultural politics that connect Latin America and Asia. Even though my project examined the formation of a trans-Pacific network in a specific historical context, the nineteenth century does not present the first instance of interactions between these two regions. Indeed, as Lévi-Strauss makes clear in Tristes Tropiques (1955), such interactions have always been active. In our contemporary world, the distance between Latin America and Asia has been decreasing even more dramatically due to the impact of international politics of migration flows and the globalization of cultural practices. There is even a kind of an “Asian Diaspora” in Latin America, with immigrants contributing to the construction of complex socio-political realities for centuries. Considering Asia’s growing importance in nearly every sphere of social life in Latin America (and in the rest of the world), we can perhaps argue that the trans-Pacific circuit is likely to one day replace the trans-Atlantic one in cultural as well economic terms. It is my hope that this study on Martí and Rizal will contribute to the further understanding of the cultural, historical, and political relationships between Latin America and Asia.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abastado, Claude. "Introduction à l'analyse des manifestes." Littérature, special number on l'Écriture manifestaire, 39 (October 1980): 3-11.
- Agamben, Giorgio. Homo sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1998.
- Aguilar Jr., Filomento V. "Tracing Origins: Ilustrado, Nationalism and the Racial Science of Migration Waves" The Journal of Asian Studies. 64, 3 (August 2005): 605-37.
- Althusser, Louis. "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses (Notes Toward and Investigation)." Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1971.
- . Machiavelli and Us. Ed. François Matheron Tran. and Intro. Gregory Elliot. London and New York: Verso, 2000.
- Amrith, Sunil S. "Gazing at the Starts." Review of Benedict Anderson's Under Three Flags: Anarchism and the Anti-Colonial Imagination. History of Workshop Journal. 66 (2008): 227-236.
- Anderson, Benedict R. O'G. Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism. London: Verso, 1983.
- . Under Three Flags: Anarchism and the Anti-colonial Imagination. London; New York, NY: Verso, 2005.
- Arendt, Hannah. The Origins of Totalitarianism. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1951.
- . On Revolution. New York: Viking, 1963.

- Balibar, Etienne. Race, Nation, Class: Ambiguous Identities. Etienne Balibar and Immanuel Wallerstein. London: Verso, 1991.
- Ballón, José C. Autonomía cultural americana: Emerson y Martí. Madrid : Pliegos, 1986.
- . Lecturas norteamericanas de José Martí: Emerson y el socialismo contemporáneo (1880-1887). México D.F.: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Coordinación de Humanidades, 1995.
- Beauregard, Paulette Silva. “La feminización del héroe moderno y la novela en ‘Lucía Jerez’ y ‘El hombre de hierro.’” Revista de Crítica Literaria Latinoamericana. Año 26, No. 52 (2000): 135-151.
- Belnap, Jeffrey. “Headbands, Hemp Sandals, and Headdresses: The Dialectics of Dress and Self-Conception in Martí’s “Our America.”” Edit. Jeffrey Belnap and Raúl Fernández. José Martí’s “Our America”: From National to Hemispheric Cultural Studies. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1998.
- Benítez Rojo, Antonio. Las isla que se repite: El Caribe y la perspectiva posmoderna. Hanover NH: Ediciones del Norte, 1989.
- Bhabha, Homi K. The Location of Culture. London; New York: Routledge, 1994.
- Blanco, John D. “Bastards of the Unfinished Revolution: Bolívar’s Ismael and Rizal’s Martí at the Turn of the Twenties Century” Radical History Review, 89 (spring 2004); 92-114.
- . “Patterns of Reform, Repetition, and Return in the First Centennial of the Filipino Revolution, 1896-1996.” Positively No Filipinos Allowed: Building Communities and Discourse. Eds. Antonio T. Tiongson, Jr., Edgardo V. Gutierrez, and Ricardo V. Gutierrez. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2006.
- Brooks, Peter. The Melodramatic Imagination: Balzac, Henry James, Melodrama and the Mode of Excess. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1976.
- Buck-Morss, Susan. “Hegel and Haiti.” Critical Inquiry, vol. 26, no. 4 (Summer 2000): 821-865.
- Caudet, Francisco. “José Rizal: “Noli me tangere” y la Filipinas colonial.” Cuadernos hispanoamericanos. 396 (1958): 581-590.

