

Copyright
by
Courtney Blaine Johnson
2004

The Dissertation Committee for Courtney Blaine Johnson Certifies that this is the approved version of the following dissertation

**(RE)WRITING THE EMPIRE: THE PHILIPPINES AND FILIPINOS
IN THE HISPANIC CULTURAL FIELD, 1880-1898**

Committee:

Nicolas Shumway, Supervisor

César Salgado

Enrique Fierro

Mauricio Tenorio

José Cerna Bazán

**(RE)WRITING THE EMPIRE: THE PHILIPPINES AND FILIPINOS
IN THE HISPANIC CULTURAL FIELD, 1880-1898**

by

Courtney Blaine Johnson, B.A., M.A.

Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Texas at Austin

December, 2004

Dedication

To Dana Maya, Clio Reyna and Palma Gloria

Acknowledgements

The desire, anxiety, hope, aggression and solidarity expressed in the writing considered in this dissertation was expressive of the mutual imbrication of macro-historical processes, institutional structures and the accidents of biography. That is, how one feels about imperial relations or one's sense for the meaning of modernity, for example, depends on the positionalities that one occupies within the matrices of relations that structure them. This project is itself the product of similar imbrications and is expressive of my particular ways of looking and feeling produced in contact with the world I inhabit. In what follows I would like to recognize a few individuals and institutions that have set me on my way toward the completion of this project and have created the conditions in which such a project makes sense.

Above all, Dana Maya is the person who has most comprehensively influenced my ways of thinking and feeling about the world I inhabit. With her I have learned to recognize that both the marvelous and the miserable proceed from the mundane and that honest thinking and feeling proceed from this insight. To say that this project would have been impossible without her influence is to seriously diminish the scope of that influence. The very person I imagine myself to be has emerged in everyday contact with her intelligence and sensibilities.

As they do all families, the accidents of birth and death have dramatically shaped and reshaped my family and I would here like to thank those who have seen these changes through with me thusfar and have taught me to appreciate the diversity of their meanings. My parents Joanne and Brent Rowse have been a reservoir of encouragement and enthusiasm on which I have drawn liberally throughout my life. I would especially like to recognize my mother Joanne who to me has been an exemplar of personal dignity and human decency whatever her circumstances. Even in his absence, the personal legacy of my late father Blaine Johnson continues to influence my life in ways that I am only now beginning to appreciate. While each of my siblings Cindie, Brendon, Mona, Jeff, Jennifer, Jana, Marti and Chris has in his or her own ways made visible to me the many ways of construing one's place in the world, I would especially like to thank my brothers Chris and Jeff who have been companions and friends to me and have never tired in their efforts to share the contagious and profound pleasures of laughter.

I also owe a tremendous debt of gratitude to Gloria Chiunti and José Maldonado for the countless and constant ways in which they have contributed materially and emotionally toward the completion of this dissertation. But in addition to quite literally creating the conditions in which it was possible for me to work through this project, Gloria has continuously demonstrated to me the pleasures of diligence and the duty of delight. For these things and for the concern and *cariño* she has shown me throughout this process I would like to thank her.

Among my friends I would especially like to thank Spencer Bolles, Lennart Sundelin, Russell Cobb, Jaime Marroquín and Ezequiel Peña for their friendship and intellectual companionship.

In my path as a student through various educational institutions beginning in Paradise, California and ending in Austin, Texas I have had many teachers for whom I

feel esteem and gratitude. Among them I would especially like to mention Greg Silva, Terrell Butler, Dru Dougherty, Julio Ramos and Katherine Arens not only for their respective commitments to sound pedagogy, but for communicating to me a passion for ideas that I aspire to emulate.

In this group of exceptional teachers I would like to also include the members of my dissertation committee. I have discovered in writing this dissertation how much the ideas expressed here bear the marks of the influence of the seminars I have taken with Professors Shumway, Salgado, Fierro, Tenorio and Cerna Bazán. To all of them I owe a gesture of thanks for their patience and flexibility in helping me through this project and for their expressions of confidence throughout. To José Cerna Bazán I would like to not only express my thanks for his intellectual influence and mentorship but also for his open-handed friendship and camaraderie in Austin and beyond.

I have a number of people to thank for their assistance and friendship during my time while doing research in Manila. In particular, I would like to thank Ting and the late Dick Boyarski for their aid in getting settled in Manila and express my gratitude to Ces Conaco who not only lent me her remarkable resourcefulness in solving the logistics of my research at the University of the Philippines and elsewhere but also shared with me her ebullient friendship. I would also like to thank a Erwin Bautista and Trinidad Regala at the Department of European Languages at the University of the Philippines who gave me helpful advice and access to the valuable library resources in Diliman. Among others, Arnold Azurin and Neil Garcia revealed to me the complexities of life in Manila and for that I would like to express my thanks. And finally, I would like to thank Father John Schumacher not only for a life of exceptional scholarship but also for his kindness and hospitality.

I would also like to thank the College of Graduate Studies at the University of Texas for a grant that made my trip to the Philippines possible.

And finally I would like to express my gratitude to my new friends and colleagues in Madison and especially to Guido Podestá and Alda Blanco for their confidence and timely assistance in making the transition to a new institution.

**(RE)WRITING THE EMPIRE: THE PHILIPPINES AND FILIPINOS
IN THE HISPANIC CULTURAL FIELD, 1880-1898**

Publication No. _____

Courtney Blaine Johnson, PhD

The University of Texas at Austin, 2004

Supervisor: Nicolas Shumway

This study considers the impact of imperialism, travel and travel writing on the Hispanic cultural field in the decades immediately preceding the imperial *desastre* of 1898. In particular, it traces the consequences of the integration of Filipino intellectuals into the metropolitan literary system based in Madrid. Traditionally, cultural histories of the pre-1898 period of Hispanic culture, and especially literary histories, have emphasized the “nation” as the principal unit of cultural analysis. This study attempts to recover an overlooked yet dynamic imperial cultural field in which literature was produced, distributed and consumed both in the metropole (Spain) and in the remaining and former colonies of Spain (Cuba, Puerto Rico and, especially the Philippines). This study focuses on travel writing insofar as it constitutes a strategic imperial literary form since in the trajectories it follows and the communities of readers it addresses, travel writing reveals how an imperial “geographic imaginary” could be used to reinforce or undermine the meaning of spatial relations in what geographer David Harvey has called

the “interpretive grid of modernity.” To tease out the role of imperial thinking in the cultural and political lives of intellectuals from the metropole and from the imperial periphery, this study focuses principally, but not exclusively, on the Filipino novelist and anticolonial writer José Rizal and on the metropolitan novelist and literary critic Emilia Pardo Bazán. In the case of the former, I consider his efforts to decolonize cultural and political relations between the metropole and the Philippines and consider the importance of travel and writing by him and his “colonial” contemporaries to that end. This study considers Emilia Pardo Bazán’s writing as a case study in what I call “imperial fantasy” and whereby I trace the psychological importance of the imperial periphery to the meaning of metropolitan “national” identity especially in the turbulent circumstances of the rapid expansion of Eurocolonial rule around the globe.

Table of Contents

Introduction: Culture and Imperialism: Filipino Writing and Imperial Fantasies ...	1
Filipino Writing and Imperial Culture	5
Emilia Pardo Bazán’s Imperial Fantasies	8
(Anti)Imperial Practices of Reading and Writing	10
Dignity and the Problem of Modernity	15
Travel, Writing, and the Metropolitan Contact Zone	18
Literature’s Prosthetic Authority	22
The World Literary System	23
Chapter 1: (Un)knowable Communities: Travel, Writing and National Consciousness	38
Provincializing Spain: Domingo Faustino Sarmiento the Anticolonial Traveler	48
Hostos’s <i>Peregrinación de la Solidaridad</i>	57
José Martí and the “viajero justo”	64
José Rizal and the Fragmentation of the Metropolitan Community of Readers	74
(Un)imagined Communities: Creole novels and newspapers	80
Creole Pilgrims: The Case of Jacobo de Villarrutia	89
<i>The Missing allá in Anderson’s Rizal</i>	95
The Spectres and Demons of Empire	104
Chapter 2: <i>La juventud filipina: La Solidaridad</i> , Travel and the Metropolitan Contact Zone	107
<i>La Solidaridad</i> and Anticolonial Solidarity	108
Modernity and Cosmopolitan Desire in the “Colony”	130
The colonial literary system in the Philippines	135
The emergence of the <i>juventud filipina</i>	140
Rizal’s “Los viajes” and the anticolonial pilgrimage	148

Chapter 3: “El Sentimiento de la Dignidad Ultrajada”: Spain and the “New” Imperial Consensus.....	160
Imperial Contradictions: Núñez de Arce in the African Campaign.....	166
Liberal Imperialists and the Reinvention of the Philippines as a “colony”	174
Pablo Feced’s <i>Filipinas</i>	183
Chapter 4: <i>Costumbrismo</i> , Travel Writing and the “Imperial Difference”.....	190
<i>Costumbrismo</i> , errores comunes, and “ojos extranjeros”.....	196
<i>La Ilustración de Madrid</i> and the Ethics of Representation.....	206
Imperial Travel Writing.....	213
Un viaje de novios: a costumbrista pilgrimage.....	220
Chapter 5: <i>La cuestión (palpitante) de Filipinas</i> : Emilia Pardo Bazán and the Pleasures of Imperial Fantasy.....	234
La cuestión de Filipinas in the Peninsular Press.....	237
Pardo Bazán and “los asuntos que tanto nos interesan”.....	245
Failure of Solidarity.....	254
The Pleasures of Travel Reading.....	259
Imperial Fantasy and Colonial “Realism”.....	264
La Integridad Nacional en.....	279
Afterword: The End of Empire.....	291
WORKS CITED.....	297
Vita.....	304

Introduction: Culture and Imperialism: Filipino Writing and Imperial Fantasies

This dissertation takes as its point of departure a seemingly straightforward question: what was the impact of imperialism on the Hispanic cultural field in the decades preceding the final demise of Spain's overseas empire? If this relationship has been productively elucidated in the cultures of other imperial systems of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries such as England, France and the United States, the cultural side of Spanish imperialism of the nineteenth century has either been routinely ignored or has been made to fit uncomfortably with models developed to describe those other imperial systems. Historiographically speaking, the reasons for this discomfiture are linked to the apparent fact that the history of Spanish imperialism has largely been imagined as a barrier to modernity while other Eurocolonialisms have been explicitly imagined as the bearers of modernity itself. That is, the history of nineteenth-century Spanish imperialism is principally viewed as a history of decolonization and the birth of Hispanic nationalisms, including that of Spain itself. If at the beginning of the nineteenth century revolutionary creoles vociferously blamed the backwardness of Spanish colonialism for the civic challenges they faced, and nation-building intellectuals of the mid-century continued to lay their post-colonial social ills at imperial Spain's door, the dramatic collapse of Spain's insular empire at the hands of the United States at the century's close only seemed to confirm these charges with the inexorable stamp of historical necessity. As Roberto Fernández Retamar has argued, it took the shock of 1898 to confirm that Spain, like its ex-colonies in the Américas was already an "underdeveloped" nation ("el subdesarrollo español"): "En el 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” (“Modernismo” 145).

But Spain of the Restoration was an imperial metropole like France and England and it was connected to its imperial periphery through writing. And if metropolitan Spanish writers did not take up empire directly in their narratives, writers from the imperial periphery did. That is, if metropolitan writers did not produce a corpus of imperial travel writing, writers from the Antilles and the Philippines produced a corpus of writing whose central concerns were indeed the dilemmas of empire. But what made the culture of Hispanic imperialism different than its English, French or US counterparts? Walter Mignolo has suggested that the answer must be sought in the organizing narratives of modernity itself which have since the Enlightenment cast Hispanic imperialism in the shadows of pre-modernity. If we have become accustomed to understanding the nature of metropolitan/colonial relations as structured by what Partha Chaterjee calls the “colonial difference,” whereby the “alienness of the ruling group” is maintained through a system of formal and informal rules, Walter Mignolo suggests that in Enlightenment Europe (and this is especially visible in the political writings of Emmanuel Kant) there arose another border that organized relations *among* imperial systems. This “imperial difference,” as Mignolo calls it, began in the eighteenth century to mark off “traditional” southern Europe from the “modern” north. This “imperial difference” was not merely statement of a power differential but rather, like the homologous “colonial difference” it was constructed on the complex and flexible bases of economics, religion, geography and, increasingly, racialization (see Mignolo 173).

Spain, then, in the nineteenth century became the “other” Europe at the same time that the centrality of northern European modernity was most vigorously asserted on a global scale. And while travel writing was a principal instrument through which the assertion of Eurocentrist conceptions of history and culture were consolidated, Spain itself became an exoticized and traditional appendage to the modern north. Mignolo adduces Kant’s political writings because it was there, Mignolo argues, that Kant became the principal architect of a “cosmo-political” order that tended to consolidate while at the same time mollify the effects of an emerging discourse of Eurocentric modernity. In this new cosmopolitics, Spain was severed off from Europe for not only did Kant racialize Spain as a “mixture of European blood with Arabian (Moorish) blood” but he suggests that this admixture is but the foundation for a thoroughgoing articulation of cultural, technological and political difference:

The Spaniard’s bad side is that he does not learn from foreigners; that he does not travel in order to get acquainted with other nations; that he is centuries behind in the sciences. He resists any reform; he is proud of not having to work; he is of a romantic quality of spirit, as the bullfight shows; he is cruel, as the auto-da fé shows; and he displays in his taste an origin that is partly non-European. (cited in Mignolo 172-3)

Kant’s litany of commonplaces of “romantic” Spain (bullfights, the Inquisition, “oriental” taste, etc.) were stock in trade for nineteenth century writers who traveled to Spain and it was against this image of traditionalism and backwardness that Spanish intellectuals struggled in order to bring about a much desired national modernity. In short, Spain occupied a middle stratum in the interpretive grid of modernity as an empire in decay. The Napoleonic occupation of Spain dramatically demonstrated not only the precariousness of Spain’s imperial status in an emerging modern world order, but the very precariousness of Spain’s national sovereignty.

Modernizing Spanish intellectuals and politicians of the nineteenth century sought to erase this “imperial difference” by improving Spain’s status in the concert of imperial nations. This effort entailed not only a domestic project of *national* regeneration but also included a revival of Hispanic imperialism along more “modern” lines. If cultural historians have attended largely to the national aspects of the struggle of Spanish modernizing intellectuals to achieve a desired modernity, the imperial side of this effort has, until very recently gone largely unnoticed especially in the cultural field. In fact, a simultaneous campaign of *imperial* regeneration in the nineteenth century accompanied peninsular reformism from the mid-century onwards that not only promoted fiscal, commercial, military and political reform aimed at retaining the remaining imperial territories in the Caribbean and the Pacific but also, beginning with the African campaign in 1859-60, included the reinvention of the meaning of Spanish imperialism through reform in the remaining colonies, re-initiating broken imperial ties with the continental Americas, and a new wave of military interventionism in the Americas, Africa and Asia. Especially in the former continental colonies of the Americas, the cultural field was an theater of this neo-imperialist campaign as Spanish intellectuals and institutions attempted to re-integrate peninsular and American intellectual production through *americanista* publications such as *La Ilustración Española y American* or *La América*, but also through increasing participation by peninsular intellectuals in the Spanish American press of the latter half of the nineteenth century. That is, Spanish modernizers sought to salvage Spanish imperialism from the dustbin of history in order to thereby salvage Spanish national dignity in the eyes of other imperial nations.

In this dissertation I take up the question of the culture of Hispanic imperialism in the decades leading up to 1898 by tracing its shadowy presence in the elite literary culture of the metropole and by following it in the literary work of writers at the

peripheries of the remaining imperial system. If a campaign of imperial regeneration shaped metropolitan feelings toward the imperial periphery, what was the response of intellectuals from the periphery and how did their intellectual production affect the cultural field in the peninsula? As already suggested, empire remains a dimly perceptible presence in peninsular literature of the late nineteenth century, but in the writing of “colonial” intellectuals like José Martí (Cuba), Eugenio María de Hostos (Puerto Rico), or José Rizal (Philippines), the dilemmas of imperial culture are clearly a central concern.

FILIPINO WRITING AND IMPERIAL CULTURE

Rather than attempt a comprehensive survey of empire in Hispanic culture of this period, I focus on symptomatic cases of the particular “pathology” that was late Spanish imperialism. Specifically, I focus primarily on the Philippines and its place in the Spanish intellectual imaginary as the “most colonial” part of the remaining empire. I concentrate primarily on a group of Filipino writers and political activists who struggled in the metropole to secure political and cultural dignity for Filipinos in the Spanish imperial system. Among these writers I put special emphasis on the novelist José Rizal in order to argue that Filipino intellectuals reworked metropolitan literary procedures, especially those related to the practice of imperial travel writing, in order to first, decolonize literary relations and procedures of representation between the metropolis and the colony, and second, to use their participation in the metropolitan literary field as a form of what I will call “prosthetic authority” (i.e. an artificial supplement for an incomplete political body) in order to intervene in a political system that legally excluded them.

By the term “prosthetic authority” I mean to indicate a particular cosmopolitan strategy that was available to anticolonial writers like Rizal because of the “imperial difference” that cordoned Spain off from “European” modernity. If the structures of the “colonial difference” that shaped political, cultural and economic relations between the

Peninsula and the Philippines depended on strictly controlled channels of authority to represent the meaning of those relations, educated Filipinos like José Rizal were able through travel and writing to procure the authority of modernity directly. That is, travel and writing freed them from the indignities of the regime of “colonial difference” not merely because in the Peninsula they were allowed to participate in the political and cultural field in ways they could not in the Philippines, but because in the Peninsula, and beyond in Europe and Asia, they were able to take up new positionalities of authority. These new positionalities had two advantages for writers like Rizal or other metropolitan/cosmopolitan Filipinos. First, they were able to observe the workings of the empire systematically often from outside that system. Since they were writing in Madrid, Paris, London and Hongkong (or compiling and reproducing writing relative to imperial questions from those locations), they were able to offer a view of the Hispanic imperial system both from that system’s center (Madrid) or from *beyond* that system. That is, they were able to assume in writing a position *beyond* the frontier of the “imperial difference.” To put this another way, Rizal and the other Filipino activists were able to appropriate and redeploy the universalizing impulse of Euromodernity against the actually existing relations of political power between Spain and the Philippines. They did this not only at the ideological level by appropriating the “prosthetic” (i.e. one size fits all) causes of bourgeois modernity (i.e. liberal democracy, commercial development, universal education, and secular statism) but they also appropriated those most “prosthetic” of modern print forms, the novel and the newspaper in their campaign to erase the colonial difference. That is, the novel and the newspaper represented available forms of authority whereby to intervene in the political system structured on their silence.

The second advantage of metropolitan and cosmopolitan locations was linked to the ability of the newspaper or the novel to restructure relations of representational

authority by virtue of the fact that these print forms could travel and be read *elsewhere*. That is, novels and newspapers rendered visible communities of readers that not only existed within the imperial system but also *beyond* it. Even though Filipino novels and newspapers had limited circulation, they actively performed the cosmopolitan nature of their anticolonial endeavors. For Filipino intellectuals like José Rizal, Graciano López Jaena and the other Filipino writers who struggled in the metropole for political reforms in the Philippines, literature was their principal weapon. They were not alone in this. Rather, they employed strategies similar to those of their contemporary anticolonial intellectuals of late Spanish imperialism such as José Martí (Cuba) and Eugenio María de Hostos (Puerto Rico) and they met with similar resistances from Peninsular intellectuals with whom they sought relations of solidarity.

But Filipino intellectuals faced barriers to political participation that Creoles like Martí and Hostos did not. That is, the Philippines was reinvented in the latter half of the nineteenth century as a “colony” while the Antilles were considered “overseas provinces” and enjoyed, among other relative privileges, political representation in the Spanish Parliament. But Filipino exclusion from imperial politics was, it turns out, less a matter of law than a convenient indulgence of what I call “imperial fantasy,” whereby anxieties that Spanish intellectuals and politicians harbored about the subordinate status of their country in the eyes of “civilized nations” —its “dignidad ultrajada” in Gaspar Núñez de Arce’s telling phrase— were assuaged through the comforting existence of overseas possessions as proof of Spain’s historical stature and promising future. But if the Philippines was the most “colonial” of the overseas possessions, the mere threat of its loss inspired in Peninsular officials, intellectuals, and the general populace deep feelings of paranoid intransigence. Whether as a traditionalist nostalgia for the glorious days of conquest and empire or as a bourgeois dream of capitalist colonial development, the

retention of overseas possessions was one policy that unified the notoriously fractious Spaniards of the late nineteenth century, and the spectre of their loss loomed large as a threat to the Spanish political intelligentsia's desire for national *regeneración*. It was against the indignities engendered by the psychodramas of this "imperial fantasy" that Filipino intellectuals struggled in the decade preceding the outbreak of the Philippine Revolution in 1896.

