


Reprinted with permission from *God's Arbiters: Americans and the Philippines, 1898–1902* by Susan K. Harris published by Oxford University Press, May, 2011.
Copyright © 2011 by Susan K. Harris.



Chapter 6

Saxon Eyes and Barbaric Souls

*Responses to the American Annexation of the
Philippines in Europe and Latin America*

Mark Twain remained deeply disturbed by U.S. imperialism throughout the first years of the new century, penning essays, speeches, dramatic monologues, sketches, and parodies that protested U.S. actions in the Philippines and elsewhere. One image that he used repeatedly substituted a skull and crossbones for the stars in the American flag. For Twain as for other Americans, the flag was the emblem of the country's honor, its claim to remarkable virtue among the community of nations. The Philippine-American War, he felt, had destroyed the grounds for the claim. Sometime during this period Twain read *An Eagle's Flight*, an English adaptation of José Rizal's *Noli Me Tangere*, originally published in 1886.¹ Rizal, the Filipino nationalist who had been martyred by the Spanish in 1896, had written *Noli Me Tangere* as a protest against Spanish misrule in the archipelago; in particular, it attacks the corrupt friars who maintained day-to-day control over ordinary Filipinos' lives. Rizal's brief introduction, addressed "To My Country," contends that he is "exposing" the Philippines' diseased state in order to solicit remedies.

An Eagle's Flight is prefaced by two other documents. One is a poem, "My Last Thought" ("Mi Último Adiós," literally, "My Last Farewell") that Rizal wrote on the eve of his execution.² The poem is a hymn to the Philippines; it addresses the archipelago intimately, as "tu," and celebrates the islands' fecundity. Rizal tells his compatriots that he is honored to take his place beside other fallen freedom fighters, and he bids readers not to




FIGURE 6.1: “Chorus in Background: Those Pious Yankees Can’t Throw Stones at Us Anymore.” *Life*, Life Publishing Company, New York, May 22, 1902. [artist: William Bengough]

mourn him because “morir es descansar,” to die is to rest. The second, unattributed, prefacing document is a sketch of Rizal’s life and accomplishments as a writer, an intellectual, a physician (he was a specialist in eye diseases), and a patriot. This forceful sketch frames the reading of the novel, marking the Filipinos as sophisticated, intelligent people who had been oppressed by the Spanish—especially the religious orders—and who were fully capable of governing themselves.

In 1901 Twain paid Rizal homage by taking the title of Rizal’s poem as he had read it in the adaptation and using it for a poem of his own.³

Twain's poem names no names—he identifies neither its speaker nor the event about which he speaks—but the U.S. annexation of the Philippines is its implicit backdrop, and its narrator too is a dying man. But whereas Rizal is a martyr speaking to a country he has loved and hoped to guide to freedom, Twain's narrator is an American president speaking to a country he knows he has betrayed. Twain's "My Last Thought" is about the damage annexation has inflicted on America's moral fiber and to its reputation in the world. His speaker blames himself, recognizing that he was inadequate for his responsibilities: "I was only weak, /Not bad. And I was out of place— /A lost & wandering atom in that vast Seat/Which only Lincolns & their like compactly fill."

Like many of Twain's short pieces, the poem is a dramatic monologue. Formally, it is very loose—the lines are written in iambs but the line and stanzas vary in length; there is some interesting internal and slant rhyme but no overall rhyme scheme. Yet, to this reader at least, the poetic mode makes it more effective than many of Twain's other political monologues, such as "King Leopold's Soliloquy." Despite the freedom of the verse, the formal constraints impose a discipline that intensifies the narrator's pathos, his heartfelt regret over his mistakes and their impact on the nation he had led. "I meant my country well," the president begins, and proceeds to rehearse the "loyal service" he had performed, especially in securing Cuban independence. "Pearl of the Antilles, speak!" he beseeches, "I broke your chains, I set you free; I raised/My country's honor to the skies; I won/the Old World's scorn & hate, the New World's/'Well done, thou faithful son!'" For the president, U.S. actions in Cuba showed his "real" intents: "O *then* I was myself," he claims, looking back on the golden moment when, Twain believed, the United States actually carried through on its commitment to help another country to freedom. The president begs his listeners to "Grant me that!" and to "forget the rest." His subsequent misdeeds, he insists, were brought about "through weakness, not intent." Because he had been "Overborne by sordid counsels, /Base ambitions," he laments, "from my head I took/The precious laurel I had earned, & in its place/I set this poor tin glory, now my wear, /Of World-Power, Conquerer of helpless tribes, /Extinguisher of struggling liberties!"

The president's last vision is of the American flag. As Twain had done at the end of "To the Person Sitting in Darkness," here he uses the flag to indicate national dishonor. The speaker first perceives, "upon my fading sight," a "holy vision": "Our Flag of snow & flame far-flashing in the sky!

/And toward it the oppressed of every clime/Uplifting their poor fettered hands/In hope & trust & worship.” But the vision fades, to be replaced with another, in which “The Stars are gone, a Skull & Bones/Are in their place; the Red Bars are there, /But soaked with guiltless blood; /The white Bars are Black—and the dying man cries out, ‘Hide it from my sight!’” The final stanza returns to the plea for forgiveness; whereas Rizal’s last line counseled his countrymen not to mourn him because “to sleep is to rest,” Twain’s speaker craves sleep as oblivion: “Sleep & forget, sleep and be forgotten— /If that dear boon might be mine!”

The sense of loss in this poem is palpable. The speaker, figuring himself as “an atom” lost in “that vast Seat/Which only Lincolns & their like compactly fill,” strikes the note of solitude that marks Twain’s late, unfinished manuscripts, many of which feature a solitary consciousness wandering through infinite space. In the poem the space is a “seat,” the throne of governance, far too large for the talents of the dying president. As with many of Twain’s late protagonists, this speaker’s mistaken judgments had precipitated his fall from security to terror, from control to powerlessness. He is acutely aware that his failures had destroyed his country’s character. He compares himself to the Revolutionary War traitor Benedict Arnold, but sadly notes that Arnold betrayed only a “garrison,” whereas he has “peddled out a Nation & its honor: /And sold them for a song!” His only recourse is to beg forgiveness, and to die.

By 1901, when he wrote this poem, Twain was a sophisticated observer of the world and of America’s place within it. He had become one of the most prominent spokesmen for the Anti-Imperialist League in part because his sojourns in Europe and his world travels gave him the authority to judge the United States from the outside. The pathos of “My Last Thought” reflects Twain’s perception that the nation had fallen from grace in the eyes of mankind as well as in the eyes of God; the poem reaches beyond internal U.S. protest to evoke the impact the government’s actions had made on the country’s international reputation. Twain first evokes patriotically charged American icons such as Lincoln and the flag, then accuses the country of betraying the ideals those icons represent. The poem’s focus on national dishonor suggests that Twain was attuned to responses to the U.S. annexation of the Philippines from locations beyond the Anglo-American alliance.

The final two chapters of this study look at challenges to the Americans from nations that did not assume that Anglo-American culture was God’s gift to the world. After a brief survey of European responses to the

Americans' interference in Spain's struggles to control its colonies, this chapter looks at writings by three Latin American writers—José Martí, Rubén Darío, and José Enrique Rodó—whose ambivalence about the United States help us observe the Americans' activities in a global context. The final chapter examines the responses of Filipino nationalists Emilio Aguinaldo, the president of the short-lived Philippine Republic, and Apolinario Mabini, the architect of the Philippine Constitution. Across the globe, observers had listened to the Americans' talk about their special virtue, and they were happy to point out that the country had fallen at the first temptation. The Filipino nationalists especially used the American narrative against their new masters.