- Caws, Mary Ann. Manifesto: A Century of Isms. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 2001.
- Chatterjee, Partha. The Nation and its Fragments: Colonial and Postcolonial Histories Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.
- Choy, Philip P., Lorraine Dong, and Marlon K. Hom. Eds. Coming Man: 19th Century American Perceptions of the Chinese. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1994.
- Constantino, Renato. Dissent and Counter-Consciousness. Quezon City: Malaya Books, 1970.
- Curtin, Philip D. The Atlantic Slave Trade: A Census. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969.
- De la Campa, Román. Latin Americanism. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999.
- De la Fuente, Alejandro. A Nation for All: Race, Inequality, and Politics in Twentieth-Century Cuba. Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 2001.
- . Havana and the Atlantic in the Sixteenth Century. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2008.
- Delmendo, Sharon. "The American Factor in José Rizal's Nationalism." AMERASIA Special Issue: "100 Years of Philippine-American History." 24; 2, (Summer 1998): 35-63.
- Derrida, Jacques. "Declarations of Independence." New Political Science 15 (Summer 1986), 7-15.
- Dizon, Alma Jill. "Felipinas Caliban: Colonialism as Marriage of Spaniard and Filipina." Philippine Studies. 46 (1998): 24-45.
- Estrade, Paul. "El acercamiento filipino-cubano en la guerra contra España (1896—1898)." El Caribe y América Latina: el 98 en la coyuntura imperial. María Teresa Cortés Zavala, Consuelo Naranjo Orovio y José Alfredo Uribe Salas. Vol. II. Morelia, Michoacán, México: Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas, Universidad Michoacana de San Nicolás de Hidalgo; Instituto Michoacano de Cultura, Gobierno del Estado de Michoacán; España: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas; [Río Piedras, P.R.]: Universidad de Puerto Rico, Recinto de Río Piedras, 1999.

- . Solidaridad con Cuba libre, 1895-1898: La impresionante labor del Dr. Betances en París. San Juan, PR: Editorial de la Universidad de Puerto Rico, 2001.
- Ette, Ottmar. “*Cecilia Valdés y Lucía Jerez*: Transformaciones del espacio literario en dos novelas cubanas del siglo XIX.” The Historical Novel in Latin America: A Symposium. Ed. Daniel Balderston. Gaithersburg, MD: Ediciones Hispanoamérica; Tulane University, 1986.
- Fernández Retamar, Roberto. Calibán: Contra la leyenda negra. Lérida, Spain: Universitat de Lleida, 1971.
- . “Modernismo, 98, subdesarrollo.” Para una teoría de la literatura hispanoamericana. Bogotá: Instituto Caro y Cuervo, 1995.
- Ferrer, Ada. “The Silence of Patriots: Race and Nationalism in Martí’s Cuba” Ed. Jeffery Belnap and Raúl Fernández. José Martí’s “Our America”: From National to Hemispheric Cultural Studies. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1999.
- “Filibuster.” Oxford English Dictionary. 20 Jan. 2010 <http://dictionary.oed.com/cgi/entry/50084692?query_type=word&queryword=filibuster&first=1&max_to_show=10&sort_type=alpha&result_place=1&search_id=2uAK-UclxGN-9523&hilite=50084692>
- “Filibustero.” Diccionario de la Lengua Española. 22nd ed. 2001.
- Flores, Patrick D. “Of Women in Philippines Popular Cinema: Or Why Lea Salonga is Sorry for not Being Perfect.” Diliman Review. 41 (1993): 41-48.
- Fountain, Anne. José Martí and U.S. Writers. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2003.
- Fradera, Josep Maria. Filipinas, la colonia más peculiar: La hacienda pública en la definición de la política colonial, 1762-1868. Madrid: Consejos Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1999.
- . Colonias para después de un imperio. Barcelona: Edición Bellaterra, 2005.
- Giles, Paul. “The Parallel Worlds of José Martí.” Radical History Review. 89 (Spring 2004): 185-190.
- Goic, Cedomil. Historia crítica de la literatura hispanoamericana: Del romanticismo al modernismo. Barcelona: Crítica, 1991.