If Filipino writing in the metropole has long been regarded as the seedbed of Filipino nationalism in the Archipelago, little attention seems to have been paid to the impact of this writing on elite literary culture in the metropole. In other words proto-nationalism has long been taken as the most appropriate analytical framework in which to consider this writing while the *imperial* dimension of its production, distribution and consumption has gone largely uncommented. This study considers this writing as anticolonial rather than proto-nationalist writing and points to its impact, however small, on the imperial cultural system in which it was produced and consumed.

EMILIA PARDO BAZÁN'S IMPERIAL FANTASIES

To shed light on the impact that Filipino anticolonial writing had on elite literary culture in the metropole this study focuses principally one symptomatic metropolitan figure: Emilia Pardo Bazán. Like other contemporary metropolitan writers, Emilia Pardo Bazán largely ignored the imperial periphery in her fiction and focused on more properly *national* dilemmas. However, here and there in her fiction and literary writing, imperial feelings seeped in. This study takes several instances of this imperial seepage and considers them in the context of debates over Hispanic imperialism and colonial policy. For example, I consider a book review published by Emilia Pardo Bazán's in 1891 in her journal *Nuevo Teatro Crítico*. The reviewed book was a collection of essays describing life in the colonial Philippines by a peninsular Spaniard by the name of Pablo Feced. The

book, *Filipinas: esbozos y pinceladas* was at its heart a polemical tract advocating the modernization of the Philippines along capitalist and semi-industrial lines. Feced argued in favor of settler colonialism and commercial expansion in order to turn the “virgin” Pacific colony into an economic dynamo for Spanish capital. Beyond the apparently untapped natural resources available in the Philippines, the key ingredient in Feced’s modernizing formula was the abundance of a docile and semi-skilled Filipino laborers who could be trained to produce wealth into perpetuity as long as Spaniards could learn the “art of treating the native.” In other words, Feced’s prescription of regulating modernity in the Spanish Philippines depended on a quasi-scientific imperialist racism, borrowed from Dutch and British models, that portrayed indigenous Filipinos as incapable of assimilating European modernity and argued that official assimilationist policies had the nefarious effect of undermining metropolitan prestige in the colony.

Pablo Feced was a bourgeois modernizer who saw political and social reforms as the solution to the commercial deficiencies of Spanish colonialism in the Philippines. Yet, Pardo Bazán’s interest in his book had little to do with his vision of a prosperous commercial future for the Spanish Philippines and more to do with the particularly salacious view of social relations between the colonizer and the colonized in the Philippines. In other words, Feced’s book provided the material for the elaboration of a complex “imperial fantasy” which Emilia Pardo Bazán both indulged personally and recommended to her readers.

In the concept of “imperial fantasy,” I adapt the psychoanalytic theories of “phantasy” developed by Sigmund Freud and Melanie Klein and apply them to the collective psychology of national and imperial imaginings. That is, I take the “we” addressed unproblematically to a “national” or “metropolitan” community of readers by peninsular writers in order to explore the psychological components that make up that

collective identity. Emilia Pardo Bazán's enthusiasm for the book, I suggest, is symptomatic of the importance of imperial fantasies in their capacity to hold in dramatic suspension the complex psychological demands placed on metropolitan intellectuals by the "psychodrama" of modernity, including anxieties about the potential loss of the colonies. I also argue that the imperial fantasies expressed in Pardo Bazán's review are spurred on by the presence of Filipino writers participating in the metropolitan literary system. This particular nexus between the Philippines and the processes of literary modernization, of which Pardo Bazán was an important promoter, allows me, furthermore, to articulate the link between changing practices of writing and reading as they relate to the interface with imperial culture. The case of Emilia Pardo Bazán is particularly revelatory in this regard because, perhaps more than any of her contemporaries, she was committed to the project of erasing the "imperial difference" that subordinated Spain to its northern neighbors in the cultural field through a self-conscious campaign to modernize the Spanish literary system. Furthermore, as a woman and a self-conscious feminist writer, Pardo Bazán was doubly subordinated by gender difference that made her location in the imperial literary system structurally analogous position of disadvantage with respect to the hierarchies of difference as were writers like José Rizal who struggled to erase the indignities of the "colonial difference" through literary means. Yet, rather than imagine relations of solidarity with Filipino intellectual struggles for dignity, Pardo Bazán indulged the seductive excesses of imperial fantasy to conjure away the threat posed by Filipino intellectual production in the metropolitan literary system.

(ANTI)IMPERIAL PRACTICES OF READING AND WRITING

Because this dissertation focuses on the cultural field, literary writing will be the principal artifact of imperial culture examined here and in this "archeological" sense, this

means returning a few seemingly accidental shards of late nineteenth century literary culture to the historical strata of everyday life in which they were produced and consumed. To do this, it is important to consider the changing practices of reading and writing that characterized Hispanic literary production of the late nineteenth century. Among the most important of the factors that influenced literary practice of this period was the general process of the cultural integration of Hispanic intellectual life into the circuits of what might be productively called the world literary system. Simply put, Hispanic readers and writers (both in the metropole and at the imperial periphery) were increasingly part of an international system of intellectual consumption and production based in the metropolitan centers of imperial Europe (especially Paris). As this integration included not only the geographical periphery but increasingly incorporated lower social strata within its circuits, writing became a principal instrument in the construction of the meaning of Euroimperial modernity. Michel de Certeau in another context has described the importance of practices of reading and writing in the constitution of everyday experience:

Far from being writers — founders of their own place, heirs of the peasants of earlier ages now working on the soil of language, diggers of wells and builders of houses — readers are travelers; they move across lands belonging to someone else, like nomads poaching their way across fields they did not write, despoiling the wealth of Egypt to enjoy it themselves. Writing accumulates, stocks up, resists time by the establishment of a place and multiplies its production through the expansionism of reproduction. Reading takes no measures against the erosion of time (one forgets oneself and also forgets), it does not keep what it acquires, or it does so poorly, and each of the places through which it passes is a repetition of the lost paradise. (Certeau 174)

The geographical metaphor at the heart of Certeau's distinction between the practices of reading and writing is worth noting. The laborious process of founding one's own place, digging one's own well, building one's own house through writing is contrasted in its humble diligence to the romance of nomadic poaching and the triumphant thrill of

“despoiling the wealth of Egypt to enjoy it” oneself. One cannot miss the imperial ideoscape at work here in which the honest laborers (writers) are bound genealogically to those who have come before them and are the bucolic bedrock of a system of accumulation that “multiplies its production through the expansionism of reproduction.” To write, it seems, is the sober work of capitalist civilization. But, of course, civilization at home means barbarism (or worse, savagery) “out there” where all rules are off and both pleasure and violence abound. As Certeau’s passage suggests, the flights of readerly fantasy follow the pathways of conquerors and travelers so that the humble French peasant can himself “despoil the wealth of Egypt” along with the Napoleonic armies, if only vicariously. If in the late nineteenth century Eurocolonialism was bringing the “wealth of Egypt” home in a very literal sense, literature was a key component in helping metropolitan societies “enjoy it themselves.” If writing was the hard work of nation building, “civilized nations” were built from the outside in as incessant representations of the “out there” reshaped the meaning of one’s own place.

But what of the Egyptians? Was despoiling the wealth of Egypt quite as satisfying to read for the despoiled? To reconfigure the geography of the readership means to rewire the circuits of pleasure to be had in the reading. And, furthermore, if the Egyptians tell the story of their own despoiling it ruins the fun altogether. Certeau’s metaphors for reading and writing point to a curious imbrication in the structures of the “world literary system.” That is to say, his metaphors articulate a relationship between the practices of writing and reading that is homologous to the relationship between *national* and *imperial* culture. Of course, in the late twentieth century when Certeau wrote these lines “well digging” and “despoiling the wealth of Egypt” strike us —we postmodern readers— as positively quaint. Not so in the late nineteenth century when the capitalist tentacles of “home” stretched to Egypt and beyond bringing to the metropolitan readers fanciful

treasures and producing literary consumers in Egypt and beyond. In other words, just as Euroimperialist expansion transformed what it meant to be “English,” “French,” or “Spanish,” it also quite literally shaped the meaning of being “Burmese,” “Algerian,” or “Filipino.” Changing practices of writing and reading played no small part in these processes.

In Spain of the last decades of the nineteenth century, the changing practices of reading and writing, linked as they were to the processes of economic, cultural and technological integration wrought by modernity generally, dramatically reshaped the Spanish “geographical imaginary” as it came into increasing contact with representations of modernity and Spain’s place in it. For the experience of modernity was not limited to the changes wrought by the instrumentalities of modernization, but contained within it a historical disposition that placed the present forever on a temporal continuum between an absolutely primitive past and a fully realized modern future. The experience of the modern, wedged between these two fantasies of historical plenitude (the naive primitive state and a fully realized modernity) underscored the traumas of the present. Just as Spain was steadily integrated into European circuits of cultural and economic exchange so too the hispanophone periphery was integrated into that system and increasingly as well into the mysteries of modernity. If Spain’s experience with modernity in the nineteenth century was traumatic (as it was elsewhere) it was particularly so in relation to other imperial powers like France, England, Holland and Germany. But with France these traumas were even more acute. Not only had the Napoleonic occupation of Spain in the first decade of the nineteenth century precipitated the anticolonial wars and eventual loss of the continental American colonies, but the cultural and ideological hegemony that France exercised over Spanish culture through the rest of the nineteenth century was so acute that no term brought such deep feelings of scorn and envy in Spain as the charge of

“afrancesado.” If England or Germany overshadowed Spanish intellectual culture through translations of their literary, philosophical and scientific production, in general, they did so indirectly through French translations. In other words, no intellectual or political culture exercised its influence more directly or contradictorily over intellectual Spain than France. If, for example, Núñez de Arce dismissed Gustavo Adolfo Bécquer’s lyric *Rimas* as “suspirillos alemanes,” such a charge was not nearly so troubling to the proponents of Academic *casticismo* than what Juan Valera called “galicismos mentales.” And if *casticismo* was the project of reinventing a purely “national” literary language, it was only one facet of a wider intellectual commitment in Spain of the nineteenth century to the cultural politics of *españolismo*, in which “España” was the locus of complex historical fantasies of imperial greatness and national dignity that, in turn, enabled fantasies about its remaining (and historical) imperial periphery.

But those fantasies were not static conventionalisms about Spain and its overseas empire. Rather, the meaning of Spanish imperialism shifted along with the changing meanings of Euroimperialism generally. It is one of the contentions of this dissertation that the changing habits of writing and reading in metropolitan Spain and in its remaining overseas possessions profoundly shaped the meaning of imperial relations that connected them to one another both politically and sentimentally.

Lydia Liu has recently argued in a different imperial context, that the sentiments that bind a colonial culture and its metropole —what she calls “imperial desire”— are counterbalanced with a potentially disruptive “desire for the sovereign” in both metropolitan and colonial cultures. Liu has suggested that a “sovereignty complex” shapes the colonial intellectual’s relation to the metropolitan culture insofar as the access to sovereignty is hindered by colonial restrictions on political participation. At the heart of this argument is the problem of dignity in modernity generally. Politically, the problem

of dignity is expressed in Liu's "sovereignty complex" when the inequities of colonial dominion are exposed by the existence of other forms of cultural authority and access, especially in the case of the colonial intellectual. But even in places where political sovereignty is fully available to the intellectual—as was in Spain or Nicaragua of the 1880s, for example— *cultural* dignity was not necessarily unhindered by the hierarchies of modernity. This is because capitalist modernity, which is structured by relations of accumulation, competition, and scarcity, produces a stratified world of clear (if complex) hierarchies of cultural, social and economic power. And the practices of writing and reading did more than any other mechanism to make those hierarchies of prestige both visible and meaningful.

DIGNITY AND THE PROBLEM OF MODERNITY

Another consequence of the shifting meanings of Euroimperialism, in its distinctly capitalist mode, that structured its connection to the problem of dignity was the renegotiation of the very meaning of sovereignty in positivist law of the nineteenth century. Liu has argued that the notion of "international law" grew out of positivist jurisprudence and replaced older conceptions of sovereignty that had been formulated in two previous shifts in the meaning of Euroimperialism. The first was articulated by Francisco de Vitoria in the early sixteenth century to solve the riddle of the legal status of the newly "discovered" Americas. At issue for Vitoria was theological question of the right of the Spanish crown to seize the lands of the inhabitants of the Americas. The second articulation of the legal definition of sovereignty was formulated by the Dutch jurist Hugo Grotius to secure sailing and trading rights for Dutch ships in the East Indies where the Portuguese claimed exclusive rights. Both Vitoria and Grotius, Liu argues, developed their legal definitions of sovereignty in "the circumstances of the colonial encounter" and that this has been the norm rather than the exception in the formulation of

international law. She then argues that Grotius's recourse to principles of natural law to develop his concept of *mare liberum* in his controversy with the Portuguese jurist Freitas based its concept of sovereignty on Asian, rather than on European maritime customs where closed seas were the norm. Furthermore, Grotius, in order to justify Dutch access to the East Indies eliminated

the possibility of conceiving the East Indies as a legal vacuum as far as the law of nations is concerned, for he argues: 'These islands [Java, Ceylon, and the Moluccas] of which we speak, now have and always have had their own Kings, their own government, their own laws and their own legal systems.[...] In defense of Dutch interests against the Portuguese, Grotius concedes to East Indian sovereigns a defined legal status in the law of nations.'" (Liu 217-8).

In the nineteenth century, however, positivist international law steadily replaced Grotius's "law of nations" as a new form of Euroimperialism began to emerge. With the rise of State commercial colonialism in England, France, Germany, Holland and Belgium, a new legal conception of sovereignty developed in which "positivist jurists begin to imagine East Asian countries as existing outside the family of nations and in need of being (re)admitted into the order of international communities." And Liu adduces C.H. Alexandrowicz to say :

Positivism discarded some of the fundamental qualities of the classic law of nations, irrespective of creed, race, colour and continent (non-discrimination). International law shrank into a Euro-centric system which imposed on extra-European countries its own ideas including admissibility of war and non military pressure as the prerogative of sovereignty. It also discriminated against non-European civilizations and thus ran on parallel lines with colonialism as a political trend.¹

In other words, positivist international law depended on a dialectic of recognition brokered by the European "family of nations." To be sovereign was no longer an assumed right on the natural law principle of non-discrimination, but rather meant to be recognized as such by the "family of nations." This paved the way in European

¹ Alexandrowicz p. 6. Quoted in Liu p. 218

jurisprudence, as Alexandrowicz points out, to the colonial “scramble” for Africa and Asia at the end of the nineteenth century and meant that older forms of sovereignty yielded to the Euroimperialist consensus.

In the mid-twentieth century, the Marxist philosopher Ernst Bloch also made the link between the displacement of the universalist principles of natural law in nineteenth century jurisprudence and the rise of the bourgeois class and its need to enshrine its power in the sanctity of positivist law. For Bloch, the most important victim of this shift was the principle of human dignity (i.e. non-discrimination) that is the first principle of natural law:

‘No one must be compelled’ — although this principle of natural law is quite false in everyday affairs, it gave the impression of being all the more true by being so uncommon, and by being the expression of a natural disposition and claim. In the nineteenth century this revolutionary disposition was opposed first by that school of thought attached to the view that law is the product of history, and then by the judicial positivism that this view restored as being more modern and more conveniently suited to the time, that is, as being empirical. But both of these rejections of natural law were too vehement to appear as detached and balanced as they pretended to be. The rising middle class often only idealized itself in its natural law, but once it had established its power, it cunningly protected itself with an antinatural law, clearly for its own profit and often out of cynicism. The idea of any sort of judicial standard was dismissed, the old attempts to elaborate one were looked on as laughable, or at least as suspect; this dismissal was carried out in such a wholesale fashion that it had the appearance of objectivity. (Bloch xxvii)

What is perhaps even more dire, for Bloch, than the cynicism of the bourgeois power elite in eliminating the principles of natural law —and in particular the principle of dignity enshrined in the idea of human rights— was the failure of socialist thinkers to connect the need for human happiness (freedom from toil and burden) to the need for human dignity (freedom from degradation and insult). For Bloch, modern socialistic thought, which imagines broad solidarities among the laboring classes of modernity, has surrendered a valuable ally in that struggle by dispensing with natural law as a matter of

historical prejudice. However, when one looks past the “often abstract, purely generic character of the eternally static old doctrines of natural law” to see what it was that natural law attacked (“a well-padded, rechristened, and retrogressive subordination”) one can glimpse the continuing relevance of the principle of what José Rizal called “la gran palanca del mundo”: human dignity.

If the changing practices of reading and writing were a key vehicle in shaping the interpretive grid of modernity, that grid could be conceived in two very different modes. The first—which is the mode of the rulers—is to see the world as a stratified geopolitical hierarchy. Or rather, as Wallerstein has suggested, as a system of centers and peripheries, each with a meaningful network of geopolitical relations. This is the way of looking that Liu and Bloch have located in the empiricism of positive jurisprudence that values stability above all else and posits actually existing relations of power as the norm. Against this world-view stands the geographic imagination that sees the world as structured by relations of domination and solidarity. This is the way of looking founded on the universalist principles of human dignity. This way of looking values struggle over stability.

TRAVEL, WRITING, AND THE METROPOLITAN CONTACT ZONE

While the process of integration produced by modernization brought about changes in the perception of the meaning of geopolitical relations at the abstract level of jurisprudence, a more sentimental sense for the meaning of those relations was produced and reproduced with the integration of the world literary system. This meant that representations of those relations, and especially those produced in travel writing, could serve to reinforce and even naturalize that stratified view through organizing principles of superiority and inferiority that, in turn, produced a moral gulf between modernity and its others. To the observable differences available to the European traveler between “home”

and “abroad” could be added any number of racial, cultural, social or environmental explanations of the superiority of the “home” culture. But whatever the trope or “science” adduced to explain these manifest differences, modernity was the master trope that underwrote their organizing structure. This is the world-view produced by imperialist travel writing for the pleasure of its metropolitan communities of readers with whom it shares a common perspective on the meaning of geopolitical relations. This is the writing in which metropolitan readers can “despoil the wealth of Egypt to enjoy it themselves.” Imperial travel writing produces and reproduces a fantasy of superiority at the center of imperial systems and those fantasies depend on the silence of the subordinated peripheries for the imperial travel writer is both from the center and writes “home” from the exotic periphery. Yet at the periphery of those imperial systems that appear in the pages of imperial travel writing, things began to change as they became increasingly integrated into the networks of Eurocolonial cultural and commercial circuits. Things were different for while changing practices of reading and writing at the center enabled metropolitan fantasies about its imperial periphery, shifting practices of reading and writing at the periphery set the conditions that made it possible for the people “despoiled” in those fantasies to challenge and bring them back to earth through literary well-digging and house-building of their own.

Imperial travel writing, Mary Louise Pratt has argued in *Imperial Eyes*, was instrumental in creating what she calls the “imperial domestic subject.” That is, travel writing brings back the “wealth of Egypt” for the pleasure of the metropolitan reader in the form of a reconfirmation of that reader’s relation of superiority to the imperial periphery. Pratt has argued that the encounter between imperial/colonial culture and the indigenous cultures of the imperial periphery created a transculturated “contact zone” in the colonial space where the imperial culture is assimilated and reworked in contact with

indigenous worldviews. Out of this transculturated contact zone, she argues, develops a new kind of contestatory writing that she calls “autoethnographic expression” in which the denizens of the colonial contact zone contest the cultural dominion of the imperial culture. But in this account of transculturation, I would like to suggest, there is a missing component to the traveling culture of nineteenth century imperialism: the colonial traveler. That is, as Eurocolonial modernity spread to the peripheral regions creating there outposts of modern culture, people from the peripheries began to travel *in* to the centers of modernity and there began to reshape the meaning of the culture of modernity itself. Once there, these peripheral travelers, who often traveled to the imperial centers to learn, gain access to what Raymond Williams calls the “total record” of writing about the meaning of center-periphery relations and, by comparing the personal details of their own experience at the periphery and at the center, they begin to understand the nature of center-periphery relations *systematically*. And finally, with this systematic understanding of the construction of the meaning of the periphery in imperial representational systems, these peripheral intellectuals are able to intervene by restructuring the meaning of that system.