Like the Filipinos, writers from other former Spanish colonies called the United States on its hypocrisies. In the writings of José Martí, Rubén Darío, and José Enrique Rodó, we see a critique of North American life and thought that provides a framework for protests about the Philippine-American War from perspectives far distant from most citizens of the United States. Like Mark Twain, these three Spanish American writers critique not just the country's actions, but also the terms within which it identified itself, the national narrative that framed U.S. debates both for and against annexation. And although it is unlikely that Twain knew of Rodó or Darío's writings, and seems to have had little or no relationship with José Martí, all four writers are marked by their deployment of specifically literary genres to communicate their critique.⁴ It is as if the very structuring of the story about the United States, with the country's birth in colonial rebellion, its celebrated embrace of equalitarianism, its insistence that its freedoms were rooted in a Protestant worldview, and its iconic documents and figures, encouraged writers to deconstruct the narrative itself, to shatter the self-image of the country they perceived as far too self-confident, far too smug. As we shall see, Mark Twain's opinion that the nation had dishonored itself was a statement with which many commentators largely concurred.

The single most common register among European governments over the Americans' decision to acquire distant territories was discomfort with the idea of an Anglo-American *rapprochement*; many countries had depended on the longstanding enmity between the United States and Britain to secure their own places in the global order, and they were leery of the shifts in balance that such a powerful alliance could facilitate. Beyond that shared wariness, official attitudes varied; Germany and Russia seemed unperturbed, whereas France professed

shock and alarm. But governments do not necessarily speak for their people. In their introduction to the collection *European Perceptions of the Spanish-American War of 1898*, Sylvia Hilton and Steven Ickringill note that “Democratic, progressive, and reformist minorities across Europe (and of course in the United States itself) [shared] an ideology suffused by the exaltation and defense of human rights. For them, the United States had represented the world’s best hope so far in the ongoing anti-militarist, anti-protectionist, anti-colonialist and anti-racist struggle towards international peace, solidarity, cooperation and progress. . . . McKinley’s intervention of 1898 was perceived by this handful of ideologues as a betrayal of American traditions and of universal values. For them, the Spanish-American war brought a sense of loss, of innocence irremediably sullied, as the American myth was shattered before their eyes”⁵ (33).

Taken across not only European national borders, but also the United States and the Spanish-speaking world, the groups that Hilton and Ickringill characterize as a “handful of ideologues” in fact articulated a pervasive and ongoing protest against U.S. imperialism. In Russia, for instance, the liberal press supported the invasion of Cuba on humanitarian grounds, but evidenced much distress over the annexation of the Philippines, which they saw as a denial of the principles of the Monroe Doctrine and, more significantly, a failure of ideals. In an article in *Vestnik Evropy* refuting American claims to the Philippines, L. Slonimsky commented that “The Americans shifted from philanthropic liberators of Cuba to merciless conquerors of another far-away island, and began to cruelly exterminate the defenders of local freedom.” Similarly, the April, 1899 issue of *Vestnik Inostrannoi Literatury* wrote disapprovingly that “the Americans were not able to maintain the loftiness of their political ideal. They were carried away by the example of Europe.”⁶ If the Russians framed the American seizure of the islands as a fall from democratic grace, the French framed it as outright hypocrisy. Serge Ricard quotes one editorial delivered shortly after McKinley’s war message of April 11, 1898, which denounced the United States for its hypocrisy, pointing out that “The sentimental fallacy of Christian and humanitarian motivations, so typically American, was but ‘the proclamation of a right of intervention pure and simple.’”⁷ French paranoia about the Anglo-American *rapprochement* was if anything more keen than Russian. Quoting Louis Joubert of *Le Correspondant*, Ricard records that

Two weeks . . . after the declaration of war and Dewey's victory at Manila Bay, Joubert . . . (remarked) . . . that John Bull and Brother Jonathan, despite their rivalry, were indeed blood kin "when it came to grabbing their neighbour's property." They shared the same unscrupulous, lawless approach to international affairs. Under the pretext of freeing Cuba, the United States . . . was now aiming at occupying the Philippines and Puerto Rico with London's approval. (Hilton and Ickringill, 145)

In addition to boorish diplomacy and faulty etiquette, Washington, the newspaper *Débats* noted, had confused its duties with its interests (H&I, 148). In August of 1899 the American periodical *The Public* reprinted an article by the Paris newspaper *Le Figaro's* special correspondent in Hong Kong, Jean Hess. In "A French View of the War in the Philippines," Hess commented that "The American intervention in the struggle engaged in by the revolutionary Tagals against the Spanish government has turned out to be nothing but a speculation of 'business men,' and not the generous effort of a people paying a debt in procuring for others the liberty that it concedes belongs to all."⁸ Hess turns to the Filipino response to the Americans' claim to benevolent intentions:

The Filipinos also, who now know the Americans pretty well, having seen them at this work, smile at their arguments; "You were groaning under the Spanish yoke. We have delivered you. But as many of you are yet savages, and all of you but big children, you cannot possibly know how to conduct your government yourselves. We are going to take upon ourselves as an especial charge your prosperity and happiness!" (*The Public*, 15)

Echoing the "savage children" and "responsibility" tropes that gained special currency after publication of "The White Man's Burden," Hess undermined U.S. proclamations not only by listening to them through Filipino ears but by associating them with the discourses of race and duty that Kipling's poem had come to represent.

Although Europeans generally did not see the Spanish-American conflicts through a religious lens, they were not insensible to its echoes of earlier Catholic/Protestant conflicts. Like many Americans who regarded the triumph of western civilization as the victory of Protestant-inflected modernity over Catholic feudalism, some Europeans framed the war within the longstanding enmity between Catholics and Protestants. Nico A. Bootsma

notes that Dutch liberal and socialist papers justified the war as an attack on the corrupt role that the Church had played in the Philippines⁹—an argument that the Filipinos had raised during their struggle against Spain and that was central to Rizal’s works, which were well known in Europe. Markus M. Hugo notes one German interpretation as a conflation of racial and religious ideologies, a “Germanic-Latin Duel,” in which a Teuton victory was to be celebrated. With this, many German Protestants viewed Spain’s distress as a necessary consequence of its Catholicism.¹⁰

Not surprisingly, the religious reading of the war and its outcome was strongest in Spain itself. *El disastre*, as the Spanish dubbed their defeat by the combined nationalist/U.S. forces, precipitated a period of national introspection during which Spain turned away from global engagements and began an intense reexamination of its own global identity. Within a few years this conversation would give way to *la regeneración*, the artistic, social, and political movement that, until Franco’s forces destroyed it, would move Spanish culture toward European modernism. But before *la regeneración* could develop, the Spanish needed time to reimagine themselves; with the exception of Morocco, they were, for the first time in nearly 500 years, a nation without an empire, a status for which they were unprepared. Writing on New Year’s Eve of 1899, one correspondent aptly summarized the state of the nation. First laying out the Spanish imperial landscape as it had appeared twelve months previous, he laments, “At the beginning of 1899, what a different picture is sketched!”