- González, Aníbal. La novela modernista hispanoamericana. Madrid: Gredos, 1987.
- González, Pedro Manuel. “Prefacio a la edición española de *Lucía Jerez*.” Lucía Jerez. Madrid: Gredos, 1969.
- González-Echevarría, Roberto. “José Martí: An Introduction” José Martí: Selected Writings. New York: Penguin Books, 2002.
- Gottberg, Luis Duno. Solventando las diferencias. La ideología del mestizaje en Cuba. Frankfurt: Iberoamericana Vervuert, 2003.
- Gray, Richard B. “Jose Martí and Social Revolution in Cuba.” Journal of Inter-American Studies. 5; 2 (Apr., 1963): 249-256.
- Guerrero, León Ma. The First Filipino: A Biography of José Rizal. Manila: National Historical Commission, 1963.
- Hagimoto, Koichi. “The Three Flags of Philippine Anti-Colonialism.” Review of Benedict Anderson’s Under Three Flags: Anarchism and the Anti-Colonial Imagination. A Contracorriente. 5, 1 (Fall 2007): 376-379.
- Harootunian, H. D. “Ghostly Comparisons: Anderson’s Telescope” Grounds of Comparison: Around the Work of Benedict Anderson Pheng Cheah and Jonathan Culler eds., New York: Routledge, 2003.
- Hau, Carolin S. Necessary Fictions: Philippine Literature and the Nation, 1946-1980. Manila: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 2000.
- Headley, Clevis. “Rethinking Caribbean Culture: An Opportunity to Rethink Afro-Caribbean Philosophy.” Shibboleths: A Journal of Comparative Theory. 1. 2 (2007): 91-105.
- Hobsbawm, E.J. The Age of Empire, 1875-1914. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1987.
- Hobson, J. Atkinson. “Extracts from ‘*Imperialism: A Study*’” (1st ed. 1902). Imperialism: Critical Concepts in Historical Studies. Ed. Peter J. Cain and Mark Harrison. London: Routledge, 2001.
- Ileto, Reynaldo C. “Rizal and the Underside of Philippines History.” Filipinos and Their Revolution: Event, Discourse, and Historiography. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1998.

- Imbert, Enrique Anderson. "La prosa poética de José Martí. A propósito de *Amistad funesta*." Estudios sobre escritores de América. Buenos Aires: Editorial Raigal, 1954.
- Jaena, Graciano López. "Homenaje a la memoria de Colón." Discursos y artículos varios de Graciano López Jaena. Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1951.
- Jáuregui, Carlos. A. Canibalia: Canibalismo, calibanismo, antropofagia cultural y consumo en América Latina. Madrid: Iberoamericana Vervuert, 2008.
- Jiménez, José Olivio. "Introducción a la poesía modernista hispanoamericana." Antología crítica de la poesía modernista hispanoamericana. Madrid: Hiperión, 1985.
- Jiménez, José Olivio, Morales Carlos Javier. La prosa modernista hispanoamericana: Introducción crítica y antología. Madrid: Alianza Editorial, 1998.
- Joaquín, Nick. "The Novels of Rizal: An Appreciation." Kathá I (1955): 262-72.
- . A Question of Heroes: Essays in Criticism on Ten Figures of Philippine History. Manila: Ayala Museum, 1977.
- Joseph, Gilbert M., Catherine C. LeGrand, and Ricardo Salvatores, eds., Close Encounters of Empire: Writing the Cultural History of U.S.-Latin American Relations Durham: Duke University Press, 1998.
- Kaplan, Amy and Donald Pease, eds., Cultures of United States Imperialism Durham: Duke University Press, 1993.
- Kim, David Haekwon. "Empire's entrails and the imperial geography of 'Amerasia.'" City 8, 1 (April 2004): 57-88.
- Kramer, Paul A. The Blood of Government: Race, Empire, the United States, & the Philippines. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006.
- La República Cubana. "¡Viva Filipinas Libre!" no. 33, 3 September 1896: p.1; and "¿Qué quiere Filipinas?" no. 36, 24 September 1896: p. 1. Reel 1, Microfilm S4587.
- La Solidaridad. "¿Se vende Cuba?" 31 March 1889: 114-116. Vol. 1, 4. Ganzon, Guadalupe Fores. Quezon City, University of the Philippines Press (1967).