Angel Rama has described this process of integration of new social sectors into the increasingly integrated world of modernity. For Rama, modernity itself, with its processes of technological, artistic, political and social advancement, was responsible for the steady incorporation of successive groups from the lower social strata and from peripheral regions into the great modern cities. But these successive incorporations,

fueron acompañadas por fuertes demandas presentadas por los estratos que ascendían y que reclamaban un lugar dentro de la estructura cultural que, por anterior a ellos, los ignoraba, y a la cual fatalmente modificarían mediante su incorporación, fuera central o marginal, consentida o arrancada a la fuerza: desde los austeros burgueses a quienes interpretó Pope (o Bello) hasta los bohemios de la clase baja entre quienes cantó Verlaine (o Darío). Se subieron al barco del mundo sin reparar en medios, en franca pelea: venían de las profundidades, de los

márgenes desdeñados, y se hicieron un lugar entre los que ocupaban espaciosos puestos sobre cubierta. Acarreaban cosmovisiones propias, a veces simples e incluso distorsionadas por los orígenes sometidos de que procedían, se caracterizaban por un aire aventurero y provocativo que tenía que ver con los modelos sociales establecidos por los poderosos de la hora, y al introducir su visión dentro de aquella que regía desde antes el sistema, lograron subvertirlo, trasmutarlo a veces, siempre modificarlo de alguna manera, aunque no podría decirse que lo sustituyeran completamente.” (*Máscaras democráticas* 15)

From this description of the urbanization of peripheral social groups in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, several useful elements emerge for considering the integration of Filipino intellectuals into the literary and political culture of Spain and Europe. First, Rama suggests that the processes of modernity itself are themselves responsible for this integration. That is, modernity creates the conditions of possibility for people from the “márgenes desdeñados” to claim a place in the culture of modernity. Second, once there, they demanded (reclamaban) “un lugar dentro de la estructura cultural que, por anterior a ellos, los ignoraba.” That demand is met with resistance by the powerful, but these new groups develop provocative strategies to make a place in the cultural system. This is because these peripheral groups have their own way of seeing the world (“una cosmovisión propia”) that is shaped and at times distorted by the political conditions from which they come (“incluso distorsionadas por los orígenes sometidos de que procedían”). And finally, as a result of their incorporation into the urban cultural system of the modern city, that system is itself modified by their way of seeing the world.

This description outlines some of the general contours of what I call in this study the “metropolitan contact zone” established by colonial Filipinos in metropolitan Spain and beyond in the modern cities of Europe and Asia. Filipinos began traveling to Europe in steady numbers in the early 1880s and there organized a concerted effort to make a place for themselves and other Filipinos in imperial culture. Toward this end, they employed the available form of authority offered by writing. This writing, it can be safely

assumed by virtue of its positionality, is qualitatively different from the kind of writing that Pratt designates as “autoethnographic expression.” One of the principal differences that I describe in some detail is its deployment of complex strategies of authority to speak and be heard in the heart of imperial culture itself. That is, the writing that emerges from the metropolitan contact zone works to decolonize the relations of imperial representational authority.

LITERATURE’S PROSTHETIC AUTHORITY

Literature, with its shifting structures of social authority in Spain of the Restoration, functioned in the hands of Filipino intellectuals as a form of what I call “prosthetic authority” (i.e. interchangeable and supplemental) which, in turn, served as the principal means of carrying out an anticolonial campaign. Not only was literature available as a form of authority to Filipino intellectuals in the metropolis but, because Spain itself was a literary backwater in the expanding *cosmopolitan* (European) literary system, Filipinos were able to bypass the structures of discursive subordination that kept them at bay in *aquellas islas* and allowed them to perceive and describe a Spain that was *provincialized* by the “imperial difference.” That is, in order to authorize themselves and their effort to decolonize political and cultural relations between the Philippines and the metropolis, Filipino writers used the prosthetic authority of literary modernity and its procedures of representation —especially the conventions of travel writing— and exploited metropolitan paranoia about modernity and its “dignidad ultrajada.” In effect, Filipino *literatos* labored to decolonize the Hispanic literary system and to make a dignified place for themselves within it.

This story of this effort is relevant to the history of nationalism in the Philippines because it addresses the somewhat troubling presence of a nationalist literature in an imperial language, but it is also relevant to the historiography of Hispanic culture

generally on account of its attention to what I see as understudied aspects of larger processes of cultural change that shaped the hispanophone world in the waning years of Spanish imperialism.

THE WORLD LITERARY SYSTEM

These understudied aspects are principally of a sociological nature and my attention to them owes an important debt to the theoretical work of Pierre Bourdieu² on the rise of a “cultural field” in nineteenth-century Europe, and to Angel Rama for his attention to the sociological dimension of literary production in the former American colonies of the Spanish empire. Both Bourdieu and Rama focus on literary production in the context of the historical rise of literature (and culture generally) as a phenomenon with institutional characteristics that increasingly separated it from other institutions of power such as the Church, the state bureaucracy, and the educational system. They both suggest that aesthetic changes once held to be the product of the “internal laws” or of the “specificity” of literature are, in fact, intimately connected to the historical and social processes of the institutionalization of the “literary” as a separate field of knowledge and prestige and the concomitant structuring of literary reception.

The contours of the “autonomous” literary field have been shaped in turn through intimate contact with the fields of power against which it defined its autonomy. With the professionalization of literary production especially in the nineteenth century the “rules of art,” as Bourdieu calls them, regulated and were regulated by an increasingly diversified system of writing, printing, distribution, critical reception and market consumption that itself constituted a feedback loop that Angel Rama names the “literary system.”³ Furthermore, this professionalization and commodification of the literary

² See especially *The Field of Cultural Production* (1993) and *The Rules of Art* (1996)

³ See Rama, *Máscaras*. p. 18

closely tracked the expanding pathways of global capital, technology, and trade to create both materially and intellectually what in the early nineteenth century Goethe could only speculatively call *Weltliteratur*. With this concept, Goethe imagined an intellectual community that effectively decentered the Neo-classicist hegemony of the French court in matters of taste and knowledge with alternative “Romantic” sources of literary value such as Classical Greece, Medieval Europe, Catholicism, Golden Age Spain, Shakespeare, folkloric traditions, etc.⁴ *Weltliterature* prefigured the material rise of a cosmopolitan literary system in which writers from the periphery could participate in the authority conferred on and by those at the center. Goethe credited Madame de Staël for having integrated German intellectual currents (Romanticism) into the dominant French literary system of the first quarter of the century. Travel, translation, international literary salons, and the integration of the book trade of northern Europe were all key to this process as were the spectacular successes of both de Staël’s *De L’Allemagne* and Goethe’s own international bestseller *Werther*.

If for Goethe a system of literary exchange (meaning intellectual exchange of all sorts including scientific, philosophical, historical and “literary” writing) was yet to be produced in the future and imagined into the past, by the end of the nineteenth century the European literary system had assumed a consolidated form. And if by the 1880s Paris still exercised metropolitan-like influence over the entire European literary system, Paris itself had been internationalized (i.e. transculturated), having absorbed intellectuals and artists from all parts of its cultural empire whether in person or in print. The technologies of travel and communication had brought France of the Second Empire into increasing contact with the world both physically, in terms of foreigners and commodities, and symbolically, in travel literature and other forms of representation of the “other”. As

⁴ See Kirst, especially chapter 1.

David Harvey has suggested, the psychological shock brought about by transformations that restructured Paris into a modern metropolis (most famously Hausmann's boulevards) dovetailed with the changing sense of the "out there" brought to Paris by extended rail networks, the Suez Canal, the telegraph, scientific travel and colonial campaigns. All of this meant significant shifts in what Harvey calls the French "geographical imagination."

It was not necessary to leave Paris to experience the shock of transformed space relations. The geographies of the mind had therefore to adapt and learn to appreciate the world of geographical variation and of "otherness" that now constituted the global space of political-economic activity. This meant, *inter alia*, coming to terms with the social and spatial relations concealed by the market of exchange of things [...]. The mass of travelogues and popular geographies that swamped the penny press indicated plenty of public curiosity. But travel and travel literature can just as easily confirm prejudices and feed fears as broaden the mind. (271)

The response to modernization in France was uneven, but Harvey's recycling of the Baudelairian/Benjaminian "shock" of the modern city is meant to remind us that modernity and its processes, both material and psychological, were often traumatic. Harvey points out that discursive continuities linked the global "others" to bourgeois fears of the tempestuous working classes whose discontent had erupted violently in 1848 and 1871. The "interpretive grid" that segregated and disciplined urban subalterns "could be loosely thrown over the whole world" (271). According to the "psychodrama" of progress—as Harvey calls it in reference to Michelet and other proponents of the systematic dissemination of "superior Enlightenment rationality"—"the submission of East to West was as necessary to the progress of civilization as the submission of female to male authority and control" so that the "deep fears" latent in orientalist discourses of the "nature, matter, the East, the female" found their echo in the "destructive, castrating female sexuality" of the rebellious crowds of 1848 and 1871 (272).

Harvey's description of bourgeois fears about the urban periphery and the imperial periphery marks both as the sites of a historic betrayal on the part of the bourgeoisie. On

the national front, the revolutionary sloganeering that first postulated broad relations of solidarity among the middle and laboring classes against the “artificial” superiority of the *ancien régime* quickly ceded to a cynical bourgeois pragmatism once that bourgeoisie was firmly ensconced in the exercise of its power, while as an ascendant bourgeoisie assumed the imperial mantle, the libertory discourses of bourgeois nationalism quickly yielded to positivist conceptions of international relations that gave a sheen of legitimacy to the rise of capitalist direct-rule colonialism at the same time that the bourgeois state consolidated its disciplinary control over the unruly urban masses. That is, the nation as a political form arose in modern times as a strategic way for an ascendant bourgeoisie to contest other political orders —namely the Absolute monarchies of the *ancien régime* and the imperial systems they engendered. Furthermore, the consolidation of bourgeois institutions globally led to the success of the nation-state as the interpretive unit for understanding the modern geopolitical order and has tended to obscure, at least in the realm of culture, the continued presence of imperial systems of power which has, in turn, led to a historiographical underestimation of the cultural relevance of such systems. Especially with the waning of the Cold War, this twentieth-century trend in cultural scholarship began to wane under the rising influence of work by postcolonial and cultural studies scholarship. Similarly, the influence of political-economic models such as Emanuel Wallerstein’s world-system theory and more recently the debates inspired by Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri’s landmark *Empire*, the continuing relevance of imperial systems and the “geographic imaginaries” those systems engender has been fruitfully born out in cultural scholarship.

In Hispanic studies, the return to the relevance of imperial relations has been further spurred by the coincidence of centennial reflections on the legacy of Hispanic and US imperialism on Spanish America and the Pacific. Beginning with the systematic

rethinking of Hispanic contact with the “New World” surrounding the 500th anniversary of the Columbian encounter with the Caribbean, and following a string of commemorations and revaluations of the centennial of late nineteenth-century struggles over Hispanic and US imperialism — the Cuban Revolution and the death of José Martí (1895), the Philippine Revolution and the death of José Rizal (1896) the Spanish-American-Cuban-Filipino War (1898), the Philippine-American War (1899), *inter alia*—the importance of imperial cultural processes have assumed a new importance in contemporary scholarship with renewed interest in “Trans-Atlantic” paradigms for a restructured field of “Hispanic Studies.”

My purpose in this dissertation, then, is to return to this imperial dimension of cultural production in my discussion of late nineteenth-century hispanophone culture. This means circumventing, wherever possible, the tendency to see culture in Spain, for example, as primarily a “national” question, or, of seeing culture in Cuba, Puerto Rico, or the Philippines of this period as primarily “proto-national.” At the same time, I do not wish to deny or even diminish the importance of national thinking in cultural discourse of this period. On the contrary, I wish to account for such national thinking in the context of imperial systems of authority. What is more, the goal here is not to study “Spanish imperialism” either in isolation or in comparison to “French,” “English,” or “Dutch” models, but rather to place these diverse imperial systems within the larger context of modernity. Doing so underscores the relational nature of these systems of cultural and political authority and makes visible the kinds of strategic interventions to which these systems were vulnerable by those forced to suffer the indignities of their hierarchical structures of power. Because modernity was the organizing trope of the ideological, political and social struggles of the nineteenth century, when that century is viewed on a geopolitical scale, the rise of the so-called “new” imperialism after the mid-nineteenth

century can be seen as process that occurs *within* modernity. Therefore the specific adaptations of *this* imperialism or *that* one can be seen as strategies to achieve a desired modernity —when modernity is conceived as a panacea— or to forestall it when modernity was conceived as the root of social ills. Similarly, anti-imperial struggle also was in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries conceived as a strategy to achieve a desired modernity.

To put this another way, even those sovereign nations who were *not* imperialist (at least in the political sense of exercising political dominion over “foreign” populations) also took on in the nineteenth century the style of empire —Napoleon’s reinvented imperial Rome— in their “republican” architecture. Of course the divided meaning of Rome with its “imperial” and “republican” legacies enabled just such a contradiction. This imperial style is visible not only in the neo-Roman architecture that sprang up in official buildings in places like Washington, Mexico City or Buenos Aires, but also in those monuments to imperial (or anti-imperial) values that expressed deep contradictions in the political culture of those capitals. For example, the massive obelisks of Washington and Buenos Aires not only complete their architectonic resemblance to the Champs d’Elysees but they are direct replicas of the imperial trophy —literally the wealth of Egypt— at the heart of the Place de la Concorde. Or, to take a counter example of contradictory anti-imperialism one could think of the monument to Cuauthemoc inaugurated in 1887 on Paseo la Reforma by Porfirio Díaz himself.

I wish to point out with these superficial examples that the “problem” of modernity in the nineteenth century was inseparable from extra-national processes of culture and populated national culture in ways that are complex and contradictory. In other words, to be modern meant to engage the culture of imperialism that structured the meaning of geopolitical relations. To bring this back to literature, we can take the

complex and contradictory case of Spanish American *modernismo*. The cosmopolitanism of Darío and his fellow *modernistas* has often been seen as an evasion of the imperatives of national culture and as cultural escapism. However, as Octavio Paz once pointed out, the *modernista* desire for the modern was not “amor a la moda” but a deeper desire to enter a “plenitud histórica.”

El modernismo no fue una escuela de abstención política sino de pureza artística. Su esteticismo no brota de una indiferencia moral. Tampoco es un hedonismo. Para ellos el arte es una pasión, en el sentido religioso de la palabra, que exige un sacrificio como todas las pasiones. El amor a la modernidad no es culto a la moda: es voluntad de participación en una plenitud histórica hasta entonces vedada a los hispanoamericanos. La modernidad no es sino la historia en su forma más inmediata y rica. Más angustiosa también: instante henchido de presagios, vía de acceso a la gesta de tiempos históricos, lo más antiguo y lo más nuevo, lo más cercano y lo más distante, una totalidad de presencias que la conciencia puede asir en un momento único. (*Cuadrivio* 20-1)

To put in terms more germane to this study, *modernismo* and its aesthetic of *artepurismo* was an effort to restructure the actual existing relations of cultural authority in order to make a place in modernity for its practitioners, and, ultimately for their homelands. Literature and art were avenues for peripheral intellectuals of the nineteenth century to participate in a “plenitud histórica” even while the material and political conditions at home remained serious impediments to that participation. One of the reasons for this was the fact that in the nineteenth century, as never before, culture (in both its elite and anthropological senses) traveled. Commodities, artifacts, languages, books, paintings, writers, artists, journalists, photographs, bureaucrats, diplomats, explorers, machines, letters, “natives” and commercial agents all criss-crossed the planet with ever increasing frequency and speed. This traveling culture created the conditions of possibility for the rise of the peripheral intellectual. As Jaime Concha has pointed out in relation to Spanish American *modernismo*, “El Modernismo alcanzará sus manifestaciones más extremas en los países menos tocados por el desarrollo capitalista, en Bolivia, Colombia y

México...Modernismo halla en los países hispanoamericanos una mezcla de atraso y de progreso, de pujanza y de marasmo.” (Concha 57-8). And for the intellectual in those places least touched by capitalist development, travelling culture not only came from afar with increasing regularity and complexity, but also it was increasingly possible for them to move toward it both physically and intellectually.

But the peripheral consumer of traveling culture, or the peripheral traveler to the center had a lot of baggage to carry. That baggage was, of course, the stigma of peripheral origins constructed by an imperial geographic imagination which interpreted the world, somewhat obsessively, in terms of spatial hierarchies. These hierarchies were rendered meaningful by the two great axes of modernity: the material and the intellectual. A place might be judged according to its material incorporation into the infrastructure of modernity and arrayed along the material spectrum that passed from “modern” to “backward” to “primitive.” And in intellectual (or moral) terms, places ranged among “civilized” “barbarous” and “savage”. The weight of this baggage is perceptible in Rubén Darío’s rebellious challenge in the “Palabras preliminares” of his *Prosas profanas* (1896):

Hombre soy.

¿Hay en mi sangre alguna gota de sangre de África, o de indio chorotega o nagrandano? Pudiera ser, a despecho de mis manos de marqués; mas he aquí que veréis en mis versos princesas, reyes, cosas imperiales, visiones de países lejanos o imposibles: ¡qué queréis!, yo detesto la vida y el tiempo en que me tocó nacer; y a un presidente de República, no podré saludarle en el idioma en que te cantaré a ti, ¡oh Halagabal!, de cuya corte —oro, seda, mármol— me acuerdo en sueños...
(*Poesía* 36)

If Darío’s impulse to declare his very existence (“Hombre soy”) sounds shrill, its necessity was confirmed by Unamuno’s offhand remark on having met Rubén Darío in Madrid in 1892 that “las plumas se le salían por debajo del sombrero.” The peripheral traveler carries just under the surface the “vida y tiempo” in which he was born. For this

reason, the aesthetic *artepurismo* of Darío's *modernismo* is, as Paz points out, not “una escuela de abstención política” —as it has so often been described, taking Darío's statements too literally rather than as strategies— but rather is fully imbricated in a social world structured by “cosas imperiales” and the ideoscape of modernity. To understand Darío's intervention (or that of any other peripheral intellectual) into that ideoscape, it is necessary to pay attention to such mundane factors as the “sociological” structures of the “literary system” in which such art was produced, reproduced, distributed and consumed and in which that art meaningfully intervened.

It is important to point out that the case of the rise of Hispanic literary culture in the Philippines (especially among the indigenous and mestizo population) very nearly forces one today to adopt a sociological approach to the study of this literature if only for the fact that the institutional setting which has shaped the discourse of literary study at least since the early part of the twentieth century simply has not known how to classify such a body of literature. It is thus difficult to assess Philippine literature in Spanish according to the traditional institutional mythologies that have grown up around literary studies. This is, of course, because the study of literature has been structured until very recently along two principal axes: first, the “universal” canon (i.e. those works worthy of translation) and second, national(ist) lines which have emphasized the seamlessness of national identity, history and language and the role of literature in the project of nation building. The “universal literature” approach reproduces the “national” bias with the effect that imperial/colonial cultural processes and products have fit uneasily into a course of professionalization structured to emphasize the national as the operative cultural unit of analysis. In Hispanic literary studies this has meant the separation of the “national” literature of Spain from those other “national” literatures produced elsewhere in the hispanophone world. This separation has historical roots in Spain, Spanish

America, and the Philippines but has also been the conscious institutional handiwork of Spain's imperial successor: the United States. Especially in the institutional and economic boom that followed its triumph in the Second World War, US universities, under the sway of Cold War policies and funding regimes, institutionalized the regional approach to "Latin America" as separate from "Peninsular" culture thus replicating the metropolitan/colonial structure of the inherited empire while eliding the continuing importance of "Peninsular" culture in the Hispanophone world. Needless to say, in this "Area Studies" model of cultural inquiry the Philippines is off the map, so to speak, of Hispanic studies

But US imperial designs are not entirely to blame for the inattention to the colonial and postcolonial dimension of the hispanophone world. In the Philippines itself, the national(ist) imperative to diagnose and complete the "unfinished Revolution" has meant a certain inward-looking impulse that also has its roots in the historical and contemporary inequities of imperial contact (Spanish, US and Japanese) as well as uneven integration into other global economic and technological processes. In Spain itself, especially in the aftermath of the Spanish Civil War, there has been a scholarly reluctance to consider Spain's encounter with modernity as fundamentally (or even importantly) shaped by its imperial/colonial history. In a recent interview with Christopher Schmidt-Nowara, Spanish historian Josep M. Fradera have pointed out that this reluctance is both historically conditioned and in the process of changing as the political and ideological circumstances of Spanish historiographers have shifted since the end of the Franco regime's grip on the Spanish historical imagination. For Fradera, Franco's neoimperialist ideal "disseminated in Latin America a radicalized version of *hispanidad*" that created a certain social scientific "backwardness" regarding its colonial past. Unlike other imperial powers (Great Britain, France, or the Netherlands) what was

absent in the intellectual life of Spain during the Franco years was “the pressure of national/colonial interests” that had elsewhere lead to “constant and diverse readings and rereadings of the past” (160).