[Spain] has lost a third of its territories; in Puerto Rico, Cuba, and the Philippines the American flag waves, those warships in which we had placed our hopes are buried in the ocean without having the power to fight the enemy; the army sent to Cuba and the Philippines no longer exists; those soldiers who survived the terrible battles with the separatists and the treacherous climate of our colonies have returned home sick and without glory; peace with the Filipinos was smashed by the impudence and bad-faith of the Yankees; in Puerto Rico hitherto loyal Spaniards have committed horrible crimes of treason and ingratitude. This is what is left to us at the beginning of this year—a beginning that catches us in the midst of such great ruin and desolation that those who can still breathe should beg God for good fortune for this unhappy country.

And he closes, “today everyone cries out, lifting their thoughts to heaven, ‘God take pity on Spain in the new year!’”¹¹

Aware of their readers' despair over their country's loss, Spanish commentators did not extend much sympathy to their former territories, now struggling against new masters. However they were interested in the problems that the United States almost immediately started having with its new subjects. Like other European monarchies, Spain had a popular movement pushing for republican reform, for which the United States had provided a model. Sylvia Hilton notes that late-nineteenth-century Spanish republicans frequently cited the United States as a model of republican ideals. American heroes such as Washington and Jefferson were regarded as models of republican virtue, and American prosperity and energy, though also regarded as materialistic, were evidence that U.S. principles had tangible outcomes.¹² But the Spanish republicans most admired the fact that the United States had no colonies. A running theme in Spanish commentary after the war was the accusation that the Americans had overturned everything in which they professed to believe. "The irony of the thing reveals itself more every day," commented Barcelona's *Diario de Barcelona* on December 30, 1898,

if one remembers that the United States, a few months past, solemnly declared that it was only in Cuba and the Philippines in order to emancipate the population from the Spanish yoke, so that they could be independent and autonomous. Now it has established a military occupation in Cuba for an indefinite period. It is probable that the Cuban insurgents will resume the guerilla war that they have been fighting for so long with the Spanish. In the Philippines the Americans are also employing force, with the object of repressing the people's hope for autonomy.¹³

Like many groups outside the United States, the Spanish had gained access to the articles and manifestos published by the various U.S. Anti-Imperialist Leagues and were busily translating them into Spanish and including them, in whole or part, in their own reports on the hostilities. For instance, on January 15, 1899, *Diario de Barcelona's* French correspondent provided a concise summary of one of Senator Hoar's anti-annexation speeches in Congress, noting that Hoar opposed ratification of the treaty based on the argument that the Constitution contained no articles permitting the acquisition or governing of colonies. Annexing the islands, Hoar maintained, would nullify the country's fundamental doctrines.¹⁴ The Spanish also took pleasure in the frustrations being experienced by their former colonists: on February 11, 1899, reporting on General Otis's

January 4 announcement that the United States would maintain sovereignty over the Philippines for the archipelago's protection, the correspondent from Madrid smugly noted that "the document demonstrates little beyond promises of liberty behind which lie an absolute military domination, a thousand times more tyrannical than was ours."¹⁵

Far more than other European countries, the Spanish perceived their conflict with the Americans as a continuation of the religious struggles of the Reformation. On January 7, 1899, *La Vanguardia* published a front-page article that suggests how keenly the Spanish understood American imperialism as an expression of Americans' faith in their Protestant mission abroad. Reported by the paper's columnist Juan Buscón, the article tells the story of Mathias Heller, a zealous Presbyterian minister in Connecticut who, according to Buscón, told McKinley that it was imperative that the United States establish "the strictest beliefs and practices of the English Reformation" in its new colony. "We must force this unhappy people to eternal salvation," he is reported to have said, "and where the force of the Bible does not persuade, then the force of our guns will do so." And the article somewhat dryly concludes that for Heller, "the best thing [McKinley] can do is to send Mathias Heller to the Governor General of the Archipelago, accompanied by many Protestant preachers and above all, many regiments."¹⁶ To the Spaniards, Heller's zealotry, though comic, nevertheless revealed the Protestant values underlying the Americans' campaign for hearts and minds in their new territories.

Nuestra América

If the Spanish press took a certain pleasure in pointing out that for all their talk about independence, their former possessions had only acquired new masters, Latin Americans were outraged by their northern neighbor's acts. The American Revolution had inspired revolutions in Latin America from the end of the eighteenth century, and like the Spanish reformers, Latin American nationalists hung pictures of George Washington next to portraits of Simon Bolivar. However, the Monroe Doctrine, originally designed to protect some of the smaller and weaker Latin American countries from predatory imperialists by declaring the Americas off-limits to European expansion, in effect gave the United States dominion over the entire hemisphere. After the Americans annexed nearly half of Mexico's territory in 1848 and "Manifest Destiny" became a popular concept, repeated calls by U.S. filibusters for the annexation of Cuba, Nicaragua,

and other countries—William Walker's attempted takeover of Nicaragua in the 1850s being the most famous example—continued to keep Latin Americans looking nervously over their shoulders. On the economic and social fronts, U.S. economic success, as manifested by a constantly rising standard of living, stimulated envy at the same time that it inspired accusations that Americans cared more about money than about ideas. A significant portion of the Latin American intelligentsia felt that the United States had sold its soul for prosperity; these intellectuals decried the intellectual and emotional emptiness of American life and values. They also understood the Protestant fervor at the base of the American narrative of freedom and natural rights, a position that they resented, as both Catholics and as nationalists who, they reminded the Yankees, were also "Americans." As a consequence, the Spanish-American War saw many leery of U.S. rhetoric about bringing freedom to oppressed peoples, and the annexation of Puerto Rico and the Philippines confirmed their worst fears.

José Martí, José Enrique Rodó, and Rubén Darío, three Latin American writers who profoundly affected late nineteenth and early twentieth-century Latin American thought, together articulated the ambivalences about the United States expressed by many citizens of Spain's former colonies. Not all of these men commented directly on the Spanish-American War; Martí, for instance, died three years before its inception. But they did all comment on the United States, often with apprehension. Like the Spanish, they tended to see U.S. and Latino cultures as opposites, and also like the Spanish, they tended to frame the struggle in religious terms. Seeking to preserve Latin American culture from the emptiness and materiality that they saw pervading U.S. life, these Americans presented a sharp critique of U.S. ideals that was calculated to counter the white Protestant culture that they feared.

José Martí

José Martí died a martyr in 1895, well before the Spanish-American War. A Cuban nationalist who had been briefly imprisoned for his participation in the first Cuban uprising against the Spanish in 1868, Martí joined General Máximo Gómez during Cuba's third uprising in 1895, only to be killed in battle with Spanish troops. Between his first and his last participation in the resistance, he had lived outside Cuba for most of his life. Fifteen of those years were spent in New York City, where he wrote poetry, provided correspondence for several Latin American

newspapers, and contributed numerous letters and articles to U.S. papers. He also served as a nerve center for the Cuban resistance within the United States and as a touchstone for Latin American consciousness in the northern hemisphere. An acute observer, Martí wrote extensively about the United States and its populations, as well as about Cuban-Spanish relations, Latin America generally, and his vision for a Free Cuba.