- Lander, María Fernanda. "Familia, clase social y modernidad en 'Lucía Jerez' de José Martí." Hispania. Vol. 86, No. 4 (Dec., 2003): 751-760.
- Larraín, Jorge. Identity and Modernity in Latin America. Cambridge: Polity; Malden: Backwell, 2000.
- Lea, Henry Charles. "The Decadence of Spain" Atlantic Monthly 82 (1898): 36-46.
- Lenin, Vladimir Il'ich. Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism. (1st ed. 1916). New York: International Publishers, 1969, c1939.
- Lifshey, Adam. "The Literary Alterities of Philippine Nationalism in José Rizal's *El filibusterismo*." PMLA 123, 5 (October 2008): 1434-1447.
- Lomas, Laura. "José Martí's 'Evening of Emerson' and the United Statesian Literary Tradition." Journal of American Studies. 43, 1 (2009): 1-17.
- López, Alfred J. José Martí and the Future of Cuban Nationalism. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2006.
- López-Calvo, Ignacio. Ed., Alternative Orientalisms in Latin America and Beyond. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2007.
- Luis-Brown, David. Waves of Decolonization: Discourses of Race and Hemispheric Citizenship in Cuba, Mexico, and the United States. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2008.
- Lund, Joshua. The Impure Imagination: Toward a Critical Hybridity in Latin American Writing. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2006.
- Lyon, Janet. Manifestoes: Provocations of the Modern. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1999.
- "Manifiesto." Oxford English Dictionary. 18 Nov. 2009. < <http://dictionary.oed.com/cgi/entry/00301198?>>
- Martí, José. Lucía Jerez. Ed. Mauricio Núñez Rodríguez. Havana: Centro de Estudios Martíanos, 2000. [1887]

- . Obras Completas de José Martí. Ed. Jorge González Alonso, José Luis Prado Ramírez, Asela Hernández Lugo, and Alain Crehuet Martínez. CD-ROM. La Habana: Centro de Estudios Martíanos, 2001.
- Martínez-San Miguel, Yolanda. “Sujetos femeninos en Amistad funesta y Blanca Sol: El lugar de la mujer en dos novelas latinoamericanas de fin de siglo XIX.” Revista iberoamericana. Vol. 62, No. 174 (1996): 27-45.
- Marx, Karl. Karl Marx: A Reader. Ed. Jon Elster. Cambridge, New York: Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge, 1986.
- Masiello, Francine. “‘Horror y lágrimas.’ Sexo y nación en la cultura del fin de siglo.” Esplendores y miserias del siglo XIX. Cultura y sociedad en América Latina. Comps. Beatriz González Stephan, Javier Lasarte, Graciela Montaldo y María Julia Daroqui. Caracas: Monte Avila Editores Latinoamericana, 1994.
- Minges, Patrick N. Slavery in the Cherokee Nation: The Keetoowah Society and the Defining of a People 1855-1867. New York and London: Routledge, 2003.
- Morillo-Alicea, Javier. “Uncharted Landscapes of ‘Latin America’: The Philippines in the Spanish Imperial Archipelago.” Interpreting Spanish Colonialism: Empires, Nations, and Legends. Eds. Christopher Schmidt-Nowara and John M. Nieto-Phillips. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2005.
- Montero, Oscar. José Martí: An Introduction. Basingstoke, Hampshire; New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.
- Morales, Carlos Javier. “Introducción.” Lucía Jerez. Madrid: Cátedra, 1994.
- National Congresses of History, Revaloración de la historia de Cuba por los congresos nacionales de historia. La Habana: Oficina del Historiador de La Habana, 1959.
- Ocampo, Ambeth. Rizal Without the Overcoat. Pasig City: Anvil Publishing, Inc., 2008 (1990).
- . Makamisa: The Search for Rizal’s Third Novel. Manila: Anvil, 1992.
- Ojeda Reyes, Félix. El desterrado de París. Biografía del Doctor Ramón Emeterio Betances (1827—1898). San Juan: Ediciones Puerto Rico, 2001.