Spain suffered not only from this colonial vacuum, but also from an aggressive Spanish patriotic offensive in the twentieth century, a reaction to the loss of the last colonies in 1898 and to Spain’s subaltern position in the international order. That aggressive patriotism emphasized the most rhetorical elements of the inherited cultural tradition. Spanish historians invented medieval Christian Spain and the empire in the Americas as the axes of Spain’s historical greatness. The curious defense of Catholicism as the national essence and of Spanish imperialism’s noble intentions —ideas that the Franco regime derived to some extent from nineteenth century liberal historical discourse— had several nefarious effects. Not only did it become impossible to generate critical perspectives on most of the Spanish past, but [also] the historical sense of several generations of Spaniards was corrupted. Moreover, this vision of history increased the gap between Spanish intellectual life and the most important innovations taking place in Europe and worldwide in the social sciences. The overall result was to alienate Latin American intellectual elites even more from Spanish culture because this rancid interpretation of the past was completely at odds with the “creole” foundations of their nation-building projects. (Schmidt-Nowara 160)

Here we can perceive negatively the continuing impact of imperial cultural systems on putatively “national” cultural phenomena. As Angel Rama has demonstrated in the case of the persistence of the “colonial” practices of the *ciudad letrada* the legacy of imperialism has continued to shape the societies that have grown out of the Spanish imperial system well beyond the period of political hegemony of the metropolitan culture. Furthermore, in the practices of reading and writing literary and cultural history, the persistent influence of the imperial cultures continue to shape how former colonial regions of the globe can understand themselves and be understood by others. As Fradera seems to suggest, the imperial aspects of cultural production still need elaboration and understanding. In part, this is my interest in the role of travel writing in the foundations of

the Filipino literary system and the impact of Filipino writing on literary culture in the metropole.

This dissertation, then, attempts to indicate a different geographical profile for the literary culture of late imperial Spain than habitually turns up in literary historiography, not only by conceiving it more broadly as “hispanophone” literary culture, but also by recuperating, as it were, the perspective of those intellectuals who by dint of their geographical location (with all of the socio-cultural meaning that location inscribes) belong to those “despoiled” by the marauding procedures of an imperial literary disposition. But at the same time that this study considers Filipino literary practices, both as readers and writers, in the hispanophone literary system as contestatory practices, it does not limit those practices to the strict dyad of colonizer and colonized that has structured much discussion of colonial and postcolonial literary studies. Rather, it traces the geographic imaginary of Spanish imperialism and the anticolonial impulse of Filipino intellectual practices within the totalizing landscape of modernity. The value of this broader view of the culture of late imperial Spain is that it underscores the fact that Spain—or any colonizing nation, for that matter (even France and England)—labored under the onus of its desire for the modern. For it is the idea of modernity—what David Harvey calls the “psychodrama of progress”—that provides the fuel for both the flights of imperial fantasies and for the contestatory gestures that defuse them. The goal of this dissertation then, is to place not only Filipino literary production in the context of the metropolitan literary system, but also to place that literary system within the larger circuits of the consolidation and integration of a world literary system. If the Philippines were culturally provincial to metropolitan Spain, Spain itself was culturally, politically, and economically “provincialized” by other centers of modernity.

The first chapter of this dissertation considers the importance of the anticolonial traveler. In particular, I consider the three most conspicuous anticolonial travelers of late Spanish imperialism: José Martí, Eugenio María de Hostos, and José Rizal. And as a confirming counterexample, I include the traveling figure of Rubén Darío, who although he did not suffer from a political “sovereignty complex,” his provincial (i.e. ex-colonial) origins made him an anticolonial thinker just the same. These travelers were secular *pilgrims*, I argue following Hostos’s definition of that term, who traveled to recover the dignity lost to them as a consequence of their (ex)colonial origins. The goal of this chapter is to assess the imperial dimension in the nationalist imaginings of these three “apostles” of nationalism in the Antilles and in the Philippines and to postulate the importance of the “metropolitan contact zone” in their efforts to decolonize Spanish imperial culture. On the first score, I argue that the theories of nationalism articulated by Benedict Anderson in his influential book *Imagined Communities* unnecessarily erase the importance of the circuits of imperial cultural authority in the gestation and irruption of nationalist imaginings. To articulate this problem in terms of traveling anticolonial intellectuals like Martí, Hostos and Rizal, I turn to Raymond Williams’s notion of “knowable communities” which allows me to supplement Anderson’s notion of “imagined communities” within an imperial ideoscape.

In Chapter Two, I turn explicitly to the concept of the “metropolitan contact zone” outlined in the first chapter. I take the case of the launching of the Filipino newspaper *La Solidaridad* in Barcelona (and later in Madrid) in February 1889. After considering the strategies of authority with which the editors of *La Solidaridad* authorize themselves to speak and be heard in the Peninsula, I turn to the colonial scene to outline the socio-cultural roots of Filipino political activism in the Peninsula. Again, I turn to the figure of the young José Rizal who as a student in Manila won two literary prizes for

compositions, that reveal seeds of the campaign undertaken a decade later in the pages of *La Solidaridad*.

Chapter Three describes the historical and discursive roots of Peninsular imaginings about the Philippines in the late nineteenth century. I argue in this chapter that a series of events lead Spain to reinvent the Philippines as a modern commercial colony. Among the factors that influence this process, I adduce the importance of a renewed military imperialism that springs to life under the lead of General O'Donnell in 1859-60 with the campaign in Africa against Tetuán, as well as minor interventions in Mexico and Tonkin. I also point to the importance of the conflict with Germany in 1885 over the Carolina Islands to explain the sudden importance of the Pacific colonies metropolitan consciousness. The 1887 *Exposicion Filipina* in Madrid's Retiro Park also makes the Philippines more visible in the metropolitan press and shapes metropolitan perceptions of what the Philippines means to the metropolitan imperial legacy. And finally, I turn to a travel account of life in the Philippines by the Peninsular writer Pablo Feced in order to describe his vision of the transformation of the Philippines from a "virgin" colony into a modern commercial colony for the benefit and glory of the mother country.

In Chapter Four, I turn to the articulation of the meaning of travel, writing and reading in the problem of modernity in the Peninsula. In particular, I describe three distinct modes of travel writing as they relate to the hierarchies of spatial relations engendered by modernity. I begin with an overview of the tradition in nineteenth century Spain of *costumbrismo* as a "modern" defense of a local culture conceived of as "la España tradicional," from the threat to national dignity posed by "foreign" travel writers. I argue there that *costumbrismo* —in a way reminiscent of the anticolonial writings of Rizal or Hostos— articulates an *ethical* relationship between the writer and the object of observation (traditional national culture) that is then inculcated into an addressed

community of readers in order to change the affective ties of that community of readers feels toward its “national” culture. I also consider here early Spanish imperial travel writing about Morocco in the 1870s in order to contrast the construction of the affective ties that bind the community of readers (in Spain) to the object of representation (Moroccan society). The final mode of travel writing I consider in this chapter is that of the secular pilgrimage. As I noted in the first chapter with the anticolonial pilgrimages of Hostos, Rizal, Martí and Darío, the pilgrim travels from a peripheral location to a central one. Here I consider the figure of Emilia Pardo Bazán and her *costumbrista* travel novel *Un viaje de novios* (1880). My argument is that this hybrid combination of *costumbrista* aesthetic procedures together with the representational strategies of the secular pilgrimage allows Pardo Bazán, like Rizal and others, to take the cultural inequities of modernity to the center of modernity itself (Victor Hugo’s Paris) in order to restructure the meaning of that relationship and, in turn, to shore up her own and Spain’s *dignidad ultrajada*.

In the final chapter, I revisit Feced’s travel account of life in the Philippines by reading, symptomatically, a review of that book published in 1891 by Emilia Pardo Bazán in her journal *El Nuevo Teatro Crítico*. I use Pardo Bazán’s review article as a way to theorize the concept of “imperial fantasy.” I do so in conjunction with a reading of Pardo Bazán’s aesthetic theories of literary Realism outlined in *La cuestión palpitante* (1882) in order to demonstrate that her Realist principles are pleasurably suspended in her assessment of Feced’s book in order, I argue, to calm a complex set of anxieties related to modernity, with the indulgent pleasures of imperial fantasies about the Philippines.

Chapter 1: (Un)knowable Communities: Travel, Writing and National Consciousness

I came from a village to a city: to be taught, to learn: to submit personal facts, the incidents of a family, to a total record; to learn evidence and connection and altering perspectives. If the walls of the colleges were like the walls of parks, that as children we had walked round, unable to enter, yet now there was a gate, an entry, and a library at the end of it: a direct record, if I could learn to read it. It is ironic to remember that it was only after I came that I heard, from townsmen, academics, an influential version of what country life, country literature, really meant: a prepared and persuasive cultural history. I read related things still, in academic books and in books by men who left private schools to go farming, and by others who grew up in villages and are now country writers: a whole set of books, periodicals, notes in the newspapers: country life. And I find I keep asking the same question, because of the history: where do I stand in relation to these writers: in another country or in this valuing city? That problem is sharp and ironic in its cultural persistence.

Raymond Williams, *The Country and the City*

Vosotros, los que en vez de vivir, peregrináis, seguid con paso firme: la desdicha que os espera es tan gloriosa, que no la trocaréis por la inútil felicidad de los felices.
Los que no peregrinan, que no lean.

Eugenio María de Hostos, *La peregrinación de Bayoán*

Lo que quede de aldea en América ha de despertar.

José Martí, "Nuestra América"

This chapter places José Rizal in the company of other modern pilgrims. These writers—and they are all writers—were travelers who followed a common trajectory: that of moving from a periphery (the countryside, the colony, the backwater) to a center (the university, the city, the metropolis, the cosmopolis) and in the process experienced similar difficulties to which they respond with similar strategies. In this discussion, José Rizal plays the leading role and his contemporaries in the hispanophone literary system (Eugenio María de Hostos and José Martí) play various supporting parts. If these

characters don't speak to each other directly, their serialized soliloquies in this chapter take the shape of an indirect dialogue with a common (if often hidden) interlocutor. This interlocutor, even when absent, is the common experience of Spanish imperialism to which each of them speaks more or less directly. That is, each from their own circumstances spoke their own truth to the institutions of imperial power. For despite the differences in geography, style, and biography, these writers from the peripheries of the hispanophone literary system shared not only a peripatetic personal history, but also the common obstacles posed to participation from the margins by an imperial representational system in which—in the period in question—intellectuals from the periphery were routinely, if not willfully ignored and silenced. If Rizal shared with Hostos and Martí both a common political dilemma (his colonial status), he also occupied an analogic spatial orientation to a world organized by the interpretative grid of modern (i.e. capitalist) imperialism. That is, if Rizal like Hostos and Martí came from the margins of empire, they did not stay there. Rather all of them traveled and wrote which enabled them both to perceive the meaning of their originary location in the interpretive grid of modernity in a systematic way, travel and writing made available ways of contesting the meaning of that location.

Raymond Williams appears as a theoretical *deus ex machina* in the turn-of-the-century drama staged here. Although his presence is anachronistic, his analogous personal trajectory and his insights into the workings of the representational economies of modernity provide some timely perspective. Along the way, I will include a handful of further anachronisms, both theoretical and anecdotal, to round out the cast. On the anecdotal side are creole travelers like Domingo Faustino Sarmiento (Argentina) and Jacobo de Villarrutia (Mexico?). On the theoretical side will be a small chorus of contemporary theorists with whom this chapter dialogues.

At the heart of the chapter is the issue of travel and travel writing in the problematic interaction of nationalism and imperialism. Without presuming to exhaust these subjects, I here suggest avenues for further theoretical investigation that, to my mind, are insufficiently considered in current Hispanic Studies and particularly in the case of the last decades of Spanish rule in the Antilles and the Philippines. In short, my argument is that in the theories I will consider, namely Mary Louise Pratt on travel writing and Benedict Anderson on nationalism, an important geographical encounter is missing in their analyses that I think the work of Raymond Williams goes some way toward making visible. This missing geographical encounter occurs in what might be called, following Pratt, the “metropolitan contact zone” and it is in this encounter that much “nationalist” and anti-imperial thought has historically developed and been deployed. For if a “contact zone” is created at the imperial periphery by the presence of the bearers of metropolitan authority, colonial travelers from the “transcultured” contact zone have made the reverse journey from the periphery to the center. It is by traveling to the center that the provincial (colonial, postcolonial, country) intellectual discovers the compendium of the representational practices —Raymond Williams calls this compendium the “total record”— with which the “valuing city” has structured the meaning of center-periphery relations. The experience of travel and the memories of home drive the provincial intellectual to re-consider this imperial record which structures the meaning of geographic relations along dyadic lines of authority (metropole-colony, center-periphery) and new metropolitan and cosmopolitan positionalities authorize him to restructure the imperial geographic imaginary. In fact the colonial traveler’s very presence in the metropole renders visible communities that inhabit the landscape but that are unknowable or meaningless from the imperial point of view. What is more, for the provincial intellectual who ventures *in* to the center and begins to perceive relations of

power systematically, the world is populated with *analogous* communities with which he can imagine relations of solidarity.

My argument is, then, threefold in its consideration of the connection between nationalist consciousness and travel writing. The first considers the figure of the peripheral intellectual who travels to the center. My principal examples are, as I have just noted, the three most conspicuous anti-imperialist intellectuals of late Hispanic colonialism: José Rizal from the Philippines, José Martí from Cuba, and Eugenio María de Hostos from Puerto Rico. The heart of the argument begins with the simple observation that while all three of these intellectuals are rightly seen to have played a foundational role in the rise of a “nationalist consciousness” in their respective homelands, the majority of their “nationalist” writing was produced in locations far removed from those homelands. That is, what these three “apóstoles” of Antillean or Filipino nationalism have in common is not only their commitments to the redemption of their respective homelands from the indignities of colonialism, but also the itinerancy of their apostolic calling. They were incessant travelers and they were all incessant travel writers. The question, then, is what is the connection between travel, travel writing and nationalist thinking?

The first part of my answer to this question takes as its point of departure Mary Louise Pratt’s analysis in *Imperial Eyes* (1992) of the importance of travel writing in the production of imperial (colonial, metropolitan and cosmopolitan) attitudes toward the periphery. Pratt’s analysis is useful for understanding the genesis of the “imperial domestic subject” and the “structures of feeling” —as Raymond Williams calls them— that underpinned Euroimperialist ideologies. Against travel writing about the peripheral zones, Pratt posits a contestatory form of writing that she calls “autoethnography” in which transculturated subjects of the colonial “contact zone” use the representational codes of the conquering culture to contest and re-present the meaning of the imperial

relation. Importantly, Pratt insists that this type of writing, often formally hybrid, is Janus-faced since it simultaneously addresses readers in the colony and in the metropolitan society.

What is missing in this account of the importance of travel writing in the production of an imperial rendering of the meaning of “planetary” spatial relations, is the figure of the provincial travel writer who travels not only to *the* imperial or national capital city (Madrid for Rizal or Hostos; Paris for Fanon or Ho Chi Min, and London for Ghandi or Achebe) but also to *other comparative* imperial centers and *comparative* peripheries. Furthermore, what is missing in Pratt’s analysis is the establishment, through reading and writing, of new transculturated zones in the heart of imperial culture itself whence the colonial intellectual is able not only to contest the particular procedures of metropolitan power over the colony, but also to marshal the authority of a systematic or “cosmopolitan” perspective in order to critique the representational practices that legitimate that rule. It is therefore central to my argument that imperial systems (despite their desire to do so) are unable to enforce strictly dyadic relations between the colonizer and the colonized. Rather, imperial systems Retoration Spain are open to cosmopolitan challenges to their authority. The colonial intellectual who travels to other centers of modernity (or other peripheries) can “prosthethically” appropriate the authority of a changed perspective on a metropolitan power that when seen only from the colonial periphery looks entirely more formidable. But the authority to be gleaned from this change in perspective is only made politically effective through writing from outside the imperial system to which one belongs since writing from other *analogous* imperial centers and peripheries brings with it the added force of “foreign” communities of readers to one’s critique. This is the importance of Rizal writing from London, Paris, Berlin, or Hong Kong; Martí from New York or Mexico; or Hostos from Paris, New York, Chile or

Santo Domingo. All three of these writers studied in Madrid and published anticolonial writing there, but their intervention in the colonial system of representation was not complete without a cosmopolitan turn in their perspective on the problem of their colonial status.

The second part of my argument in this chapter concerns the question of the rise of a nationalist consciousness in such anticolonial intellectuals as Rizal, Hostos and Martí. In brief, I argue that the experience of travel and production of “nationalist” writing metropolitan or cosmopolitan locations complicate Benedict Anderson’s account of the rise of “creole” nationalisms in the Americas and the “nationalist” writing of José Rizal. Anderson’s account of nationalist writing and the role of the instruments of print-capitalism depend on a simplified imagined audience. For reasons that will become clear in the discussion below, Benedict Anderson’s theory of the rise of national consciousness seems to be biased toward local processes of identification even while the overall focus of his project is supranational in scope and method. Missing from Anderson’s account is the importance of supralocal practice. What my project attempts to add to Anderson’s analysis of supranational elements like print-capitalism, constitutionalism, bureaucratic structures and other “modular” components of nationalist imaginings is the degree to which these elements are deployed within an *imperial* representational system that is already structured by strict relations of representational authority. That is, by both assessing the importance of travel in the thought of anticolonial writers like José Rizal, José Martí and Eugenio María de Hostos, and secondly, considering the problematic issue of the communities of readers to which their anticolonial texts were addressed, this chapter attempts to make visible the mechanisms of literary authority on which these writers depended in their particular critiques of Hispanic imperialism.

Key to his account of the rise of nationalism as an “imagined community” is Anderson’s attention to the representational technologies of print-capitalism. In Anderson’s view the capitalist print forms of the newspaper and the novel provide vehicles for imagining a “community in anonymity” that provides an analog for national imaginings. But Anderson’s version of nationalist imaginings begs the important question of who is writing and who is reading those novels and newspapers; this is a question that anticolonial writings such as Rizal’s *Noli me tângere*, or Hostos’s *La Peregrinación de Bayoán* bring to the fore. The problem for Anderson’s version of the instrumentality of novels and newspapers in national imaginings is that it depends on an already existing community of readers who share a common geographic imaginary (i.e. “we English” or “we Filipinos”). Or, rather, because Anderson’s theory has its sights fixed on the rise of nationalist thinking, it is inattentive to the actual composition of communities of readers in an imperial system of representation. But, I argue, what is most striking about anticolonial writing is precisely that it does not address a consolidated community of readers. Rather, it calls into consciousness a multifarious and fragmented readership whereby the strict dyadic authority of imperial rule—that of colonizer/colonized—is refracted onto alternative communities of readers who, in turn, represent multiple positionalities and modes of authority that are meaningfully arrayed throughout the imperial system and beyond. Anticolonial writing like that of Rizal, Hostos and Martí not only writes back to the metropole but writes beyond it to readerships that exist both inside and outside the structures of imperial power.

This occurs because anticolonial writing is vitally linked to the problem of authority in an imperial system which depends on strict codes and identifiable hierarchies of representational authority. Writing, as Angel Rama has emphasized in his concept of the *ciudad letrada*, was a primary instrument of power in the Hispanic imperial system

since it had the power to impose an abstract and ideal system of signs onto a multifarious and contradictory reality in the colonies. Writing created and enforced strict hierarchies of authority over what could be said in what fashion in order to maintain the verticality of the colonial power structure. This abstract power of writing to impose order on the “anarchic confusion” of reality in the colonies was not diminished but rather enhanced by its ill-suitedness to the reality over which it exercised its dominion because of the exclusive authority of the *ciudad letrada* to produce writing in the colony:

Este exclusivismo fijó las bases de una reverencia por la escritura que concluyó sacralizándola. La letra fue siempre acatada, aunque en realidad no se la cumpliera, tanto durante la Colonia con las reales cédulas, como durante la República respecto a los textos constitucionales. Se diría que de dos fuentes diferentes procedían los escritos y la vida social pues los primeros no emanaban de la segunda sino que procuraban imponérsele y encuadrarla dentro de un molde no hecho a su medida. Hubo un secular desencuentro entre la minuciosidad prescriptiva de las leyes y códigos y la anárquica confusión de la sociedad sobre la cual legislaban. Esto no disminuyó en nada la fuerza coercitiva impartiendo instrucciones para que a ellas se plegaran vidas y haciendas. (*La ciudad letrada* 42)

But the political order which depended so heavily on the exclusive ministry of the *ciudad letrada* was itself particularly open to writerly interventions. That is, although the colonial system of representational authority was strictly enforced through censorship and tightly controlled access to writing and printing, the ability of the political authority to enforce such strictures became increasingly difficult as the colonies, and the metropolitan society itself became increasingly integrated into extra-imperial circuits of cultural authority. Because writing itself possessed special authority in the maintenance of imperial power, it was also a powerful tool in the hands of those intellectuals who were no longer loyal to the political authority which the *ciudad letrada* served.