Like Mark Twain (whose *Connecticut Yankee* Martí compared to *Don Quixote* and which he sent to a friend's son in Mexico shortly after it was published¹⁷), Martí's relationship with the United States encompassed his own ambivalences. His many years in the country, scrutinizing its peoples and its cultures, gave him far more insight into the American psyche than most European commentators possessed. Although he wrote glowingly of many of the country's institutions, great men, and progressive movements, he also criticized its injustices and its superficialities. From his first days in the United States, the country's size and energies amazed him: in "Impressions of America (By A Very Fresh Spaniard)," written during his first visit to the United States in 1880, he commented with awe on the American proclivity for constant busyness, even in the height of August's heat waves. He also asked whether devoting such energy to business contributed "in the same extent to the development of these high and noble anxieties of soul, that cannot be forgotten by a people who want to escape from unavoidable ruin . . . Material power, as that of Carthage, if it rapidly increases, rapidly falls down. . . . Life wants permanent roots; life is unpleasant without the comforts of intelligence, the pleasures of art and the internal gratification that the goodness of the soul and the exquisiteness of taste produce to us."¹⁸ For Martí—and as we shall see, for writers such as Rubén Darío—U.S. industry and prosperity presented a peculiar challenge: as evidence of the progress that could be made by a former colony they were admirable, a model to the rest of the hemisphere, but as evidence of a materialistic culture eager to extend itself beyond its geopolitical borders they were alien and threatening. To these Catholic Americans, deeply immersed in developing and describing their own very different populations and traditions, U.S. culture, for all its young power, appeared empty, materialistic, soulless.

During his years in the United States, young Martí came to terms with much of the country's culture (he moved, for instance, from lamenting the forwardness of American women to applauding the public speaking skills of Vassar College's graduates), but he maintained his identity as a Cuban

revolutionary and the loyalties—and resentments—that identity entailed. Nine years after questioning Americans' spiritual life, he explained Latin American ambivalence about the United States.

They admire this nation, the greatest ever built by liberty . . . They have made of the heroes of this country their own heroes, and look to the success of the American commonwealth as the crowning glory of mankind; but they cannot . . . believe that excessive individualism, reverence for wealth, and the protracted exultation of a terrible victory are preparing the United States to be the typical nation of liberty, where no opinion is to be based in greed, and no triumph or acquisition reached against charity and justice. We love the country of Lincoln as much as we fear the country of Cutting. (“A Vindication of Cuba,” SW, 263–64)

The last line contrasts Abraham Lincoln, the liberator of American slaves, to Francis Cutting, a prominent annexationist who, Martí implies, would enslave Cuba. This long letter to the editor is intended to make the readers of the *New York Evening Post* reevaluate several recent articles that had labeled Cubans effeminate, lazy, morally defective, and unfit for self-government. Martí's goal was to gain Americans' help in the revolutionary cause while making it clear that he was not advocating annexation. Noting that “the political knowledge of the average Cuban compares well with that of the average American citizen,” Martí challenges the United States to consider what it would look like if “the nation that was rocked in freedom, and received for three centuries the best blood of liberty-loving men, [employs] the power thus acquired in depriving a less fortunate neighbor of his liberty” (SW, 266). Martí's closing argument accuses the United State of having already proven itself uninterested in extending its own liberties to its neighbors when it refused to assist the Cuban revolutionaries. “A Vindication of Cuba” is the kind of argument that explains why Mark Twain believed that U.S. intervention in Cuba had been a moment of national greatness; we do not know if Twain read Martí's writings, but Martí's ideas provide at least some of the background for the government's decision to invade the island.

Martí's bitterness about U.S. policies toward Cuba and the Cubans did not stop him from continuing to observe the United States and its inhabitants, comparing and contrasting Latin America and its northern neighbor on cultural, intellectual, political, and racial grounds. Writing

in *Patria*, the Cuban Revolutionary newspaper that he founded in New York, Martí lays out his understanding of the United States, especially its demographic diversity and its relationship to its Latin neighbors. Unlike U.S. politicians, Martí cautions his fellow Cubans to see the country as a highly diverse, politically fractured population. “Not only have the elements of diverse origin and tendency from which the United States was created failed, in three centuries of shared life and one century of political control, to merge, but their forced coexistence is exacerbating and accentuating their primary differences” (“The Truth About the United States,” SW, 330). Painting an increasingly contentious and corrupt U.S. social and political landscape, Martí warns “the American peoples of Spanish descent” not to fall into “servitude to a damaged and alien civilization.” He labels the United States’s claim to be uplifting its neighbors “a barren and irrational aspiration, the cowardly aspiration of secondary and inadequate people, to seek to achieve the stability of a foreign nation by paths that differ from those that led the envied nation to security and order by its own efforts and by the adaptation of human liberty to the forms required by the particular makeup of the country” (SW, 331).

For Martí, “democracy,” “freedom,” and “independence” are flexible political goals. “Ideas, like trees, must grow from deep roots,” he admonishes, “and must be adapted to the soil in which they are planted in order to grow and prosper.” Blind transplantation of institutions from one country to another results in “monsters, . . . not nations” (SW, 331). As he also elaborated in his essay “Our America” (“Nuestra América”), “to govern well, one must attend closely to the reality of the place that is governed” (SW, 290). In “The Truth About the United States” he argues that the Latin countries must probe the depths of their differences from the North Americans and believe in their own surging potential: “the North American character has declined since its independence, and is less humane and virile today, while the Hispanoamerican, from any point of view, is superior today” (SW, 332).

Coming out of well over a decade of close study of the United States and its peoples, and from his fervent belief in a new kind of Latin American civilization, Martí’s vision posits a rise and fall of civilizations. The North American civilization, founded in hope and principle, has seen itself fractured by difference and corruption, whereas the Latin republics are now poised to emerge as the new American civilization. In keeping with this, Martí celebrated Latin Catholicism and racial heterogeneity as a contrast

to Anglo-Saxon claims to Protestantism and racial unity. “Our feet upon a rosary, our heads white, and our bodies a motley of Indian and criollo we boldly entered the community of nations,” he declares of the formation of Latin American republics in “Nuestra América.” “Bearing the standard of the Virgin, we went out to conquer our liberty” (SW, 291). And although he decries the faulty paths that Latin republics had taken on their journeys toward realizing that liberty, he also believes that “the real man is being born to America, in these real times” (SW, 293), and that Latin American culture will triumph—at least as long as aggressive forces from the north can be withstood.

Rubén Darío

For Jose Martí, then, Latin America was the new cradle of yet another New World—a counterweight to the Protestant, materialist, and ideologically racist United States. He was joined in that vision by Nicaragua’s Rubén Darío. A decade younger than Martí, Darío was first and foremost a poet, a revolutionary in the arts far more than in politics. Leader of the *modernismo* movement in Latin America, his aesthetic allegiances to Europe, to European Romanticism, and to the Symbolists and Parnassians make him an unlikely candidate to represent Latin American attitudes toward the United States. Yet the Spanish-American War and the annexation of Puerto Rico and the Philippines profoundly affected him, giving rise to at least one stunning poem of resistance and to other writings expressing his own, and his contemporaries’, rage. Like Martí, Darío spent years outside of his own country; unlike Martí, most of that time was spent in Europe and other Latin American countries rather than the United States. Like Martí, Darío worked as a journalist, writing in particular for the internationally read *La Nación* of Buenos Aires. Unlike Martí, he also served as a diplomat for his home country, traveling extensively, perhaps obsessively, throughout his life: to Spain, France, Honduras, Argentina, Chile, El Salvador, Panama, Costa Rica, Cuba. Although he visited the United States briefly—in part to meet Martí—the majority of his international experiences took place in Europe and Latin America.