- Pan-Montojo, Juan. ed. Más se perdió en Cuba: España, 1898 y la crisis de fin de siglo. Madrid: Alianza, 1998.
- Pellicer, Rosa. “La mujer en la novela modernista hispanoamericana.” Actas del IX Simposio de la Sociedad Española de Literatura General y Comparada. I: La mujer: elogio y vituperio. Eds., Tua Blesa, María Teresa Cacho, Carlos García Gual, Mercedes Tolland, Leonardo Romero Tovar and Margarita Smerdou Altolaguirre. Zaragoza: Universidad de Zaragoza, 1994.
- Phelan, John Leddy. The Hispanization of the Philippines: Spanish Aims and Filipino Responses, 1565-1700. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1967.
- Pilapil, Vincente R. “The Cause of the Philippine Revolution.” The Pacific Historical Review. 34; 3 (Aug., 1965): 249-264.
- Pierce, Donna and Ronald Otsuka. Eds., Asia & Spanish America: Trans-Pacific Artists & Cultural Exchange, 1500-1850. Denver: Denver Art Museum, 2009.
- Pocock, John Michael. Prophecies of José Rizal about the Philippines. Manila: Rex Book Store, 1997.
- Poll, Michael R. Masonic Enlightenment: The Philosophy, History and Wisdom of Freemasonry. Lafayette, LA: Cornerstone Book Publishers, 2006.
- Ponce, Mariano. Cartas sobre la revolución (1897-1900). Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1932.
- Puri, Shalini. The Caribbean Postcolonial: Social Equality, Post-Nationalism, and Cultural Hybridity. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.
- Quibuyen, Floro C. A Nation Aborted: Rizal, American Hegemony, and Philippine Nationalism. Manila: Ateneo de Manila University, 1999.
- Rafael, Vicente L. Contracting Colonialism: Translation and Christian Conversion in Tagalog Society under Early Spanish Rule. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1988.
- . The Promise of the Foreign: Nationalism and the Techniques of Translation in the Spanish Philippines. Durham: Duke University Press, 2005.
- Ramos, Julio. Desencuentros de la modernidad en América Latina: literatura y política en el siglo XIX. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1989.

Retana, Wenceslao Emilio. Vida y escritos del Dr. José Rizal. Madrid: V. Suárez, 1907.

Ricoeur, Paul. "Biblical Hermeneutics." Semeia 4. Ed. John Dominic Crossan. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1975.

Rizal, José. Noli me tangere. Manila: Instituto Nacional de Historia, 1995. [1887]

---. "Filipinas dentro de cien años" in La Solidaridad Reprinted in La Solidaridad. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press, 1967. The four sections of the article can be found in the following pages: I (vol. 1, 582-584), II (vol. 1, 658-670), III (vol. 1, 768-782), and IV (vol. 2, 40-50).

---. Sucesos de las islas Filipinas por el Doctor Antonio de Morga. Edición anotada por José Rizal, París, 1890. Escritos de José Rizal, Tomo VI. Manila, Comisión Nacional del Centenario de José Rizal, 1961.