Rizal, Martí and Hostos were pilgrims—in the sense given to that word by Hostos—rather than mere travelers. Travel is never a matter of indifference nor simply a

matter of pleasure for the provincial intellectual because travel means to “be taught, and to learn” which is to participate in the representational economy of what Raymond Williams calls the “valuing city” that remains inaccessible if one stays put at the peripheries of power. In a world structured by centers and peripheries, to go to the center means to submit —as Raymond Williams says in the epigraph at the head of this chapter— “the personal facts, the incidents of a family, to a total record.” That is, the partial, the fragmentary, the seemingly incidental view of things at the margins acquires —through a logic of comparison and an interplay of perspectives— a systematic aspect. For once the garden gate to the library is opened and one learns to read the record of “what country life, country literature really [means],” the procedures and impulses that have historically produced the record itself begin to emerge and diverge from the object of representation.

Of course, the journey from the periphery to the center is not the only trajectory undertaken in a world structured by geographical hierarchies. Technocrats travel to administrative posts; disillusioned heirs take up the simple life of the countryside; commercial agents scout out prospects and establish outposts for accumulation and distribution; scientists collect specimens; vagabonds set out to “see the world” and so on. But the provincial, the colonial, the hick has something to prove, a burden to bear that does not weigh down on the outbound metropolitan or the wandering cosmopolitan. That burden is the total record itself that describes what “country life, country literature really means.” If to travel means to have access to the library of the “valuing city,” this access —as Williams points out— demands that the provincial intellectual decide where to stand in relation to this record. This problem is “sharp and ironic” because for the “modern native” or the “urban provincial” it presents a false choice: does one stand for the country against the city or for the city against the country? This question is not posed to the naïve

country person who stays put and it is not problematic for the sentimental metropolitan who ventures out, for even the modern traveler who goes “country,” or “native,” etc. does so by virtue of relations of power that make the choice to abandon the center in favor of the “simple life” available in the first place.

For the provincial intellectual, the choice of where to stand in relation to the writers of the total record boils down to accepting or rejecting the spatial hierarchy through which imperial ideological relations are arrayed. If one accepts the hierarchy as normal, one can choose the city or the country and take one’s place in the world. But for the provincial this is to sidestep the problem of the potent mix of disdain and desire with which the city habitually regards the country. To choose the country against the city is to abandon the struggle in favor of a humiliated quietude. To choose the city is to turn against one’s origins and to adopt the haughtiness of the city against oneself and the (un)knowable communities written out of the total record.

As Raymond Williams suggested in *The City and the Country*, one of the most arduous tasks facing the provincial intellectual is the one of choosing where to stand in relation to the totality of writers whose works have structured the meaning of the hierarchies of space. All of the writers considered in this chapter tackle this task in different and often revealing ways. But none of them can afford to consider this problem with indifference on account of the very fact that they are provincial writers in relation to the “valuing city” that has constructed the meaning of their provincial place in the hierarchies of space. And in the case of each of these writers, this “valuing city” was principally imperial Madrid. Each in his own way, these writers struggled to erase the historical stigma of his (ex)colonial origins by decolonizing his relation to the metropolitan culture and each employed various strategies to accomplish this. In addition to a common historical relation to Hispanic imperialism, the thing that all of these writers

shared, however, was that they all traveled to Spain and there engaged the structures of feeling that shaped the meaning of the metropole to their homeland. To trace the range of the strategies employed by these writers I will consider these peripheral writers roughly chronologically beginning with the case of Domingo Faustino Sarmiento the Argentinian pedagogue and statesman who traveled to Madrid in 1846. I then consider that case of Eugenio María de Hostos, the Puerto Rican novelist, philosopher, sociologist and patriot who first traveled to Spain as a student and returned in 1863 as a political activist and writer. Next I will consider the well-known writing of José Martí who was exiled to Spain from his native Cuba at the age of sixteen and there studied and agitated for the political independence of the Antilles.

PROVINCIALIZING SPAIN: DOMINGO FAUSTINO SARMIENTO THE ANTICOLONIAL TRAVELER

In her influential book *Imperial Eyes*, Mary Louise Pratt coined a number of “idiosyncratic terms” in order to describe cultural production at the margins of European imperialism in its encounter with indigenous cultures. Adapting Fernando Ortiz’s notion of transculturation, Pratt suggests that under the combined influence of scientific methodologies, capitalist integration, and imperial expansionism, new circuits of knowledge and cultural relations were established in the “contact zone” where the agents of expansionist European science, capital and colonialism systematically assimilated new regions of the globe through discursive, commercial or political means. Out of this encounter arose what she calls a “planetary consciousness” that not only profoundly reshaped life at the periphery of the imperial system but also fundamentally altered social and cultural relations in the metropolitan societies. Beyond the material consequences of Euro-expansionism, the contact zone engenders a crucial conflict of representation. She

turns to the quasi-genre of travel writing as a primary vehicle for this representational commerce born of the contact zone.

Travel writing, she argues, is an important instrument in the service of Euro-imperialism's "obsessive need to present and re-present its peripheries and its others continually to itself" (6) and through travel writing, Pratt seems to suggest, the imperial metropolis is capable of a curious form of false consciousness. On the one hand, she says, the "imperial metropolis tends to understand itself as determining the periphery" and on the other it "habitually blinds itself to the ways in which the periphery determines the metropolis." (6) Pratt's treatment of imperial-metropolitan travel writing amounts, then, to a "critique of ideology" and as such, this project leads Pratt to consider a side of travel writing that she does not explore (so to speak) in any detail but that nonetheless is useful for my project. That is, with the insistence that travel writing allows for certain ideological fantasies, she wonders aloud first, how "metropolitan modes of representation [are] received at the periphery?" and second, how "does one speak of transculturation from the colonies to the metropolis?" (6). For considering these questions, travel literature is uniquely apt because its tropes of "discovery" and "cataloguing" put it in a "relation of copresence, interaction, interlocking understandings and practices" (7) with the other inhabitants of the contact zone but at the same time glosses over these negotiations in the construction of a relation of "here" (the location of reading) to "there" (the location of contact). In this way, travel writing constructs its readership as much as it constructs the object of its gaze. In order to counterbalance the ideological tilt of travel writing, Pratt suggests that there is another kind of writing born of the "contact zone" that she calls "autoethnography" or "autoethnographic expression." If ethnographic texts, she argues, "are a means by which Europeans represent to themselves their (usually

subjugated) others, autoethnographic texts are those the others construct in response to or in dialogue with those metropolitan representations.” (7)

If for Pratt, then, travel writing tends to enable the ideological framework of European expansionism, autoethnographic writing, by contrast, tends to contest this mode of representation from the margins, as it were, of that diffusionist ideoscape. Such writings are by nature, then, hybrid since they “involve partial collaboration with and appropriation of the idioms of the conqueror.” (7) Crucially for my purposes, Pratt identifies the inside/outside relation of the autoethnographer with respect to the location of reading. That is, “autoethnographic texts are...usually addressed both to metropolitan readers and to literate sectors of the speaker’s own social group and bound to be received very differently by each.” (7) Surprisingly, however, little of Pratt’s attention in the book is actually paid to autoethnographic writing and the vast majority is devoted to metropolitan travelers’ experiences at the imperial periphery. Only one of the many writers Pratt considers in her chapter on American creole reinterpretations of the legacy of European travel writing in America *reverses* the traditional diffusionist trajectory of the metropolitan traveler. That writer is Domingo Faustino Sarmiento who breaks with convention and writes a travel narrative about the North. Pratt notes the anomalous character of this trajectory and although she does not put it precisely in such terms, she suggests that there is a decolonizing impulse to Sarmiento’s project:

So do colonial asymmetries play themselves out in writing apparatuses: the metropolis ongoingly, indeed perhaps obsessively, represents the colony to itself, and also ongoingly calls upon the colony to represent itself to the metropolis, in the endless recording and bureaucratic documentation that the Spanish Empire seems particularly to have specialized in. For colonies to lay claim to their mother countries, however, even a purely verbal claim, implies a reciprocity not in keeping with colonial hierarchies. (190)

Sarmiento's notorious Hispanophobia here assumes the shape of an unsettled colonial score and his rewriting of the relationship between the metropolis and its erstwhile periphery sets out to reverse this relationship. As a "postcolonial creole subject" Pratt argues, Sarmiento's subjectivity "was constituted relationally, with respect (among other things) to Spaniards, to Northern Europeans, and to non-white Americans." (188) Through this relational scheme of identifications and disidentifications, Sarmiento and other creole self-fashioners imagined themselves as against not only the non-white Americans but for them, "Spaniards, too, were barbarians." (188) But if Sarmiento had a colonial score to settle, his effort to provincialize Spain was performed for an American readership keen on making a clean break with colonialism rather than renegotiating relations with the former metropolitan society. What is missing, remarkably, in Sarmiento's text is the representational exchange in which Spanish colonialism specialized. This severing of colonial ties is carried out by Sarmiento even at the level of orthography. Discussing his ideas about the modernization of American orthography with a group of liberal Spaniards, Sarmiento is unperturbed by the specter raised by his interlocutors of linguistic divergence and eventual mutual incomprehensibility between Americans and Spaniards. "Este no es un grave inconveniente," he responds with characteristic verve,

como allá no leemos libros españoles; como Uds. no tienen autores, ni escritores, ni sabios, ni economistas, ni políticos, ni historiadores, ni cosa que lo valga: como Uds. aquí i nosotros allá traducimos, nos es absolutamente indiferente que Uds. escriban de un modo lo traducido i nosotros de otro. (*Viajes* 148)

Sarmiento does not talk *to* or *for* but only *of* Spain. He does not engage Spain in a dialogic renegotiation of cultural authority, but rather closes down the possibility for such dialogue into the future in his indifference to linguistic divergence. Despite Sarmiento's peripheral origins, his text is not *autoethnographic* in Pratt's sense because it has erased

the metropolitan/peripheral ties that structure the shared system of meaning that emerges in the contact zone. That is, if he acknowledges Argentina's peripheral relation to northern nations he denies being peripheral to Spain. Rather, Sarmiento the travel writer assumes in Spain the posture of the *costumbrista* (ethnographic) writer in a foreign place and there finds *analogous* obstacles to modernity to those he had described on the Argentinean pampas:

Los hombres de la clase culta siguen en todo la moda europea, i el paletó i el chaleco se resisten, como todos saben, a la descripción; pero el pueblo, es decir lo que aun es en España jenuino español es digno de pincel...El sombrero calañez del sevillano...da ademas al español un aspecto tan peculiar que bastara por sí solo, a no haber tantas otras singularidades, para colocarlo fuera de la familia europea, como aquellos *subjéneros* que descubren en plantas i animales los naturalistas.(*Viajes* 159)

Here Spain is a *subjénero* of Europe as is Sarmiento's Argentina with its conflicting civilized and barbarous elements. What is modern in Spain is foreign to it but what is autochthonous (jenuino español) is worthy of a *cuadro de costumbres* (*pincel*) as an index of what excludes Spain from the European family of modern nations. But more than this, Sarmiento is drawing on a tradition of European travel writing on Spain that had tended to solidify Spain's romantic image as antimodern.

Especially in the case of Sarmiento, with his enthusiasm for the homogeneity that modernity promised, a Spain "digno de pincel" was a Spain unworthy of esteem, and irrelevant to the project of nation-building back in the "espacio doméstico" of his readership in America (officially Chile and Argentina). The divergence (severing) of a once shared—or rather imposed—system of representation, and the exteriorization of Spanish *costumbres* was quite necessary for Sarmiento's nation-building project and at the same time wickedly satisfying:

Esta *Aspaña* que tantos malos ratos me ha dado, téngola por fin en el anfiteatro, bajo la mano; la palpo ahora, le estiro las arrugas, i si por fortuna me toca andarle

con los dedos sobre una llaga a fuer de médico, aprieto maliciosamente la mano para que le duela. (*Viajes* 146)

If we were to pose Raymond Williams's question (where does he stand in relation to these writers: in another country or in this valuing city?) Sarmiento clearly stands with the "valuing city" against the barbarous countryside. This is not to say that Sarmiento is not periodically moved by the emotional force of barbarous pagentry—for example his famous discourse on the power of the color red in *Facundo*, or in his enthusiasm for the majesty of the Spanish bullfight—but in his writing, these attractions (each *digno de pincel*) can be safely dismissed as an emotional atavism. What remains palpable in Sarmiento is the bitterness, always dressed up in sarcastic humor, that he feels toward the humiliations of a historic subordination and his desire to first call up the memory of the humiliation and then subvert it symbolically:

A propósito, una noche hablabamos de ortografía con Ventura de la Vega i otros, i la sonrisa del desden andaba de boca en boca rizando las estremidades de los labios. Pobres diablos de criollos, parecian disimular, ¡quién los mete a ellos en cosas tan académicas! I como yo pusiese en juego baterías de grueso calibre para defender nuestras posiciones universitarias, alguien me hizo observar que, dado caso que tuviésemos razon, aquella desviacion de la ortografía usual establecia una separacion embarazosa entre la España i sus colonias.” (147-8)

Sarmiento calls up the imperial habits of regarding the Americas (“sonrisa del desdén,” “España y sus colonias”) in order to make the reversal all the more poignant. If Spanish intellectuals are accustomed to exercising exclusive authority over linguistic matters, Sarmiento defends, with heavy artillery, “nuestras posiciones universitarias.” For Sarmiento, an American university has as much claim to authority as a Spanish one does for both of them look to the same translated books to authorize their ideas. Sarmiento's text performs the symbolic severing of relations both in his affected insouciance at the prospect of linguistic divergence, but also in his performance of a false community in order to abolish any hope of communitarian imaginings between excolonial America and

the ex-metropolis. That is, Sarmiento, by affecting the “unanimous assent” of his interlocutors, inverts the relations of authority that once structured the imperial representational system. For if the imperial system depends on the communication of the sovereign will from the center to the silently consenting periphery, here Sarmiento inverts this relation making his Spanish interlocutors participants in their own provincialization:

Lo que daba mas realce a esta peroracion era que, a cada nueva indicacion, yo afectaba apoyarme en el asentimiento unánime de mis oyentes. Como Uds. saben... decia yo, como Uds. no lo ignoran... ¡Oh! estuve admirable, i no habia concluido cuando todos me habian dado las buenas noches. (148)

Of course, the true symbolic reversal is only perceptible in Sarmiento’s retelling and perhaps passed unnoticed by his Spanish victims. This reversal was performed for an American readership who would not miss its grandiose pleasures (“¡Oh! estuve admirable”). In Spain, as Pratt points out, Sarmiento assumes the role of a metropolitan travel writer and goes to great lengths to establish the moral (and material) contrast between Spain and an all-embracing modernity. The seriousness with which he studies the institutions of France and the United States in the same voyage is almost completely lacking in his descriptions of Spain. For if France and the United States elicit in him admiration and analysis, and Tunisia represents a marked case of contrasts and condescensions, Spain elicits feelings of bitterness and irony that are assuaged with sarcasm and symbolic revenge.

Sarmiento’s text is not “autoethnographic” in Pratt’s sense because it does not intend to engage an imperial system of representation in a dialogue of renegotiation. Rather Sarmiento’s text performs the impossibility of such a renegotiation and symbolically severs the legacy of contact between Spain and Spanish American modernity. What separates Sarmiento’s text from “autoethnographic expression” is the question of cultural sovereignty. Sarmiento is happy to embrace the “homogeneity” of

civilized modernity if it allows him to stamp out the “barbarous” legacy of colonialism. In order to complete the process of decolonization, however, it was necessary to ceremonialize this new cultural sovereignty by subjecting the ex-metropolis to the harsh light of his modern gaze. But this ceremony of revenge is only perceptible in the imagined community of Spanish American readers to whom Sarmiento’s text is addressed:

Poned, pues, entera fe en la severidad e imparcialidad de mis juicios, que nada tienen de prevenidos. He venido a España con el santo propósito de levantarla el proceso verbal, para fundar una acusacion, que, como fiscal reconocido ya, tengo de hacerla ante el tribunal de la opinion en América; a bien que no son jueces tachables por parentesco ni complicidad los que han de oír mi alegato. (147)

Sarmiento humorously assumes the posture of a linguistic ethnographer not only in Spain but among the Spanish Academicians: “Imajinaos a estos buenos godos hablando conmigo de cosas varias, i yo anotando: -no existe la pronunciacion áspera de la *v*; la *h* fué aspirada, fué *j*, cuando no fué *f*; el frances los invade; no sabe lo que se dice este académico, ignoran el griego; traducen, i traducen mal lo malo.” Unlike Hostos or Martí Sarmiento does not attempt to understand the legacy of colonialism systematically nor does he look to forge new ties of solidarity with Spanish intellectuals who like Spanish Americans “translate” modern ideas. Rather, Sarmiento subjects Spanish intellectuals to the same disdain to which they subject him and replicates the hierarchical worldview of an imperial traveler.

Autoethnographic texts, which Sarmiento’s is not, are engaged perforce with colonial/imperial systems of representation and with the conflicts over authority and dignity that these systems engender. This is because they are not sovereign texts but rather operate within the codes imposed on them by another culture. That is, they cannot manage the political, moral and linguistic severing that Sarmiento preaches with such insouciance since autoethnographic texts emerge in the sustained encounter brought

about by colonial domination. For such texts to emerge, the contact zone has to enter into relations of production, distribution and consumption with these (literary) systems of representation. To put this another way, the emergence of autoethnographic writing within an imperial system of representation might be taken as an advanced stage in the development of that system insofar as the colonized are not only consumers of metropolitan literary culture (including the travel literature of the contact zone) but also become themselves producers of writing that engages the power relations structuring that system of representation.

In the case of Hispanic colonialism, this integration was systematically avoided through rigid control of the production, consumption and distribution of written texts at the periphery.⁵ Autoethnographic writing speaks *of* the colonial contact zone but in so doing also speaks *of* the metropolitan society both as a presence in the contact zone but also as a social order that has created and maintains the conditions of contact. Furthermore, autoethnographic texts, as Pratt points out, speak simultaneously *to* the colonial society and *to* the metropolitan society critiquing the latter's tradition of representing the (in fact) transculturated contact zone as a zone of uneven acculturation. But Pratt uses the example of Guaman Poma de Ayala's manuscript as her principal example of "autoethnographic expression" and in so doing dramatically demonstrates the importance of travel and communities of readers in the efficacy of "autoethnographic" interventions. For Guaman Poma de Ayala's autoethnographic text—for all of its dialogic hybridity and historical revisionism—was a dead letter. Even after its "discovery" in a Danish archive in 1908, it was not published until the 1930s and went

⁵ These controls over were not limited to *previa censura* and other limitations on printing, the book trade, and political speech generally in the colonies but Ángel Rama has pointed out the overwhelming centralizing impulse of the *ciudad letrada* whose monopoly over written language assured the commitment of colonial *letrados* to the smooth functioning of the Imperial system of representation and the verticality of power. See Rama, *La ciudad letrada* p. 41.

unappreciated until the late 1970s, “as positivist reading habits gave way to interpretive studies and Eurocentric elitisms gave way to postcolonial pluralisms”(4). If Guaman Poma’s twelve-hundred page letter to Felipe III went unread, and Sarmiento’s travel writing constitutes a shallow imperial reversal, what are the strategies available to the colonial intellectual who wishes to intervene in the system of representation that structures the meaning of an imperial ideoscape?

Unlike Hostos, Martí and Rizal, Sarmiento was not a colonial subject in the Hispanic imperial system when he traveled to Madrid and wrote home about it. Rather he used the conventions of travel writing, (*lo pintoresco*, moral contrast, ridicule) to sever once and for all the ties that still subjected him to the imperial disdain of metropolitan Spaniards. The point for Sarmiento was not to make the Spanish intellectuals understand their *analogous* position in the hierarchies of modernity to the one occupied by his own native Argentina, or by his adopted Chile, but rather to make his American audience understand that Spain was just as provincial as the Americas.

HOSTOS’S PEREGRINACIÓN DE LA SOLIDARIDAD

Because Sarmiento’s America was no longer subject to the imperial dominion of Spain he could afford not to engage Spaniards in a renegotiation of cultural relations. Of course, as is readily apparent in his descriptions of Madrid, Sarmiento had a cultural score to settle with the former metropolitan society. But just the same, Sarmiento settles for the superficial pleasure of siding with “civilization” against the barbarous image of “romantic” Spain. Sarmiento was no longer obliged to write in the assimilated language of the metropolitan culture but rather self-consciously sought to diverge from those codes, not so much as a strategy of cultural sovereignty but rather in order to facilitate the rapid assimilation of other imperial cultures that to him were more valuable. And as the case of Guamán Poma de Ayala’s letter to Felipe III which never arrived demonstrates,

writing (and especially writing from the imperial periphery) was not sufficient in itself. Colonial *peregrinos* like Hostos, Martí or Rizal could not settle for the superficial satisfactions of off-handed irony. Nor could they afford dead letters. Rather, they struggled to participate in a system that depended on their silent obedience. It is this “voluntad de participación” that lends meaning to Hostos’s appeal to all *peregrinos* in the prologue to the first edition of his *Peregrinación de Bayoán* (1863). He appeals to broad solidarities among those to whom a “plenitud histórica” has been systematically denied:

Vosotros, los que en vez de vivir, peregrináis, seguid con paso firme: la desdicha que os espera es tan gloriosa, que no la trocaréis por la inútil felicidad de los felices.