Darío, then, lacked Martí’s intimacy with the United States and its inhabitants. However *modernismo*, the artistic movement in which he was deeply engaged, carried with it a commitment to the Hispanic past and faith in the development of Hispanic cultures independent both of Spain

and of the United States. Although the critical debates about the history of *modernismo* show that there was—and remains—considerable dispute over the movement’s major thrust, at least one element in it emphasized the development of a specifically Latin American identity.¹⁹ Darío’s protest against the United States sprang from his commitment to that identity; he feared the influence of North American culture as much as he feared the overt threat of American political control. Like Martí, he was impressed by North American energies but also saw U.S. culture as a vast wasteland. Like most non-Anglo-Saxon Catholics, he resented white American claims to racial superiority and Protestant claims to be practicing the only valid form of Christianity. In response to U.S. arguments that they were uplifting backwards races, he created a counternarrative that celebrated Latin Americans as soulful, passionate, devout, and Catholic. Even more than Martí’s “Nuestra América,” Darío’s writings suggest that the latent power of Hispanic America was ready to burst forth, overpowering the weakened and corrupted North. “From Mexico to Tierra del Fuego, there is an immense continent in which the ancient seed has been sown, and the vital sap, the future greatness of our race, is about to begin once more to run,” he declares in “The Triumph of Caliban.” “From Europe, from the universe, there comes a vast cosmopolitan wind, which will help to invigorate our jungle.”²⁰ Conscious of the Anglo-American alliance, especially the myth of common blood that the British periodicals employed to convince the Americans of their sibling relationship, Darío posits an identical bond for the Hispanic world: “when the moment comes, and politics and policies and interests of another species rear their heads, our peoples feel the rush of common blood and the rush of common spirit.” He makes the enemy explicit:

Do you not see how the English enjoy the triumph of the United States, locking away in the vault of the Bank of England their old rancors, the memory of past struggles? Do you not see how the democratic, plebeian Yankee throws up his three *hurrahs!* And sings “God Save the Queen” when a ship flying the Union Jack passes by? And together, they think: “The day will come when the United States and England own the world.”

And that is why our race must unite, as body and soul unite, at moments of tribulation. We are the sentimental, feeling race, but we have also been masters of power; the sun has not abandoned us, and the renaissance is ours, by ancestral inheritance. (SW, 510–11)

Drawing on a mythic, Native American racial consciousness and wedding it to the inheritance from Spain, Darío suggests that the Latin Americans have more authenticity, a longer history of power, than the blue-eyed Anglo-Saxons of the North. “Ariel”—Darío’s symbol for Latin America—will yet triumph over Caliban.

Invested in Latin American potential, Darío was also conscious of impediments to its realization. In “The Threat of Yankee Imperialism,” a short section reprinted in the collection *Tantos Vigores Dispersos*, Darío quotes a French commentator on the relations between Hispanic America and the United States and among the Latin countries themselves:

If Brazil, Argentina, and Chile would abandon their intestinal quarrels and rivalries, achieve political stability, and consecrate themselves to cultivating the marvelous riches of their soil, in a quarter or half a century, they would see power in this region so constitute itself that they would be able to counterbalance Anglo-Saxon America, and render useless the United States’ cherished dream of panamerican hegemony.²¹

Hoping that “the thoughtful among us” would listen to these suggestions, Darío feared that if they did not, North American materiality would overcome Latin American spirituality. “The Marvelous Red Gorillas,” possibly his most famous essay on the United States, establishes his hostility toward Anglo-Saxon cultures: “No, No I cannot; I do not want to be part of these silver-toothed buffaloes. They are my enemies, they are hated by Latin blood, they are the barbarians.”²² He describes the North American landscape, both physical and spiritual:

I have seen the Yankees, in their smoky cities of iron and stone, and the hours that I have passed among them have been anxious ones. It seemed to me that I felt a mountainous oppression, I felt like I was breathing in a country of Cyclops, eaters of raw meat, bestial blacksmiths, inhabitants of mastodons’ houses. Red, heavy, greasy, they walk along their streets pushing and shoving animatedly, hunting the dollar. The minds of these Calibans are circumscribed by the purse and the factory. They eat, they count, they drink whisky and make millions. . . . [T]hey are enemies of all ideality. . . . They have temples to all the gods and believe in none. They are imitators and counterfeiters in the arts and sciences, these marvelous red gorillas. But all the time in the world will not serve to polish the enormous beast.

No, I do not want to be part of them, I cannot be part of the triumph of Caliban.²³

Even in the midst of his anger, however, Darío also expresses the ambivalence, the mixture of admiration with anger, that characterized the Latin American response to the United States in those days. Darío's primary target was Theodore Roosevelt, who called for honesty between nations but who had personally invaded Cuba and had overseen the annexation of the Philippines.²⁴ Darío's most direct attack was motivated by the promulgation of the "Roosevelt Corollary," which interpreted the Monroe Doctrine to permit the United States to exercise police powers throughout the western hemisphere. His apprehensions were right; over the years, the corollary would be used to sanction U.S. interventions in Cuba, Nicaragua, Haiti, and the Dominican Republic.²⁵ "To Roosevelt" (1904), a poem, compacts Darío's countermythology, his ambivalence about the United States, and his symbolic use of American figures into vivid, image-laden verse, brilliant in Spanish and still forceful in its English translation. Sardonically addressing Roosevelt as the "Great Hunter," at once "primitive and modern, simple and complicated . . . arrogant and strong, exemplary of your race," he figures him as the nation's representative:

You yourself are the United States.
 You will be a future invader
 Of naïve America, the one with Indian blood
 That still prays to Jesus Christ and still speaks the Spanish tongue.

Having delineated the two Americas, he accuses the United States of assuming that its form of civilization, and the violence it sanctions, makes it the emblem of progress:

You think that life is one big fire,
 that progress is just eruption,
 that wherever you put bullets,
 you put the future, too.
 No.

And with that "No," that flat denial of North American triumph, the poet launches his counteroffensive. There is a shadow menacing the United States, the shadow of Latin American potential. Even though

“The U.S. is a country that is powerful and strong. /When the giant yawns and stretches, the earth feels a tremor,” nevertheless it is haunted by “our own America . . . America of the great Moctezuma and Inca . . . Catholic America and Spanish America.” That Catholic, Spanish, Indian America,

lives with you, with your Saxon eyes and barbaric souls.
 And dreams. And loves, and vibrates; it's the daughter of the Sun.
 Be careful. Spanish America is alive and well! . . .
 Roosevelt, you'd need to be transfigured by God himself . . .
 To finally capture us in your talons of iron.