---. El filibusterismo. Manila: Instituto Histórico Nacional, 1996. [1891]

---. "Diario y memorias." Publicaciones de la Comisión Nacional de Centenario de José Rizal: Escritos de José Rizal. Vol. 1. Manila: Comisión Nacional del Centenario de José Rizal, 1961.

Rotker, Susana. American Chronicles of José Martí : Journalism and Modernity in Spanish America. Trans. Jennifer French and Katherine Semler. Hanover: University Press of New England, 2000.

Saldívar, José David. "Nuestra América's Borders: Remapping American Cultural Studies." Edit. Jeffrey Belnap and Raúl Fernández. José Martí's "Our America": From National to Hemispheric Cultural Studies. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1998.

Santí, Enrico Mario. "'Our America,' the Gilded Age, and the Crisis of Latinoamericanism." Jose Martí's "Our America": From National to Hemispheric Cultural Studies (1999).

Santillan-Castrencia, Pura. The Women Characters in Rizal's Novels. Manila: Regal Publishing, 1960.

Saxton, Alexander P. The Indispensable Enemy: Labor and the Anti-Chinese Movement in California. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1971.

- Schmidt-Nowara, Christopher. "Imperio y crisis colonial." Más se perdió en Cuba. España, 1898 y la crisis de fin de siglo. Ed. Juan Pan-Montojo. Madrid: Alianza Editorial, 1998.
- . The Conquest of History: Spanish Colonialism and National Histories in the Nineteenth Century. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2006.
- Schmitt, Carl. Nomos of the Earth in the International Law of Jus Publicum Europaeum. (1st Ed., 1950) Ulmen: Telos Press, 2003.
- Schuler, Esther E. "José Martí: Su Crítica de Algunos Autores Norteamericanos." Archivo José Martí. 5, no. 2 (1950): 164-191.
- Schulman, Ivan A. Símbolo y Color en la Obra de José Martí. Madrid: Editorial Gredos, 1960.
- . Vivencias: Martí y el modernismo. La Habana: Centro de Estudios Martíanos, 2005.
- . "Lucía Jerez: Una novela de la modernidad decimonónica." Lucía Jerez. Buenos Aires: Stockcero, 2005.
- Schumacher, John Norbert. "Philippines Masonry to 1890" Asian Studies. 6 (1966): 328-341.
- . The Propaganda Movement: 1880-1895. The Creation of a Filipino Consciousness, the Makers of Revolution. Manila: Solidaridad Pub. House, 1973.
- . The Making of a Nation: Essays on Nineteenth-Century Filipino Nationalism. Manila: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1991.
- Scott, David. "Colonial Governmentality" Social Text 43 (Autumn, 1995): 191-220.
- Smith, Paul. Discerning the Subject. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1988.
- Sommer, Doris. Foundational Fictions: The National Romances of Latin America. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991.
- Stanley, Peter W. Nation in the Making: the Philippines and the United States, 1899-1921. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1974.
- Sumsky, Victor V. "The Prophet of Two Revolutions." Philippine Studies. 49 (2001): 236-254.

Torres-Pou, Joan. “La narrativa anticolonial hispano-filipina: el caso de *Noli me tangere* y *El filibusterismo* de José Rizal” Iberoamericana. (1) 2001; 7-14.

Vitier, Cintio. Vida y obra del Apóstol José Martí. La Habana: Centro de Estudios Martíanos, 2004.

---. “Nuestra América”: Edición Crítica. Havana: Centro de Estudios Martíanos, 2005.

Zaide, Gregorio F. José Rizal: Life, Works, and Writings. Mandaluyong City: National Book Store, Inc., 1992.

Zanetti, Susana. “*Lucía Jerez* en el marco de la novela moderna latinoamericana.” José Martí 1895/1995. Literatura, política, filosofía, estética. Eds. Ottmar Ette y Titus Heydenreich. Nuremberg: Vervuet Verlag, 1995.