Los que no peregrinan, que no lean. (*Bayoán* 33)

For Hostos, then, the world is divisible by a founding dichotomy: those who make pilgrimages and those who live the useless happiness of the happy. This foundational ethical gesture makes way for broadly conceived solidarities that cut across the hierarchies of geography and politics. This is important to Hostos’s literary and political project because it purports to make visible unknown communities of readers with which to challenge the imperial ways of representing the colony. Furthermore, it fractures existing metropolitan communities of readers (conceived as sharing a “domestic” imperial morality) by introducing an ethical dimension to the act of reading itself (“Los que no peregrinan, que no lean.”). To read this book is to imagine oneself in relation to this foundational gesture of solidarity and attack. And if one decides to read on, not only does this mean taking sides (to be a friend or enemy) but one must do so with the charge to read well: “Hojea un libro, es profanarlo.” (33) Unlike the imperial writer who assumes a common point of view with an imagined metropolitan community of readers for whom the act of reading reconfirms that shared perspective, Hostos attempts to provoke a restructuring of the geographic imaginary that shapes that commonly imagined

point of view along newly visible ethical lines. Those who are pilgrims (i.e. those to whom simply *living* is forbidden) should read on, and those who are not (i.e. those who simply live the useless happiness of the happy) should read at the risk of perturbing that happiness, for they are the enemy. In 1863 when he wrote the prologue to the first edition, Hostos imagined the book as a way to recast the meaning of the Antilles in the imperial imaginary:

Quería que *Bayoán*, personificación de la duda activa, se presentara como juez de España colonial en las Antillas, y la condenara; que se presentara como intérprete del deseo de las Antillas en España, y lo expresara con la claridad más transparente: "las Antillas estarán con España, si hay derechos para ellas; contra España, si continúa la época de dominación". (*Bayoán* 16)

This passage, taken from the prologue to the second edition, is narrated in the past tense and with this new prologue and new edition (published in Chile in 1872), Hostos reflected on the failure of his plan to make known through his *Bayoán* as “intérprete del deseo de las Antillas en España.” The book was written, published and distributed first in Madrid and only after his austere plan failed to elicit the response he first imagined, Hostos abandoned the metropole to pursue new strategies of intervention in the imperial system in comparative centers and peripheries like Paris, New York, Chile and Santo Domingo.

For Hostos, travel and reading, coming and going, consulting the total record and comparing it to personal and collective experience, brought fully to consciousness the representational procedures and perspectival prejudices that had constructed what the colony “really meant,” and, at the same time, pointed the direction to altering its meaning in order to include and dignify the (un)knowable communities that inhabited its landscape. And as we noted above in the case of Raymond Williams, the peripheral intellectual who travels and reads the “total record” discovers a multiplicity of perspectives (i.e. writers of “another country”) that lead the provincial intellectual

progressively toward a systematic understanding of the construction of the meaning of the imperial geographic imaginary. In the case of the colonial Hostos, this meant combining historical reading of the meaning of the colony by writers from other countries with actual physical travel that allowed him to finally understand the problem systematically:

Raynal, Robertson, de Pradt, Prescott, Irving, Chevalier, me presentaron a América en el momento de la conquista, y maldije al conquistador. Un viaje a mi patria me la presentó dominada, y maldije al dominador. Otro viaje posterior me la presentó tiranizada, y sentí el deseo imperativo de combatir al tirano de mi patria. (*Bayoán* 8)

The combination of the looping arcs of Hostos's anticolonial pilgrimages and a systematic consultation of the "total record" take Hostos progressively past the "personal facts, the incidents of a family" toward an increasingly broad conception of the problem so that the "Isla infortunada en que nací" becomes a more systematically conceived *patria geográfica*. This restructuring of Hostos's geographical imagination is connected to a rearrangement of the "structures of feeling" associated with patriotism which passes from a *feeling* to a *resolute will* whose foundation rests on newly conceived solidarities. Like Williams's "adult experience" Hostos's feelings were transformed through an ever more broadly conceived "community" in disgrace:

El patriotismo, que hasta entonces había sido sentimiento, se irguió como resuelta voluntad. Pero si mi patria política era la Isla infortunada en que nací, mi patria geográfica estaba en todas las Antillas, sus hermanos ante la geología y la desgracia, y estaba también en la libertad, su redentora. (*Bayoán* 8)

This process of restructuring the geographical imaginary comes full circle, as it were, with a universalist gesture of solidarity. That is, the fact of colonialism and the incidents of imperial rule, when seen from the *systematic* perspective of the total record reveal the possible structures of universally conceived solidarities against the despotism of monarchy:

España tiranizadora de Puerto Rico y Cuba, estaba también tiranizada. Si la metrópoli se libertaba de sus déspotas ¿no libertaría de su despotismo a las Antillas? Trabajar en España por la libertad ¿no era trabajar por la libertad de las Antillas? Y si la libertad no es más que la práctica de la razón y la razón es un instrumento, y nada más, de la verdad ¿no era trabajar por la libertad el emplear la razón para decir a España la verdad? (*Bayoán* 8)

The culminating gesture of these looping intellectual pilgrimages is the conviction that the highest duty of the colonial intellectual is to simply speak the truth that the imperial ways of seeing hide from view. That the problem was, at least in part, a problem of representation is apparent in the fact that Hostos's first impulse was to write a novel. That is, once his patriotic feelings had transformed themselves through systematic understanding into a resolute will, he set about putting that will in to action by engaging in a "guerra de ideas." Hostos imagined his *Bayoán* simultaneously as the judge who would condemn Spanish colonialism in the Antilles and as the interpreter of Antillean desires in the Peninsula. This restructuring of the "meaning" of the relationship between the Antilles and the Peninsula produced in 1863 the figure of *Bayoán* as an anticolonial pilgrim and reveals an important stage in the development in Hostos's "nationalist" imaginary. What is at stake is not whether there was or should be a relationship between the Antilles and the Peninsula but rather what the nature of that relationship was, and what it meant for both Antilleans and Peninsulars. What is clear in Hostos's resolution to write a novel is the recognition of the material reality of the relationship between the Peninsula and the Antilles, and simultaneously, his perception that the meaning of that relationship was open to interpretation on both sides of the Atlantic. It was a matter of making visible the communities of readers whose existence rendered the relationship meaningful. In the Antilles this meant adding a new perspective to the "total record" that could muster the courage and authority to condemn Spanish colonialism. In the Peninsula it meant bringing into view not merely a new interpretation of Antillean desire but the

very fact of Antillean desire which the imperial system of representation had been careful to systematically ignore:

¿Cómo decir a la altiva metrópoli, que toda su historia en América era inicua?
¿Cómo hacer entender a las Antillas que, si era bueno todavía esperar, era ya inútil esperar? ¿Cómo conseguir que un libro de propaganda antiespañola se leyera en España y se dejara leer por España en las Antillas? ¿Cómo hacer aplaudir de los escritores y de los críticos españoles un libro nuevo y un escritor novel que se atrevía a pensar en alta voz lo que nadie osaba decirse en el oído?
(Bayoán 13)

As Hostos describes in some detail in the prologue to the second edition of *La peregrinación de Bayoán* (Santiago de Chile 1873), his literary project of making the desires of the Antilles known in the Peninsula was a failure. Despite a warm reception in private from such political and literary luminaries as General Ros de Olano and Pedro Antonio de Alarcón, Hostos's "guerra de ideas" was met with what he called the "guerra de silencio" in the public press. Hostos austere refused and even scrupulously preferred to offend his friends like the novelist and historian Juan de la Rada y Delgado or the colonial novelist Francisco Entrala⁶ when they offered to write a prologue or favorable reviews of *Bayoán* in the Madrid press preferring to wait for a "spontaneous" response to the publication of his novel:

El juicio público y no el de ellos, era lo que yo necesitaba. Y como no lo necesitaba para pavonear la estúpida gloria contemporánea, reducida a la interesada admiración de los menguados, y a la importuna curiosidad de los curiosos, sino que lo necesitaba para autorizar mi entrada en la vida activa, en la propaganda penosa, en la lucha difícil en que ansiaba comprometerme, quería que el juicio fuera definitivo. Juicio definitivo es el sincero: juicio sincero es el espontáneo, y no es espontáneo ni sincero el juicio individual que previene arbitrariamente, con aplausos o censuras, el juicio colectivo. (25)

⁶ Francisco de Paula Entrala lived in the Philippines from 1873-82. He was active in the colonial press and published among other things *Olvidos de Filipinas* which was a critique of travel writer Francisco Cañamaque's *Recuerdos de Filipinas* (1877) which according to John David Blanco was "one of the two or three defenses of the *indio* written by a Spanish colonialist to come out of the late colonial or post-1844

When only one serious but unsigned review article appeared in the Madrid papers, Hostos bitterly collected the unsold copies of his book from Madrid bookstores and sent them to the Antilles where the book was proscribed by the colonial authorities.⁷ For Hostos, *Bayoán* was a vehicle, a means to provoke a debate and to bring into view what was officially hidden. His project was not frustrated by suppression; quite the contrary, it was defeated by silence. His book, which was meant to be an instrument in the “guerra de ideas” to provoke a more direct confrontation, failed to provoke a public debate:

Compadecí muchas más veces que maldije la iniquidad de los jueces a quienes me había sometido y si algo no he perdonado y si algo no perdono todavía, es que aquel silencio inesperado me haya obligado, imposibilitando mi plan, a seguir con la pluma en la mano. Lo que en mi intención no era más que un instrumento de combate, ha tenido que convertirse después en fin de vida. (31)

Despite the failure of *Bayoán*, Hostos’s initial strategy to render visible new communities of readers and writers by establishing a “metropolitan contact zone” was predicated on newly conceived solidarities between the “tyrannized” of the Antilles and the “tyrannized” in the Peninsula itself. This is the meaning of the modern *peregrino* in Hostos. When in 1863 he believed that he had found fellow *peregrinos* in the democratic radicalism of Peninsular republicanism, he dedicated his efforts in order to achieve through these newly conceived solidarities the simultaneous liberation of Spain and the Antilles from the tyranny of the common enemy. Hostos was just as bitterly disappointed, however, by his republican allies as he had been by the “guerra de silencio” with which his *Bayoán* was met in the Peninsular press. Once in power, those political allies who had led him to believe that the triumph of Peninsular republicanism would mean the redemption of the Antilles turned their back on his anti-imperial cause.⁸

period.” (221) Entrala also published in 1881 (a year before his death) a *costumbrista* novel set in the Philippines with the title *Sin título*. For an assessment of this novel see Blanco pp. 220-237.

⁷ See *Bayoán* p. 31.

⁸ See Carlos Rama, p. 212

Hostos had in 1863 turned to literature as a temporary strategy, an “instrumento de combate,” but his failure to elicit a spontaneous response from the Spanish literary system forced him to make writing his only weapon. That is, his attempt to establish a “metropolitan contact zone” had been a failure not only in his relations with literary Madrid but in his attempt to make visible an interplay of readerly communities addressed simultaneously in his novel. Ten years later, Hostos wrote the prologue to the second edition of his *Bayoán* which was published in Santiago de Chile. In this prologue, he felt he needed to explain the failure of his novel in order to rescue it from oblivion. It needed to be rescued, it seems, not as a success but rather as a failure: “Este libro me ha sido funesto. Por eso lo amo tanto, que es el único de mis trabajos literarios que contemplo con orgullo y puedo leer sin la tristeza piadosa que tengo para las obras de imaginación.”(6) To be a *peregrino* means to fail gloriously.

JOSÉ MARTÍ AND THE “VIAJERO JUSTO”

About the time that Hostos was writing the prologue to the Chilean edition of his *Bayoán*, a young José Martí published an open letter to the new Spanish Republic with the title, “La República española ante la Revolución cubana.” In it, Martí exhorted the newly installed Republican government to recognize Cuban independence on the democratic principles that had brought them to power. To no avail, Martí reminded peninsular intellectuals that Cuban patriots, like themselves were struggling against a common despotism and like the revolutionaries of 1868, Cuban revolutionaries were then fighting for a republican form of government. Like Hostos, Martí had been in the Peninsula for multiple reasons. He had been exiled from his native Cuba at sixteen for sedition, and while in Spain had begun to study law first in Madrid and later in Zaragoza. While in Spain, Martí was active in Freemasonry and agitated actively for the independence of the Antilles. And like Hostos, Martí’s efforts to influence imperial

politics in the Peninsula were unsuccessful. And like Hostos, Martí abandoned his efforts in the metropole to pursue his campaign in Europe and North and South America. In the two decades after writing his open letter to Spanish Republicans, Martí continued to struggle not only for the “national” cause of the independence of the Antilles but articulated that cause systematically in relation to imperial relations of power. Martí articulated the interface of the local concerns of nationalism with the geopolitical realities of imperial aggression in his most well-known political essay, “Nuestra América” (1891). In this essay he proposes to solve the “enigma hispanoamericano” through the articulation of continental solidarities among the ex-colonial republics of Spanish America whose continued postcolonial problems stem from their inability to come to grips with the legacy of Hispanic colonialism and the impending imperial threat posed by the United States. Although he does not explicitly reference the continued colonial status of the Antilles, Martí’s analysis of Spanish American imperial woes addresses Cuba’s imperial dilemma indirectly and forecasts the kind of strategic solidarity that might have warded off the US usurpation of the cause of Antillean independence.

To put this another way, while Martí was certainly an architect of Cuban “nationalism” and actively struggled for more than two decades to liberate the Antilles from the grip of Hispanic political dominion, he understood the pitfalls of “local” solutions to imperial problems. Just as he saw that the difficulties of the nation were not solved with the achievement of political independence, the failure to articulate an alternative to imperialism through a broadly conceived regional solidarity threatened to undermine an already achieved sovereignty (in the case of continental nations) and an as yet to be achieved sovereignty (in the case of the Antilles). This systematic approach to the problem of sovereignty in the Americas was not available, Martí suggests at the beginning of his essay, to those who saw “national” problems in too “local” a frame:

Cree el aldeano vanidoso que el mundo entero es su aldea, y con tal que él quede de alcalde, o le mortifique al rival que le quitó la novia, o le crezcan en la alcancía los ahorros, ya da por bueno el orden universal, sin saber de los gigantes que llevan siete leguas en las botas y le pueden poner la bota encima, ni de la pelea de los cometas en el cielo, que van por el aire dormido engullendo mundos. (228)

Rather, the “aldeano vanidoso” whose local concerns consume his attention is unable to notice the imperial threat that looms on the horizon. It is Martí writing from the “entrañas del monstruo” that is able to perceive the threat of imperialism not only to the cause of national sovereignty in his native Cuba but also to the dignity of Spanish America when seen as a whole. Like Hostos, Martí was not a mere traveler in the hierarchies of modernity who could simply enjoy the luxuries of a metropolitan location (New York) but was committed to the glorious suffering of the *peregrino*. Or, as he put it in his poem “Amor de ciudad grande,”

¡Tomad vosotros, catadores ruines
De vinillos humanos, esos vasos
Donde el jugo de lirio a grandes sorbos
Sin compasión y sin temor se bebe!
Tomad! Yo soy honrado: y tengo miedo! (83)

For Martí, the superficial pleasures of metropolitan living inspired deep feelings of unease and even disgust (“¡Me espanta la ciudad!”) because, as an exile there, Martí is condemned to watch the orgiastic consumption of superficial pleasures all around while he in solitude and horror consumes his own entrails: “De carne viva y profanadas frutas/ Viven los hombres, —¡ay! mas el proscrito/ ¡De sus entrañas propias se alimenta” (“Hierro” 89). For Martí, the pilgrim for dignity, the question of where to stand in relation to the record that had structured the meaning of center/periphery relations was not simple for he could not simply side with the “valuing city” nor, on account of his proscription from his homeland simply side against the city. Rather, he was left with

complex feelings of longing, loss and fear for both. The provincial intellectual who chooses the “valuing city” against his own origins is that “sietemesino,” that weakling against whom Martí railed in his essay “Nuestra América”:

Hay que cargar los barcos de esos insectos dañinos, que le roen el hueso a la patria que los nutre. Si son parisienses o madrileños, vayan al Prado de faroles, o vayan a Tortoni, de sorbetes. ¡Esos hijos de carpintero, que se avergüenzan de que su padre sea carpintero! ¡Estos nacidos en América, que se avergüenzan, porque llevan delantal indio, de la madre que los crió, y reniegan, ¡bribones!, de la madre enferma, y la dejan sola en el lecho de las enfermedades! (228-9)

These are the “letrados artificiales” who by siding with the “valuing city” against “la madre enferma” try to govern with “antiparras yankees o francesas” rather than with an eye to the realities that obtain in the Americas. For Martí, the problem for the sickly American republics is that they inherited an imperial geographical imaginary that subjected the countryside to the abstract structures of the governing city the solution is for the intellectual to construct a different relation to the total record that has tried to decipher the “enigma hispanoamericano”:

Nos quedó el oidor, y el general, y el letrado, y el prebendado. La juventud angélica, como de brazos de un pulpo, echaba al Cielo, para caer con gloria estéril, la cabeza coronada de nubes. [...] Ni el libro europeo, ni el libro yankee, daban la clave del enigma hispanoamericano. Se probó el odio, y los países venían cada año a menos. Cansados del odio inútil, de la resistencia del libro contra la lanza, del la razón contra el cirial, de la ciudad contra el campo, del imperio imposible de las castas urbanas divididas sobre la nación natural, tempestuosas o inerte, se empieza, como sin saberlo, a probar el amor. (233)

Martí’s optimism for the future of the American republics stems from his faith in the emergence of the figure of the “hombre real” who, unlike the *letrado artificial* will not only know how to read the total record, but under the influence of *la lectura crítica* will be able to adapt the theoretical knowledge and critical procedures generated elsewhere to local conditions:

Estos países se salvarán, porque, con el genio de la moderación que parece imperar, por la armonía serena de la Naturaleza, en el continente de la luz, y por

el influjo de la lectura crítica que ha sucedido en Europa a la lectura de tanteo y falansterio en que se empapó la generación anterior, le está naciendo a América, en estos tiempos reales, el hombre real. (233)

The importance of the *hombre real* depends not only on a new way of reading (“lectura crítica”) the “total record” of the university library, but also attention to the way in which that library has constructed a particular outlook. It is not simply a question of learning *what* the record contains, but of learning *how* and *why* such a record was created and how to apply its methods (not copy its contents) to the project of rendering visible communities previously unknowable:

La Universidad europea ha de ceder a la Universidad Americana. La historia de América, de los incas a acá, ha de enseñarse al dedillo, aunque no se enseñe la de los arcontes de Grecia. Nuestra Grecia es preferible a la Grecia que no es nuestra. Nos es más necesaria. (231)

Martí, then, answers with great urgency Raymond Williams’s question of where to stand in relation to these writers of “another country or of the valuing city” who pretend to tell what American life “really means.” Martí’s answer lies in the emergence of *hombres reales* who read the total record in the “Universidad europea” in order to build in its place an American University. That is, the *hombres reales* read “para aplicar, no para copiar” (234). As Williams’s question underscores, the “total record” available in the university library does not constitute a homogeneous, or even a closed system, but rather offers a multitude of perspectives and trajectories all of which render the “country life” meaningful. Even the “valuing city” is open to points of view of writers from “another country” with other relations to other countrysides. The provincial intellectual must read the record critically in order to diagnose the ways of looking and the representational procedures that have rendered the provinces meaningful in a multitude of contradictory ways that opens their contents to a systematic methodological analysis by the provincial intellectual. This, of course, is Raymond Williams’s project in *The Country and the City*.

But it is also the project that Martí proposes for the new American intellectual who, shaking off the blinders of a “village” perspective, becomes a critical reader of the total record that renders visible the relationship between the *aldea* and the “gigantes que llevan siete leguas en las botas.” But this “methodological” relationship comes with the comparative experience of travel between the centers and peripheries that render the “interpretative grid” of modernity meaningful.