According to Darío, the peoples who had arrived before the Anglo-Saxons remain embedded within the United States—both in the Native American communities and in the Hispanic populations of states like Louisiana and California that had been wrested from the Spanish and the Mexicans. These communities stand on the sidelines of the Anglo-Saxon conversation but observe, like Martí, and bide their time. In the face of Anglo-Saxon convictions that America's missions, including Manifest Destiny, are divinely inspired, Darío hurls back Latin America's response: “. . . you think you have it all, but one thing is missing: God!” (SW, 119–21)

In accusing the United States of godlessness, Darío rejects American claims that annexation and other forms of intervention would bring Christianity to benighted peoples. Speaking from inside the subject position that Kipling belittled as a “loved Egyptian night,” Darío, by force of his writing, illuminates the darkness, showing its richness and its passions. Like Spain and Catholic Europe, he correctly reads the Spanish-American War as a religious struggle disguised as a battle for the Enlightenment, and this poem, in particular, unmask the enemy's lies.

Although the precocious Darío had written an anti-clerical essay in his youth, “El jesuita” (1881), Catholicism was in fact one of the frameworks for his writing and, especially, for his construction of Latin American identity. In his homage to José Martí, written after Martí's death, Darío highlights Martí's religious devotion as a way of locating the hero's Latin American roots, a genius, but also “un hombre— . . . a man. More than that,” Darío tells us, Martí “was what the true superman should be: grand and virile, possessed of the secret of his excellence, in communion with God and with nature.”

In communion with God lived this man of soft yet immense heart . . .
 And in communion with God he was, having ascended to God by the
 firmest and surest stairway—the stairway of pain. . . . He rose to God by
 the path of compassion and by the path of pain. . . . (SW, 447)

Eulogizing Martí as a man of faith, and writing as one himself, Darío also positions his precursor within the United States, noting that his years in New York were his most productive. “It was there that one saw Martí the thinker, Martí the philosopher, Martí the painter, Martí the musician, Martí the poet . . . With incomparable magic, he portrayed the United States alive and palpitating, with its sun and its souls” (SW, 449). For Darío, Martí’s identity is rooted in nation and in religion, making him both a leader for his own peoples and the ideal observer-critic of the North American scene. Darío reads the Martí of “Nuestra América”—the name Martí used to designate the America of the Indian, the Catholic, and the Spaniard—as the counter-figure to what Roosevelt represented. Whereas the North American leader was aggressive, barbaric, and godless, the Cuban leader was passionate, religious, and patriotic, using his power with language to express his love for Hispanic America, his faith in God and his desire to free Cuba from domination by others.

José Enrique Rodó

José Martí and Rubén Darío were both native to the Caribbean, a northern hemispheric region that the United States used as a testing ground for imperialism throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. In contrast, José Enrique Rodó (1872–1917) was Uruguayan, from a country well below the equator and little known to most North Americans. In 1900, Rodó published an essay, *Ariel*, that remains the most-referenced formulation of the *modernista* call for an Hispanic culture constructed in contradistinction to the North Americans. Like Darío, Rodó, taking his imagery from Shakespeare’s *The Tempest*, posited the United States as Caliban and Latin America as Ariel. The essay’s narrative voice is Rodó, age 29 when he wrote it, in the guise of Prospero, the elder, teacher, and sage.

Darío and Rodó were not the first writers to take *The Tempest* outside of its original contexts. One of the major adaptations was Ernest Renan’s *Caliban: Suite de “La Tempête,”* published in 1878. In this French reading of Shakespeare’s play, Caliban, returned to Italy with Prospero,

illustrates Renan's pessimism about the intellectual and cultural advantages of democracy. Like Renan, most Europeans viewed Caliban and the Caribbean island on which the play took place as sites either for white fantasies about the ethnic Other or allegories about European political disputes. However, Darío and Rodó shifted the narrative; in their writings, the island and its characters became a location for rehearsing the story of imperialism and enslavement within the contexts of the Americas. Unlike later postcolonial writers, both Rodó and Darío adopt Shakespeare's dichotomy between the spirit Ariel and the brutish Caliban. They posit the United States as Caliban, emblem of materialism, and the Latin American states as Ariel, emblem of the spiritual. Together Darío and Rodó use the framework of a British play, refracted through a French adaptation, to signal the essential differences between the North Americans and Latin America.

Ariel is a monologue. Prospero, a teacher, sits beside a statue of Ariel, who symbolizes "the noble, soaring aspect of the human spirit."²⁶ Prospero insists that his students must ground their personal, social, and political lives in spiritual rather than material values. Urging them to "aspire . . . to develop to the fullest possible measure the totality of your being" (A, 41), Prospero inveighs against utilitarianism, a "false and vulgarized concept that conceives of education as totally subordinate to a utilitarian end" (A, 41). The model for the life of the spirit should be Athens, which promulgated "a concept of life based on the total harmony of all human faculties and the mutual agreement that all energies should be directed toward the glory and power of mankind" (A, 43).

If Athens is the exemplum for the virtuous society, the United States represents its antithesis. Rodó carefully posits the United States and the classical world as moral and cultural opposites, redefining New World concepts like "democracy" and pointing out the Americans' mistakes. In contrast to the Americans, Rodó imagines a democracy of the elite, something akin to the "talented tenth" envisioned by the African American activist/intellectual W. E. B. DuBois in his 1903 study of race relations in America, *The Souls of Black Folk*. In *Ariel* Prospero insists that "A democracy, like an aristocracy, will recognize the distinction of quality; but it will favor truly superior qualities—those of virtue, character, and mind" (A, 67). Whereas DuBois argued that the talented tenth would uplift the rest of the community, Rodó rejects the idea that inferior minds can be uplifted. He believes that only a spiritual and intellectual elite can lead Latin America. For Rodó, it is a scientifically proven fact that

“hierarchical order is a necessary condition for all progress” (A, 69). For that reason he believes that American democracy has institutionalized “egalitarian mediocrity as a norm for social relationships” (A, 70). Through Prospero, he warns against “*USA-mania*” (A, 71)—the tendency, increasingly pronounced, to emulate the United States socially as well as politically and economically.

Like both Martí and Darío, Rodó sees Protestant and Catholic cultures as producing radically different individuals. Rodó traces U.S. mediocrity to the religious orientation of its founders, who, he claims, balanced a fierce commitment to individualism with an equal commitment to social engagement. “Each [American] marches forward to conquer life in the same way the first Puritans set out to tame the wilderness,” Prospero observes. “Persevering devotees of that cult of individual energy that makes each man the author of his own destiny, they have modeled their society on an imaginary assemblage of Crusoes . . . [and yet] they have at the same time created from the spirit of association . . . a plan of research, philanthropy, and industry.” Significantly, Rodó understands the power of the American common school system to create new citizens: “[T]hey have made the school the hub of their prosperity, and a child’s soul the most valued of all precious commodities” (A, 75). In themselves, these qualities—individualism, a strong communal ethic, and a passion for universal education—are excellent. But they are also limited because they restrict Americans’ horizons to the immediate, the material: “their culture is . . . admirably efficient as long as it is directed to the practical goal of realizing an immediate end” (A, 75–76).

For Rodó there is much to be admired about the United States. The Puritan strain encourages morality and a kind of infinite energy. But the celebration of practicality, the “immediate ends” to which the culture is directed, makes a cultural goal of what should be merely a means. The U.S. school system produced “a universal semi-culture, accompanied by the diminution of high culture.” He objected to the leveling effect of general education. “To the same degree that basic ignorance has diminished in that gigantic democracy, wisdom and genius have correspondingly disappeared” (A, 82).

The upshot of all this, for Rodó, is that “as an entity,” U.S. civilization “creates a singular impression of insufficiency and emptiness” (A, 79). Rather than formulating new ideals, the American genius demonstrates an “eternal preoccupation with material triumphs” (A, 79). Americans have energy, material comforts, and an extraordinary ability to innovate, but

they have basically no ideas, much less ideals; in the midst of their plenty, they are spiritually empty, intellectually void; they enjoy wealth but have no sense of beauty, “good taste has eluded [them]” (A, 81). Like Matthew Arnold, who had already critiqued the United States on much the same grounds, Rodó celebrates the spiritual and the intellectual—immaterial qualities—over the practical and tangible.

Prospero's point is that his students should celebrate the spiritual nature of Latin culture rather than yearning for the world's riches. “Everything in *our* contemporary America that is devoted to the dissemination and defense of selfless spiritual idealism—art, science, morality, religious sincerity, a politics of ideas—must emphasize its unswerving faith in the future” (A, 94; emphasis added). And the Latin American future that he envisions balances spirituality with action, thoughtfulness with enthusiasm. Prospero concludes by asking his students to keep Ariel's image in their hearts as an emblem of their goals. “Once affirmed in the bastion of your inner being, Ariel will go forth in the conquest of souls . . . Often I am transported by the dream that . . . that the Andes, soaring high above our America, may be carved to form the pedestal for this statue, the immutable altar for its veneration” (A, 100).

Ariel is a call to resist cultural imperialism. Rodó's prescience lay in his understanding that *U.S.-mania*—the admiration for all things North American—could lead to slavish imitation, which was an open invitation to U.S. corporations to export American material culture. Latin America's spirituality, its sense of communal heritage, would be buried under the weight of North American's goods. This would be as great a threat to Latin American identity as armed interventions. For Rodó, Latin America should choose a developmental process rooted in Spanish and Native cultures, Catholicism, and above all, a commitment to ideality above materiality.

At the turn into the twentieth century, then, Latin American intellectuals, fired by the vision of North American military and cultural imperialism, were formulating a counter ideology to the U.S. narrative. In contrast to the U.S. valuation of individualism, Protestantism, and homogeneity, the Latin American voices valued communalism, Catholicism, and racial diversity. Whether the Latin American countries actually enacted those values was in the end no more relevant than the fact that the idea of a racially and religiously homogeneous United States was a myth. These transnational narratives were intended to unite often squabbling Latin American countries in order to resist an increasing threat from the

north. The Latin American counternarrative, however, also provides us with a means of measuring the Filipino response to the American occupation. By 1898 Latin America had had nearly a century to adjust to the Yankees' efforts to annex their neighbors, and their narratives developed out of those repeated experiences. For the Filipinos, annexation came as an unexpected, and unwelcome, surprise.

Chapter 6

1. “Noli me tangere” is Latin for “touch me not.” In St. John’s narrative of Christ’s death and resurrection, Jesus says these words to Mary Magdalene when she encounters him, newly risen, at the mouth to the sepulcher where his body had been laid the previous night. See St. John 20:17, in the Vulgate (Latin) or the King James (English) bibles. My warm thanks to my colleague Stanley F. Lombardo for his kind assistance here.

2. José Rizal. *An Eagle’s Flight: A Filipino Novel Adapted from Noli Me Tangere* (New York: McClure, Phillips & Co., 1901).

3. In *Mark Twain’s Library: A Reconstruction*, Alan Gribben quotes Isabel Lyon’s diary entry of 1906, recording that Twain had read her both Rizal’s poem and his own. Twain’s version was dated May, 1901, from New York City, and he originally laid it loose in his copy of *An Eagle’s Flight*. In 1966, Arthur Scott reprinted the poem in *On the Poetry of Mark Twain* (University of Illinois Press), now long out of print. My sincere thanks to Kevin Bochynski, who provided me with an electronic copy of the poem and of Scott’s commentary.

4. Martí knew and admired Twain’s writings, but there is no evidence that Twain was aware of the Cuban journalist, even though they frequented the same scenes in New York City, including, if Justin Kaplan is correct, sitting on the stage together at Madison Square Garden on April 14, 1887, when Walt Whitman gave a lecture on the 22nd anniversary of Lincoln’s assassination. See Justin Kaplan, *Walt Whitman: A Life* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1980), 29. My thanks to David H. Fears for bringing this to my attention.

5. Sylvia L. Hilton and Steve J. S. Ickringill, eds., *European Perceptions of the Spanish-American War of 1898* (Berne: Peter Lang, 1999), 33. Abbreviated H&I.

6. L. Slominsky, *Vestnik Evropy*, April 1898, p. 825, and *Vestnik Inostrannoi Literatury*, 252–53, as quoted in H&I, 130.

7. Serge Ricard, “The French Press and Brother Jonathan: Editorializing the Spanish-American Conflict,” H&I, 144.

8. Hess was *Le Figaro*’s correspondent in Hong Kong. “A French View of the War in the Philippines,” dated Hong Kong June 20, 1899, published in *Le Figaro* July 28, 1899; reprinted in *The Public*, no. 72 (Vol.2), August 19, 1899, 13–16, this excerpt p. 13.

9. Nico A. Bootsma, “Reactions to the Spanish-American War in the Netherlands and in the Dutch East Indies,” H&I, 35–52.

10. Markus M. Hugo, “‘Uncle Sam I Cannot Stand, for Spain I Have No Sympathy’: An Analysis of Discourse about the Spanish-American War in Imperial Germany, 1898–1899,” H&I, 70–93.

11. Al empezar el año de 1899 ¡cuán distinto es el cuadro trazado! Especialmente ha perdido una tercera parte de su territorio; en Puerto Rico, Cuba, y Filipinas ondea el pabellón norte-americano; aquellos buques de guerra, en los

que tantas esperanzas cifrábamos, se hundieron en la mar sin poder combatir con los barcos enemigos; aquellos ejércitos enviados á Cuba y Filipinas no existen; han regresado á la patria enfermos y sin gloria aquellos soldados que sobrevivieron en la terrible lucha sostenida con los separatistas y con el clima traidor de nuestras colonias; la paz de Filipinas fue rota por la impudicia y mala fe yankee; en Puerto Rico los hasta entonces leals españoles cometieron con la patria el horrendo crimen de la traición y de la ingratitude. Esto es lo que nos deja el año que acaba, y el que mañana empieza nos sorprende en medio de tanta ruina y desolación tan grande, que apenas si quedan alientos para pedir de nuevo á Dios venturas para este infortunado país. . . . En fin, todo el mundo grita hoy, llevando al cielo su pensamiento; ¡Dios tenga piedad de España en el año nuevo!—C. De C. “Correspondencias Particulares de Diario de Barcelona,” *Diario de Barcelona*, 2 enero, 1899, 76–77 (my trans.).

12. Sylvia Hilton, in H&I, 62.

13. “La ironía de las cosas se advierte mas á cada dia que transcurre, si se recuerda que los Estados Unidos, hace pocos meses, declaraban solemnemente que en Cuba y en Filipinas solo trataban de emancipar las poblaciones del yugo español, para que pudiesen ser independientes y autónomos. Ahora se procede a la ocupación militar de Cuba por un período indefinido. Es probable que los insurrectos cubanos acabarán por hacerles la misma guerra de guerrillas con la cual han combatido por tanto tiempo á los españoles. En las Filipinas emplearán tambien la fuerza los americanos al objeto de reprimir las aspiraciones autónomas de la población.” *Diario de Barcelona*, December 30, 1898, 140 (my trans.).