The procedures of representation must be understood systematically in order for the hierarchies of space to be reconfigured not only to reconstitute a dignity lost to the “pasado sofocante” of colonialism but also to ward off future assaults on the dignity of “nuestra América” by other “gigantes”. This project, which takes its stand in history with an eye to the future, must urgently reconstruct a dignified past (“nuestra Grecia”) to ward off the threat of an enslaved future. That is, the urgency of Martí’s message was not only drawn from the subjection of his native Cuba to the ignominy of colonialism but also to the “desdén” of a new imperial power in the hemisphere that was increasingly turning a covetous eye toward the lands of its neighbors to the South. If, for Martí, the historical failures of the American republics were due to the hate and ignorance that were the imperial legacy of a “pasado sofocante,” their salvation (embodied in the “hombre real”) would grow out of love and knowledge. Similarly, the salvation of “nuestra América” from the covetous gaze of the United States would come not only from love and knowledge among the republics of “nuestra” America in order to put up a common front (“el deber urgente de nuestra América es enseñarse como es, una en alma e intento, vencedora de un pasado sofocante”), but also to combat the ignorance that facilitated the “ambición” of its northern neighbor with a “prueba de altivez, continua y discreta, con que se la pudiera encarar y desviarla” (235). That is, facing a united America south of the

Bravo, the neighbor to the North would be obligated to regard them with respect and comprehension:

El desdén del vecino formidable, que no la conoce, es el peligro mayor de nuestra América; y urge, porque el día de la visita está próximo, que le vecino la conozca pronto, para que no la desdeñe. Por ignorancia llegaría, tal vez, a poner en ella la codicia. (235)

To overcome the “desdén” of a neighbor as formidable as the expanding United States, Martí insists that American intellectuals must not fall prey to facile explanations of imperial aggression. For example, for Martí, the United States does not entirely bear the ethical burden of its “desdén” for its American neighbors. Rather, “como los pueblos viriles, que se han hecho de sí propios, con la escopeta y la ley, aman, y sólo aman, a los pueblos viriles.” To ward off this *desdén*, Martí’s America must “enseñarse como es.” That is, it must elicit in its formidable neighbor a desire to “know” (conocer) Martí’s America “como es”: “urge, porque el día de la visita está próximo, que el vecino la conozca, la conozca pronto, para que no la desdeñe.” (235)

What Martí’s solution to the new imperial threat reveals is the *systematic* nature of his thought. That is, the internal problems of the Americas (its “pasado sofocante”) are of a piece with its looming imperial dilemma with the United States. Just as the “odio” between the city and the countryside which was the most important of the suffocating legacies of Hispanic colonialism in the post-independence period, the solution to the problems produced by that “odio” consists in “probar el amor” between the “castas urbanas” and “la nación natural.” That is, the colonial legacy of urban superiority over the countryside—a scheme replicated faithfully at each level of the larger imperial order—is of the same fundamental structure, the same way of looking with disdain, that underpins the geopolitical order that produces the “desdén” of an increasingly imperial United States. If the United States is to be cured of its imperial ambitions, it must be

convinced to change its way of looking southward, and if it cannot be convinced to look lovingly, it must at least be convinced to look with respect.

It is because Sarmiento chooses the “valuing city” against the barbarous countryside that Martí so harshly criticizes Sarmiento in “Nuestra América.” For, as Martí pointed out in great conceptual detail, Sarmiento replicates the imperial ideoscape when he opposes “civilization” to “barbarity” in order to solve the “enigma hispanoamericano.” That is, although Sarmiento trains the “desdén” of imperial travel writing on a Spain “digno de pincel,” in so doing, Sarmiento has merely traded one cultural metropolis (Spain) for others (France, the United States). For Martí, Sarmiento does not solve the problem of dignity or, what is the same thing, sovereignty in the Americas by simply translating “el libro importado.” In other words, Sarmiento’s disdain for Spanish backwardness is analogous to his disdain for the backwardness of Spanish America itself (“como Uds. aquí i nosotros allá traducimos, nos es absolutamente indiferente que Uds. escriban de un modo lo traducido i nosotros de otro.”) For Martí, “no hay batalla entre la civilización y la barbarie, sino entre la falsa erudición y la naturaleza.” That is, Sarmiento, in his desire to settle a colonial score, settles for superficial satisfactions while leaving in place the geopolitical ideoscape that produced the colonial humiliations in the first place. Whereas Sarmiento defends American universities in the face of Spanish disdain, he does so on the grounds that they are equally peripheral to modernity. For Martí, the “Universidad europea ha de ceder a la Universidad Americana” because the American University should teach the history of America.

It is also for this reason that to accept facile explanations such as the “odio de razas” between the “Germanic” and “Latin” civilizations is to accept the conventional *content* of the “total record” rather than to understand its *systematic* significance. The

imperial ambitions with which an expansionist United States is increasingly in the habit of regarding Martí's America are tempered by the fact that the United States is itself the object of a complex system of gazes that keep the "desenfreno" of imperialist ambition reined in. That is, not only does US imperialism constitute a departure from "lo más puro de su sangre" (i.e. its republican tradition), but its imperial ambitions are further reined in by the regard of others: "su decoro de república pone a la América del Norte, ante los pueblos atentos del Universo." (235) This interplay of gazes constitutes a powerful "freno" on US ambitions and it is in the context of this complex regard that any calculus of resistance must be strategically undertaken. For this reason, Martí insists, new structures of feeling must take hold in the world against the imperial modes of "desdén" and "odio." For this reason, to accept an "odio de razas" as an explanation for the heightening conflict between North and South America was to accept and replicate in a slavish logic of *ressentiment* of those imperial structures of feeling that would eventually sanction US expansionism. Martí's appeal is then to restructure the feelings that underpin imperial ways of looking and to do this he appeals to universal notions of solidarity. But, as I mentioned above, Martí was not naive about the realities of political and material power and for this reason insisted that the powerful are themselves not impervious to principled challenges when those challenges are accompanied by a show of solidarity. But for this solidarity to crystalize, it must be brought to consciousness by overcoming "village" thinking that gets in the way of systematic thinking ("Lo que quede de aldea en América ha de despertar"). For Martí, what is urgently needed are new structures of feeling about geopolitical relations and those new structures of feeling are first and most powerfully perceived by the "viajero justo" who in his travels deciphers the bookish construction of the meaning of the relationship between the centers and peripheries of modernity:

No hay odio de razas, porque no hay razas. Los pensadores canijos, los pensadores de lámpara, enhebran y recalientan las razas de librería, que el viajero justo y el observador cordial buscan en vano en la justicia de la Naturaleza, donde resalta, en el amor victorioso y el apetito turbulento, la identidad universal del hombre. (235)

Martí's intervention into the structures of feeling that constituted the "pasado sofocante" of Spanish colonialism and the "codicia" of US expansionism were both possible from *afar*. That is, Martí writes *of* and *to* Spanish America about imperialisms old and new from the vantage point of New York City, and within the context of a broad coalition of anticolonial intellectuals working to liberate Cuba from the shackles of Spanish colonialism. From this point of view, the urgent need for solidarity with other Spanish American republics in order to stave off US intervention in Cuba itself made a systematic restructuring of the meaning of geopolitical relations necessary. That systematic restructuring meant discarding the conventions of imperial ways of looking ("el odio" or "las razas de librería") in favor of an ethical mode of seeing the world ("amor" or "el viajero *justo* y el observador *cordial* buscan en vano en la justicia de la Naturaleza"). And like Williams or Hostos, Martí's intervention is possible from the analytical distance of a systematically conceived solidarity. These new relations of solidarity were conceivable to the *viajero justo*, furthermore, because the technologies of travel steadily unified the globe. Hostos, Martí and Rizal were incessant travelers and also incessant travel writers. In other words, if the processes of modernity steadily integrated distant regions of the planet and that integration meant the material and political subjugation of much of the globe to Eurocolonial control, this integration also afforded those at the periphery the tools to perceive and contest their own subjugation systematically. In the case of José Rizal, the integration of the Philippines into the world literary system proved to be of decisive importance.

JOSÉ RIZAL AND THE FRAGMENTATION OF THE METROPOLITAN COMMUNITY OF READERS

Toward the end of the nineteenth century the integration of a global literary system was producing new communities of readers not only deeply within European societies but also in those regions of the globe connected culturally to Europe through trade, travel and colonialism. Those new communities of readers around the globe, when considered abstractly, certainly shared many characteristics including the kinds of literature they read and their means of procuring it. For example, the serialized novel (the *folletín-novela* in the Hispanic press) that made possible the international popularity of such writers as Alexandre Dumas and Eugene Sue reached Madrid in the mid 1840s⁹ and the Philippines in the 1860s. But to read Sue or Dumas in Manila was certainly not the same as reading it in Madrid which in turn was different from reading it in Paris. This is not simply because of the palpable lag in the time it took for such literature to make its way through the pathways of translation, transmission and reproduction but, perhaps more importantly, because to read these authors in Manila or Madrid was to be part of a community of readers that transcended local circumstances and made possible the act of reading *against* others. María Cruz Seoane has pointed out that appearance of the *folletín-novela* in the Peninsular press of the mid-1840s caused an extended controversy most importantly because of their immense popularity and led eventually to the establishment of a an official censor specifically for *folletines* in 1852.¹⁰ For traditionalist moralists like Jaime Balmes the pernicious effects of the writings of anticlerical writers like Sue were propagated in newspapers whose political leanings were not necessarily the same as those in the novels they published, but the popularity of the *folletines* made their publication indispensable:

⁹ See Seoane 203-6

¹⁰ Seoane p. 205.

Sea cual fuere la novela, por más que el escritor se entregue a todo género de ataques contra el dogma, contra la moral, contra el culto, contra todas las instituciones religiosas, contra el clero en general, los tolerantes periódicos le abren las dilatadas columnas de sus folletines y hasta luchan entre sí con viva emulación para arrebatarle la preferencia en ofrecer al público la seductora leyenda. No dudamos asegurarlo: si un extranjero juzga de la España por la simple lectura de los periódicos, deberá creer que está aclimatado en nuestra patria el indiferentismo religioso más completo. (Cited in Seoane 204)

Balmes's concern for the mass readership of *folletines* was based on the disruptive power of new communities of readers and the influence of literature to unsettle the traditional structures of authority (especially the Church). That is, not only did anticlerical novels like Sue's *Wandering Jew* popularize new sources of secular authority and ways of feeling among an increasingly large readership but the very popularity of these literary forms had the effect of consolidating the power of the press as a "fourth power" in Spanish society. The influence of the transnational book trade also made its mark on the Philippines despite rigid censorship and the material challenges associated with a distant and incipient literary market. Although Sue's *Wandering Jew* or Dumas's *Three Musketeers* were not published in the Manila press as *folletines* these books and others like them were increasingly available in Manila bookstores, as Rizal pointed out in a letter to Ferdinand Blumentritt:

It is not true what a Spaniard writes about the lack of books in the Philippines. In proof of this there are rich booksellers, like *Agencia Editorial* whose owner became so rich in three years that his bookstore looks like that of Bailly Bailliere. But the majority of the books for sale are religious and narcotizing in character. Many people have small libraries, big ones being rare, because books are very costly. The works of Cantú, Laurent, Dumas, Sue, Victor Hugo, Esrich, Schiller, and others are read. In my town of only 5 to 6,000 inhabitants there are some six small private libraries. Ours is the largest, consisting of more than one thousand volumes; the smallest may have twenty or thirty. The *Indio* in general is fond of reading and studying. It is a proven fact that even families with less than P600 income send their children to Manila to study. And though they know that the fate of educated Filipinos is to have enemies and even to die shot on Bagumbayan Field. (Rizal-Blumentritt 209-10)

Rizal's passage underscores the incipient nature of the colonial literary field in the 1880s. But more than this, it points to shifts in the moral community about which Balmes fretted. Furthermore, Rizal's comment comes in response to "a Spaniard" who has claimed that the Philippines is without books. In the Spaniard's comment we can sense the workings of an imperial imagination which evokes the Philippines in its moral *contrast* to the Peninsula where (one assumes) there must be no lack of books. Rizal's response does not merely contradict the Spaniard's description of the Philippines but rather evokes a community of readers there that does not look directly to the Peninsula for its literary fare. Colonial reading was rapidly shifting from the "narcotizing" to the "seductive" as translations of international bestsellers displaced *novenas* on the shelves of the literate elite. It is instructive to note that of the seven authors mentioned by Rizal, only César Cantú was Spanish. Changing habits of reading in Manila and the provinces meant that new communities of readers emerged in the colonial Philippines not only as purchasers of books but also as newspaper subscribers. These are the changes that Rizal evokes in his comment which points not only to the existence of books in the Philippines, but also to the existence of alternative moral communities even in the provinces. These communities of readers may be incipient, but they are passionate. So passionate, indeed, that they are willing to bring on themselves the wrath of a paranoid colonial state in order to read and study.

At this point, it may be fruitful to ask what it meant to be a reader in the colonial Philippines and how reading shaped what in hindsight looks like an emerging "national" consciousness? As we saw above in the anxieties expressed by Jaime Balmes, the increasingly integrated nature of the peninsular and colonial literary fields into the cultural circuits of a global literary system created official paranoia sufficient to elicit official censorship. If this paranoia had largely disappeared in official circles in the

Peninsula by the time Sagasta assumed power in February of 1881, and censorship of the press was officially abolished in 1883, in the Philippines, however, official censorship remained in effect until the end of the Spanish regime. There the traditionalist fears expressed by Balmes in the 1840s were still very much alive and in fact dramatically increased in the colony in reaction to the beginnings of anticolonial agitation by intellectuals like José Rizal or Marcelo del Pilar. In June of 1882, José Rizal arrived for the first time in Spain where he had gone to study medicine. While there, he simultaneously studied literature and art and became involved in the social and political activities of the Madrid Filipino colony. Among his earliest literary efforts in the Peninsula were short articles written for a new Manila newspaper called the *Diariong Tagalog*.

In this context, it might be particularly fruitful to ask what the difference was in, say, Manila of 1882, to be a reader of the official *Gaceta de Manila* (which communicated the official business of the crown in the colony) and the *Diariong Tagalog* (which appeared that year as the first bilingual newspaper in the colonial Philippines)? These newspapers were both dailies and undoubtedly shared many common readers, but there can be no doubt that the sense for the “community” performed in the pages and instantiated by the actual readership of each publication was quite different. As I will have occasion to point out below, the importance of a publication like the *Diariong Tagalog* (1882) was not simply that it laid the groundwork for “national” imaginings — even though with the benefit of hindsight it is tempting to emphasize its proto-national importance— but equally important was its function as an instrument for integrating new communities of writers and readers into the imperial and cosmopolitan representational economies. Rizal, who contributed to the short-lived paper, did so from Madrid where in addition to publishing essays and speeches, he also wrote “*Revistas de Madrid*” in which

he personalized the fortnightly ephemera of life in the capital city for Manila readers. The importance of these publications was that they made visible new zones of reading and writing for “Filipinos” like Rizal who not only “reviewed” the imperial city but also spoke to and from that city in the Peninsular press and in the process made a new zone of contact visible to colonial readers who were both friends and enemies, urban and rural, rulers and ruled. Furthermore, through Rizal the director of the *Diariong Tagalog* made efforts to compete with other Manila newspapers for Peninsular and international news—in the days before the telegraphic cable when the mail boat sailed every fortnight—by subscribing directly to Madrid newspapers.¹¹

As the example of the *Diariong Tagalog* suggests, the kind of community evoked in *this* newspaper or *that* poem, *this* novel or *that* “cuadro de costumbres” was not a simple matter of evoking or addressing “we Filipinos,” “we caraqueños” or “we English” but such publications rendered visible and meaningful spatialized relations of power and representational authority as well as the existence of discrete communities of readers arrayed meaningfully through the imperial order and beyond. The gap between “what the Philippines really meant” in the pages of the official *Gaceta de Manila*—with its daily assemblages of royal decrees, official appointments and public contracts— and what it meant in the pages of the *Diariong Tagalog* or other contemporary colonial newspapers like *La Oceanía Española*, the *Diario de Manila* or the *Revista del Liceo Artístico-Literario de Manila* underscores the fact that the communities of readers and writers in the colonial and imperial literary systems were dramatically shifting and open to new forms of participation and contestation from new geographic positionalities.

Discrete communities of “Filipinos” —not only *indios*, mestizos, creoles, peninsulars, and Chinese, but also *frailes*, civil officials, journalists, planters, employees,

¹¹ See *Epistolario Rizalino* 1:52.

military officers, municipal elites, etc— constituted increasingly complex communities of readers in colonial society that set in motion complex circuits of identification and disidentification that made any particular publication a complex intervention in multiple struggles for influence and in this way those interventions were expressive of an equally complex system of paranoias and compensations. As was apparent in the Balmes quote, these official paranoias were exponentially increased when the prospect of “un extranjero” is thrown into the mix. As John David Blanco has pointed out, beginning in the late 1860s and accelerating in the 1880s, the “closed” cultural and political system of the colonial Philippines was increasingly integrated into the “open” cultural and political system of the Peninsula. The particular power of Rizal’s participation in the pages of the *Diariang Tagalog* while living in Madrid, or the importance of the fact that he wrote and published his novel *Noli me tángere* in Berlin, was to make visible an increasingly “open” cultural and political reality in the Philippines despite the desperate efforts of those bent on keeping it closed.

To put this another way, what is lost in seeing a particular colonial newspaper like the *Diariang Tagalog* or a particular anticolonial novel like Rizal’s *Noli me tángere* as only, or even principally, evocative of an imagined community of “we Filipinos” is to miss or misconstrue the ways in which these publications re-presented the meaning of imperial relations of power that subtended and motivated their “structures of feeling.” To imagine the “community of readers” addressed in Rizal’s *Noli me tángere* as a homogeneous “Filipino” readership that is constituted *against* those “foreign” readers who might read the book accidentally, as it were, means to gut the book of its analytical intervention into the socio-political consequences of late Hispanic colonialism, and it is also to disregard the book’s most potent political weapon: official paranoia.

This is not to say that an *imagined* community —i.e. a (tenuously) projected image of a sovereign “Filipinas”— does not appear in the pages of Rizal’s novel or in those of a newspaper like the *Diariong Tagalog*. But such an image, however tenuous or powerful, constitutes a particular representational strategy to offset other competing representations of the “meaning” of the Archipelago in geopolitical terms. It is no accident that newspapers like the *Diariong Tagalog* and novels like Rizal’s *Noli me tângere* constituted explicit attempts to integrate a “local” outlook on the “cuestión de Filipinas” with both a metropolitan and cosmopolitan point of view on the meaning of “Filipinas” not only within the Spanish imperial system, but also within the “planetary” system of modernity.

Rizal’s writing has been properly taken as foundational in the origins of Filipino nationalism and Rizal himself may have believed as much about his endeavors. But what seems to be largely overlooked in Rizal’s literary procedures is precisely the imperial dimension of his audience. That is, Rizal often claimed that his goal was to create what we might now call a “national consciousness” or, following Benedict Anderson, an “imagined community” among his fellow “Filipinos,”¹² but his writing was practiced in an imperial literary system and this fact has seldom been taken seriously in the voluminous historical criticism of Rizal’s work.

(UN)IMAGINED COMMUNITIES: CREOLE NOVELS AND NEWSPAPERS

Without doubt, the person whose work has done the most to integrate Rizal’s work into world-historical narratives beyond Rizal’s native *Filipinas* has been Benedict

¹² For one example among legion, he wrote to his friend and fellow *laborante* Mariano Ponce (referring to the articles of Marcelo del Pilar) “todos trabajamos por nuestro país y nuestra pluma no escribe por ni para nadie sino para nuestra patria. Sea nuestro único lema: Por el bien de la Patria. El día en que todos piensen como él [M. H. del Pilar] y como nosotros, ese día habremos cumplido con nuestra penosa misión, cual es la formación de la nación filipina. (*Epistolario Rizalino* 2:35-6)

Anderson. In his landmark book *Imagined Communities* Anderson makes many innovative and subsequently very influential claims about the origins and spread of nationalism in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. One of those claims is that new forms of representation (the newspaper and the novel) emerged in the eighteenth century under the influence of technological, economic and linguistic changes brought about by the rise of a modern and increasingly mechanized form of capitalist print culture. What is evident for Anderson in the novel and the newspaper is that they “provided the technical means for ‘re-presenting’ the *kind* of imagined community that is the nation.” (25). Anderson’s first example is, surprisingly perhaps for a world accustomed to European innovations, not a “nationalist” novel from England, France or even the United States but rather a “colonial” novel from the Philippines: José Rizal’s *Noli me tangere*. Anderson partially justifies his choice of Rizal’s novel in a later essay¹³ by asserting that Rizal anticipates the emergence of the “colonial” novel: “So what about other great colonial novels by the colonized? There is nothing in the Americas, nothing in the rest of Southeast Asia, nothing in Africa till three-quarters of a century later” (232).

Anderson’s choice of a “colonial” (rather than “European”) novel as his example of the form’s function as an instrument that brought about nationalist thinking derives from his contention that nationalism does not emerge first in Europe but rather in the colonial Americas and only subsequently in Europe as a “second wave” phenomenon.¹⁴ Rizal’s “colonial” novel is exemplary of “national imaginings” because it could be seen to “re-present” the “‘exterior’ time of the [Manila] reader’s everyday life” as continuous with the “‘interior’ time of the novel” with the effect of giving a “hypnotic confirmation of the solidity of a single community, embracing characters, author and readers, moving

¹³ “The First Filipino” in *Spectre of Comparisons*. p. 232.