14. En el Senado Americano M. Hoar abrió la campaña contra la política anexionista del gobierno en materia de territorios extranjeros. M. Hoar combatió la ratificación del tratado de paz Hispano-Americano, apoyándose en que la Constitución americana no contiene ningun artículo que permita la adquisición y el gobierno de una dependencia que no se encuentra en condiciones de ser admitida como Estado ó como territorio de la Union americana. Hizo observar el orador que el gobierno no tenia derecho de adquirir ningun territorio extranjero, ni de gobernarlo sin su consentimiento. La adquisición de territorios como las Filipinas situados á miles de kilómetros de distancia de los Estados Unidos y habitados por razas inferiores, incapaces de ejercer derechos políticos, viene á anular la doctrinas y el pueblo americano se hallan embriagados por la conquista y no dispuestos á escuchar los consejos de la prudencia, es muy probable que mas adelante recuerden las advertencias de los que deseaban impedir que su país se metiese en aventuras peligrosas y siempre costosísimas. *Diario de Barcelona*, 15 enero, 1899, 569 (my trans.).

15. . . . el documento no acusa mas que muchas promesas de libertad tras un dominio militar absoluto, mas tiránico cien mil veces que el tan criticado nuestro. . . . *Diario de Barcelona*, 11 de febrero, 1899, 1737–39 (my trans.).

16. Y si hoy hemos sacado á colación el nombre y las ideas del piadoso pastor, ha sido por encontrar en una hoja extranjera un singular ex-abrupto del mismo. Mathias Héller, que á pesar de todos los vicios y defectos inherentes á la raza yankee, cree en la absoluta superioridad de ésta sobre todas las demás razas del globo, es partidario decidido de la política llamada imperialista. Aplauda la anexión de Puerto Rico; aplauda la anexión del Archipiélago filipino, y “espera” que Cuba quedará definitivamente anexionada á la Unión. Pero esa serie de conquistas no las abona el

por motivos de lucro colonial; no. Lo que él exige imperiosamente, en una especie de memorial dirigido á Mac-Kinley, es que éste imponga á los habitantes recientemente anexionados, las creencias y las prácticas más severas de la Inglesia reformada. Singularmente en Filipinas. “Hay que obligar á esos infelices indios—dice— a la salvación eterna” y donde no llegue la fuerza persuasiva de la Biblia, llegue la fuerza convincente de las carabinas.” Lo mejor que puede hacer, por lo tanto el Jefe de la Unión, es enviar de gobernador general al Archipiélago a Mathias Héller, acompañado por supuesto de muchos predicadores protestantes y sobre todo de muchos regimientos. *La Vanguardia*, “Busca, Buscando,” 7 enero, 1899, 1 (my trans.).

17. See Martí’s *Obras Completas*, 144, 363. In the second letter, Martí notes the vernacular nature of Hank Morgan’s language and the novel’s “moving and profound idea.” My warmest thanks to Laura Lomas, author of *Translating Empire: José Martí, Migrant Latino Subjects, and American Modernities* (Duke University Press, 2008), for this reference. Shelley Fisher Fishkin has edited an anthology of writings about Mark Twain, which includes a full translation, by Edward M. Test, of two of Martí’s letters to Latin American newspapers, contributed under the general title “Escenas Norteamericanas: 1884” (“North American Scenes: 1884”). Both letters focus on Twain’s writings, the first discussing them generally and the second praising *A Connecticut Yankee in King Arthur’s Court* particularly. Martí reads *CY* as a document in the struggle for recognition of the common man. These translations are a wonderful addition to the conversation about Mark Twain’s international impact. See Fishkin, *The Mark Twain Anthology: Great Writers on His Life and Work*.

18. Martí, *Selected Writings*, 33.

19. Gerard Aching notes that there is little consensus about the actual work that *modernismo* performed. Commentators tend to fall into three camps: seeing the movement purely as an art form, seeing it as a means of forming alliances with Europe, and seeing it as a means of creating cohesiveness among the Latin American intelligencia. See *The Politics of Spanish American modernismo: By exquisite design* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 7.

20. Darío, *Selected Writings*, 511.

21. “Si Brasil, Argentina y Chile, abandonaran sus querellas intestinas y sus rivalidades, hallasen la estabilidad política y se consagrasen a cultivar las riquezas maravillosas de su suelo, se podría ver en un cuarto de siglo, o en medio siglo, constituirse en esa región naciones potentes, capaces de contrapesar a la América anglosajona, y de hacer en lo de adelante vano el sueño de hegemonía panamericana acariciado por los Estados Unidos” (*Tantos Vigores Dispersos*, 82, my trans.) *Tantos Vigores Dispersos*, the title a line from one of Darío’s poems, is a collection of his short writings. See *Tantos Vigores Dispersos (Ideas Sociales y Políticas)*, Selected and Edited by Jorge Eduardo Arellano (Managua, Nicaragua Libre: Consejo Nacional de Cultura, 1983). Abbreviated TVD.

22. NO, NO PUEDO, no quiero estar de parte de esos búfalos de dientes de plata. Son enemigos míos, son los aborrecedores de la sangre latina, son los Bárbaros (TVD, 83, my trans.).

23. Y los he visto a esos yankees, en sus abrumadoras ciudades de hierro y piedra, y las horas que entre ellos he vivido las he pasado con una vaga angustia. Apréciame sentir la opresión de una montaña, sentía respirar en un país de cíclopes,

comedores de carne cruda, herreros bestiales, habitantes de casas de mastodontes. Colorados, pesados, grasosos, van por sus calles empujándose y rozándose animadamente, a la caza del dollar. El ideal de esos calibanes está circunscrito a la bolsa y a la fábrica. Comen, calculan, beben whisky y hacen millones . . . Enemigos de toda idealidad. . . Tienen templos para todos los dioses y no creen en ninguno . . . En el arte, en la ciencia, todo lo imitan y lo contrahacen, los estupendos gorilas coloradoes. Más todas las rachas de los siglos no podrán pulir la enorme Bestia.

No, no puedo estar de parte de ellos, no puedo estar por el triunfo de Calibán (TVD, 84, my trans.).

24. In “Mr. Roosevelt, a Marvelous Gorilla,” originally published in 1910, Darío cites Roosevelt’s philosophy that the principle requirements for good citizenship should be energy and honesty, then quotes Roosevelt’s own words: “I have never believed that a nation should treat other nations differently than an honest man should treat other men.” According to the endnote in *Tantos Vigores Dispersos*, “Mr. Roosevelt” was originally published, in French, in the *Paris Journal*, May 27, 1910, under the title “The Words and Acts of Mr. Roosevelt.” It was also collected and republished by Margarita Gómez Espinosa in *Rubén Darío, Patriot* (Madrid: Ediciones Triana, 1966, 320–24).

25. See the U.S. Department of State Web site “Diplomacy in Action: Roosevelt Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine, 1903.” www.state.gov/r/pa/ho/time/lp/17660.htm.

26. Rodó, *Ariel*, 31. In his prologue to this edition, Carlos Fuentes notes that the oratorical structure of the essay reflects Rodó’s own roots in classical oratory, and that the essay often functions as a peroration.