¹⁴ See *Imagined Communities*, p. xiii.

onward through calendrical time.” (*Imagined Communities* 27). This characteristic of novelistic representation —“a complex gloss on the word ‘meanwhile’”— is key for Anderson’s theory because it conjures up a “sociological organism moving calendrically through [...] time” that is the “precise analogue of the idea of the nation” (26).

However, the theoretical utility of the novel in the rise of nationalism is beset with two important ambivalences, both of which are connected to its vacillation in Anderson’s work between its function as an “analogue” to the “idea of the nation” and as an instrument that “provides the technical means for ‘re-presenting’ the *kind* of imagined community that is the nation” (25, original emphasis). The first ambivalence emerges in the chronological account of the rise of nationalism in relation to the historical rise of the novel in the newspaper. The second is the problem of audience in the novel (and newspaper) in its relation to a projected “imagined community.”¹⁵ If American creoles pioneered nationalism, why are there no American “colonial” novels to speak of? ¹⁶ And what of American relative scarcity and limited distribution of “colonial” periodicals? Could these print forms have conditioned the emerging communitarian imaginings and encouraged processes of nationalist identification? Colonial newspapers did exist in Spanish America in the period leading up to the crisis of 1808 but their circulation was usually limited to the “ámbito de oficialidad”— and they generally followed (or criticized) the official modernizing impulse of the “sabias medidas borbónicas” that included scientific, bureaucratic and commercial content.¹⁷ Although creole *ilustrados* also participated in the production of early colonial periodicals, it seems too heavy a

¹⁵ Jonathan Culler has noted both of these ambivalences in his recent essay “Anderson and the Novel” in *Grounds of Comparison*. As I hope will become clear in the discussion below, both Culler’s critique and Anderson’s reply to Culler in the same collection allow for a possible solution to these ambivalences.

¹⁶ The fact that there were no “colonial” novels written by creoles has been variously explained. Pedro Henríquez Ureña for his part chalks it up to colonial censorship and limitations on the booktrade. See Henríquez Ureña, p. 180.

¹⁷ See Álvarez and Martínez Riaza, *Historia de la prensa hispanoamericana*, p. 45.

historical burden to give to “provincial creole printmen” of Spanish America the “specific task” of “providing the framework of a new consciousness” (65). Did these newspapers (since there were no novels) provide the “framework of a new consciousness” or perhaps provide one expression, albeit an important one, of that emerging consciousness that now stands out because it is still available to historians while others (e.g. conversations, letters, social clubs, professional associations, changing habits of reading and writing, gossip, etc) are less so?

But dogging Anderson’s sense for the importance of newspapers is the problem of their actual readerships. That is, who was participating in the colonial literary system and to what degree is it possible to think of colonial readers as belonging to singular communities of readers that could be imagined into national communities? To put this in concrete terms, Anderson argues that in the case of colonial creole readers “the newspaper reader of Caracas quite naturally, and even apolitically, created an imagined community among a specific assemblage of fellow-readers, to whom *these* ships, brides, bishops and prices belonged. In time, of course, it was only to be expected that political elements would enter in.” (*Imagined Communities* 62, original emphasis) If this claim is to be taken seriously it is important to ask what it would mean for a particular Caracas reader to imagine a community of fellow readers “apolitically”? At the heart of Anderson’s argument is an emphasis on form rather than content. In other words, for Anderson, what is decisive about the newspaper for national imaginings are its formal characteristics more than the specific content, (or “politics”) of any particular newspaper and its embeddedness in any particular society. These formal characteristics, Anderson suggests, shape new spatiotemporal habits of mind that make national imaginings possible.

Anderson's seemingly arbitrary choice of a "Caracas reader" is historically infelicitous for several reasons. First, it is difficult to imagine an "apolitical" reader of Caracas's first newspaper —the *Gazeta de Caracas*— for the simple fact that its first issue (October 24, 1808) postdates the Napoleonic invasion of the Peninsula and the bulk of the content of this paper consisted of reprinting news articles and official correspondence related to the political crisis of the colonial authority. Secondly, what is clear in the first edition of the *Gazeta de Caracas*, with its description of the history of the press in the viceroyalty of Nueva Granada, is precisely a pre-existing sense for "we caraqueños" to which the new publication gives a long awaited expression. Its projected urban (Caracas) and provincial subscribers ("los señores que residen fuera de esta capital, en las ciudades, y pueblos de lo interior, en las provincias del departamento de esta Capitanía General, ó en otros puntos"),¹⁸ the sense for the community of readers to whom "these ships, brides, bishops, prices belonged" certainly predated the appearance of the newspaper form. Indeed, the newspaper itself depended on older forms of communication —namely the posting of official decrees and public announcements— of which the editors avail themselves to advertise extraordinary issues of the newspaper: "Quando se reciban noticias, cuyo inmediato conocimiento interese al público, habrá una *Gazeta Extraordinaria*, de que se avisará por Carteles en los parages acostumbrados."¹⁹ Anderson's arbitrary choice of a Caracas reader as his example of the "apolitical" colonial reader is further complicated by the particular political landscape in Caracas and Venezuela at the time. Francisco de Miranda had already made his failed attempt to liberate Nueva Granada from Spanish rule, and Simón Bolívar had (by his own account)²⁰ already taken an oath (in Italy) to decolonize Venezuela. In other words, "politics" —

¹⁸ *Gazeta de Caracas*, 1:1 (October 24, 1808)

¹⁹ *Ibid.*

²⁰ See Bolívar's letter to Simón Rodríguez January 19, 1824.

meaning “national” politics—had already entered into any conceivable “specific assemblage of readers” before the *Gazeta* appeared on the scene. Therefore, when the publisher of the newspaper announced their criteria for the kind of writing the newspaper would publish, other excluded communities of readers lurk behind the editors’ totalizing gesture to a seemingly homogeneous community of its readers:

Al mismo tiempo que se solicita la asistencia de todas las personas instruidas en las *Ciencias y Artes*, se dá al Público la seguridad de que *nada saldrá de la Prensa* sin la previa inspección de las personas que al intento comisione el Gobierno y que de consiguiente en nada de quanto se publique se hallará la menor cosa ofensiva á la Santa Religión Católica, a las Leyes que gobiernan el pays, á las buenas costumbres, ni que pueda turbar el reposo ó dañar la reputación de ningún individuo de la sociedad, á que los propietarios de la Prensa tienen en el día el honor de pertenecer. (*Gazeta de Caracas* 24 October 1808, original emphasis)

To belong (*pertenecer*) to the society evoked and addressed in the first edition of the *Gazeta* was not only to belong to a particular sector of that society that the official channels of representational authority allowed to become visible, but also to belong to a moral community that is meaningfully set off against that other (invisible) community that *would* wish to “perturbar el reposo” of the society to which they belong.

The point here is not to diminish the importance of the newspaper as an agent in the construction of a “national” consciousness but rather to point out that the “formal” — or “modular” as Anderson tends to call them— characteristics of the newspaper seem to explain more when conceived abstractly as macro-historical processes than in the concrete historical circumstances of any particular case of national imaginings. As the particular case of the *Gazeta de Caracas* makes clear, the *imagined* community called up by *this* Caracas publication is hardly “apolitical” and hardly a comprehensive view of “todas las personas instruidas en las Ciencias y Artes.” The (self-)censorship announced in the first issue indirectly acknowledges alternative communities of readers and writers who might indeed wish to publish or read writing that would contravene the authority of

the official censor or even be offensive to the Church. Rather than evoking an “apolitical” community of “we caraqueños,” the *Gazeta* insisted rather stridently on the continuing structure of representational authority that bound Caracas to the Peninsula in a moment when that authority was most severely threatened. At the heart of the community of readers evoked in colonial publications (including newspapers and novels insofar as these forms existed) was the meaning of the colonial relation in the wide field of geopolitics and the authority to represent those relations. The political question of representational authority is immediately put to the Caracas reader of the *Gazeta de Caracas*, for to imagine a community of fellow-readers is already to imagine communities organized according to matrices of identification and disidentification (i.e. negative identification) and arrayed along the axes of friends and enemies, city dwellers and provincials, rulers and ruled. What is more, in the wake of the Napoleonic invasions and the pronouncements of the Cádiz Junta, the channels of representational authority were only precariously maintained. In these circumstances it is important to ask with Partha Chatterjee, whose community is being imagined in the pages of the *Gazeta de Caracas*?²¹ And perhaps even more important is the question of whether the community addressed in its pages by the publishers corresponds to the “specific assemblage of fellow-readers” conjured up in the minds of its actual readers.

These conundrums of historical causality are not easily resolved, but the *association* of the newspaper and novel with nationalism has proven to be a productive one. As the case of the *Gazeta de Caracas* suggests, however, it seems highly problematic to imagine “politics” as merely supplementary to the experience of reading or explaining the importance of the newspaper principally as a new formal way of apprehending space and time. This is so because the colonial newspaper by its very

²¹ See Chatterjee, *The Nation and its Fragments* chapter 1.

nature intervenes in the production of the meaning of geopolitical relations of power, and this “content” is not incidental to its form. In the case of the *Gazeta de Caracas*, the newspaper form simply replaced with mechanical type and broadsheets a more rudimentary system of official and unofficial communication. The publishers offered to print local literary contributions that would have otherwise circulated in hand-written copies. The handwritten royal decrees which had previously been posted at the *parages acostumbrados* throughout the Capitanía General de Caracas were now published in the newspaper that was distributed along the same administrative pathways. It seems more appropriate to see the rise of print-capitalism in Hispanic colonial spaces —of which the *Gazeta de Caracas* is a prime example— as vitally linked to an imagined *imperial* community that was attempting to shore itself up in the face of an encroaching threats to its authority.

But Anderson does not lay the historical burden of national imaginings entirely on the novel and the newspaper, for he rightly emphasizes the contributing impact of changing bureaucratic habits especially under the Bourbon monarchies in the rise of a creole national consciousness. In particular, he notices the limited trajectories of creole bureaucratic “pilgrimages” compared to their peninsular counterparts. But it seems to me that an important component to the jumble of factors that shaped creole consciousness into something like nationalism is missing from Anderson’s account not only of creole nationalisms in the Americas but also, surprisingly, in the late nineteenth-century case of Rizal. That element seems to me the dynamic inside/outside logic of re-presentation set in motion by travel and contact.

Anderson emphasizes the importance of travel in the national imaginings of creole functionaries by describing their “cramped” viceregal careers:

If peninsular officials could travel the road from Zaragoza to Cartagena, Madrid, Lima, and again Madrid, the ‘Mexican’ or ‘Chilean’ creole typically served only in the territories of colonial Mexico or Chile: his lateral movement was as cramped as his vertical ascent. In this way, the apex of his looping climb, the highest administrative centre to which he could be assigned, was the capital of the imperial administrative unit in which he found himself. (57)

It was in these “cramped” pilgrimages —Anderson argues— that the creole functionary began to perceive his bureaucratic “travelling-companions” as part of a community with a shared geographic fate. But Anderson argues that these “cramped viceregal pilgrimages had no decisive consequences until their territorial stretch could be imagined as nations, in other words until the arrival of print-capitalism.” (61). But as we have seen in the case of the *Gazeta de Caracas*, print-capitalism does not seem to be the primary agent of territorial imaginings in Hispanic colonies of the Americas. In fact, Anderson admits that “the printer-journalist was initially an essentially North American phenomenon.” Although the *Gazeta de Caracas* was conceived as a capitalist venture and included the figure of the “printer-journalist,” its appearance in 1808 seems to limit it as a vehicle through which the “territorial stretch” of the Capitanía General de Caracas could be imagined as a nation.

Unlike in North America, few Spanish American creole nationalist leaders were “printmen” by trade or inclination. But most of those leaders did at one time spend time not only in the metropolis (an important “pilgrimage” in itself) but also in other capitals of Europe. Anderson notes in a footnote that at any given time in the first decade of the nineteenth century there were approximately 400 *americanos* in Spain, and that many important leaders of the Independence movement had, in fact, not simply followed the “cramped” routes of the creole bureaucrat, but rather had traveled not only to Madrid but to other European capitals. He mentions the well-known cases of San Martín, Bolívar, and Manuel Mello, and quoting Gerhard Masur’s biography of Bolívar says that while in

Madrid, Bolivar belonged “(c. 1805) to ‘a group of young South Americans’ who, like him, ‘were rich, idle and in disfavour with the Court. The hatred and sense of inferiority felt by many Creoles for the mother country was in them developing into revolutionary impulses.’” (57 n.34). Why the experience of travel as a factor in the rise of a creole national consciousness is relegated to a footnote is left uncommented. But, for the purposes of this study, it seems a phenomenon that deserves further comment.

CREOLE PILGRIMS: THE CASE OF JACOBO DE VILLARRUTIA

Beyond the more well-known cases of traveling creoles (Simón Rodríguez, his student Simón Bolívar, or his compatriots Francisco de Miranda and Andrés Bello), an interesting exception and contradictory confirmation of Anderson’s model of the stifled creole functionary is the interesting and complex case of Jacobo de Villarrutia.²² As I hope to demonstrate with the case of Villarrutia, the rise of ‘creole consciousness’ followed many and contradictory paths. The figure of the “travelling creole” I am invoking here need not be taken too literally for much of the “contact” between creoles and “travelling culture” happened in such out of the way places as colonial Chuquisaca, as the case of Mariano Moreno demonstrates.²³ Villarrutia was the son of a high ranking functionary and born in Santo Domingo in 1757. He began his studies in Mexico (Nueva España) and finished them in Spain where he stayed for some 20 years. He studied law, joined learned societies of literature and jurisprudence, published the newspaper *El correo de los ciegos* for two years and generally sustained the

preocupaciones de ‘espíritu avanzado’: el problema de la felicidad humana, las normas jurídicas, el pensamiento de los monarcas filósofos, la situación de las clases obreras, la educación de los ciegos, el periodismo, el progreso del teatro, la enseñanza del latín, las reformas ortográficas, la novela inglesa... (186)

²² The following biographical sketch is taken entirely from Pedro Henríquez Ureña’s *La Utopía de América*, pp. 186-90.

²³ See Shumway, p. 25-6.

His American birth did not apparently limit his bureaucratic pilgrimages to his native Santo Domingo for he returned to the Americas as a judge (*oidor*) in the Capitanía de Guatemala. While there, he continued his intellectual endeavors begun in Spain in part through his involvement with the colonial periodical the *Gaceta de Guatemala*²⁴ After leaving Guatemala in 1805, he founded the first daily in Spanish America (*Diario de México*) together with “el prolífico escritor y ardoroso patriota Carlos María de Bustamante.” (186) As a consequence of his involvement in the separatist agitation in 1808 he escaped to Europe where he stayed until after independence was achieved whereupon he returned to Mexico.

Villarrutia seems to have acquired his taste for newsprint not in the stifling circles of the colonial bureaucracy but rather in his experience in Enlightenment Spain. This is not to say that his “creole consciousness” could not have developed while a young man in Nueva España. But it is more likely that his sense for his creole status was heightened by his time as an *Americano* in Spain. Furthermore, one suspects that his sense for the connection between print culture and the “nation” might have had much to do with the absolutist cultural policies of Enlightenment Spain in its emerging subaltern status to imperial rivals like France and England. And finally, to call a ranking functionary like Villarrutia who participated in colonial journalism a “printman” a la Ben Franklin is of course to stretch the term to its limit. Villarrutia was a denizen of the *ciudad letrada* whose strict hierarchies certainly did not permit the do-it-yourself ethos of the early Anglo-American journalist/printers.

²⁴ This newspaper began in 1729 and persisted through changes and suspensions until 1816. In the period that Villarrutia was an *oidor* in Guatemala (1792-1804), the newspaper expanded its size and included subscribers in the capital as well as the provinces of the *Capitanía*. “Su trayectoria se complicó cuando asumió la dirección Simón Bergaño y Villegas de ideas progresistas, lector de los enciclopedistas, especialmente de Voltaire, que inevitablemente se topó con las cortapisas de la oficialidad que forzaron el cierre del periódico en 1806 en que fue denunciado por subvertir el orden educativo y moral.” See Álvarez and Marínez Rianza, p. 40.

Villarrutia was, according to Pedro Henríquez Ureña, “uno de los primeros aficionados a la novela inglesa” (190). He translated an epistolary novel by a conspicuously anonymous Irish noble woman (Francis Elizabeth Chamerlaine) who was a literary disciple of Richardson. The novel (*The Memoirs of Miss Sidney Bidulph*) was translated from a French translation as *Memorias para la historia de la virtud* by Villarrutia and published in Alcalá de Henares in 1792. He was, again according to Pedro Henríquez Ureña, interested in the English novel “como medio de propaganda moral.” (187) But Villarrutia like most Spaniards of his time probably did not speak English. In fact, in the 18th century “la literatura de Inglaterra empezaba apenas a conocerse en España y sus colonias; las corrientes que de ella se filtraban habían de atravesar el tamiz francés, con pocas excepciones.” (187) What becomes clear here is that Spain, like Goethe’s “Germany” and Richardson’s England was emerging as a cultural province of cosmopolitan Paris as the European literary system tended toward steady integration. As the prestige of the French, and soon, the English novel grew in that literary system, literary Spain and its itinerant creoles struggled to get up to speed with modern style. This emerging sense of the backwardness of Spain in the full glare of the French Enlightenment must have affected creole *litteratos* like Villarrutia deeply for they in Europe were doubly provincial. Villarrutia’s concern with modernization, which was evident in his intellectual pursuits, meant that he, like Padre Feijoo saw Spain as a place full of *errores comunes* that needed enlightened correcting. It can be scarcely doubted that Villarrutia’s commitments to the pursuits of an “espíritu avanzado” as an *americano* in the Peninsula such as legal reform, journalism, the advancement of the theater and his translation of an “English” novel from French as an instrument of “moral propaganda” stemmed from a changed perspective on the nature of Spanish rule in the Americas. It is clear that Villarrutia was looking beyond the metropole for new forms of social morality.

This sketch of the career of Jacobo de Villarrutia does not allow for speculation on the nuances of motivation in his transformation from a young creole student into a colonial judge and writer and finally into a patriot for Mexican independence. What it does suggest is that although Anderson's account of the rise of a creole consciousness seems in the main valid, it remains difficult to isolate individual causalities in that historical process. Creoles, "taken as a historical formation" —as Anderson puts it— certainly must have been influenced in their relation to the colonial administrative unit in which they lived by the emergence of forms of print-capitalism like the newspaper. But like the non-existent "colonial" novel, the colonial newspaper —structured as it was by colonial controls on print culture— was a site of production for geopolitical relations of power and for influencing structures of feeling about imperial rule. What also becomes clear is that individual creoles may have followed different routes to nationalist feelings and for many of them, those routes led through the capitals of Europe where they found themselves both celebrated curiosities, as in the case of Francisco de Miranda, and doubly provincialized.

Furthermore, what the case of Villarrutia's literary inclinations point to is not the novel's *instrumentality* in evoking a particular national community *in potentia*, but rather its *analogical* function. That is, Villarrutia was interested in the novel "como medio de propaganda moral" not because he saw himself in the community evoked by *The Memoirs of Miss Sidney Bidulph* but rather because he saw the *analogous* (i.e. modular or cosmopolitan) morality evoked in the translated title (taken from the French) *Memorias para la historia de la virtud*. The "virtue" exemplified in the plot is *translatable* across particular structures of power and authority to impose a universal system of moral values. In other words, Villarrutia's translation of an "English" epistolary novel draws our attention not only to the progressive integration of the Spanish literary system into a

system dominated by the cultural authority of Paris, but also to the fragmentation of moral authority under the ideological pressure exerted by Enlightenment conceptions of morality that subjected the structures of feeling that underpinned Spanish imperial authority to alternative, and often highly critical points of view. But, in regard to the absence of the colonial novel, Villarrutia's translation suggests that in the world of the Enlightenment novel, it was not necessary to evoke any particular social milieu for the novel's value as an instrument of "moral propaganda" since that new morality was conceived as universally applicable. In the 1790s the modern ideals of the Enlightenment had not yet foundered on the rocks of the "nationalist" reaction to the Napoleonic invasion of Fichte's Germany or Goya's Spain.

To put this another way, until the crisis of the Napoleonic invasions, the universal values of the Enlightenment project could be shared enthusiastically and applied with vigor in Paris, Madrid, Berlin or Mexico. But when the Napoleonic armies occupied Madrid and Berlin in 1808, the imperial meaning of Enlightened modernity took on a whole new aspect. It was in the aftermath of this crisis that Fichte read his *Address to the German Nation* and theorized the idea of the "internal border" and the spiritual organicism of the modern nation that could persist "internally" even when its "external borders" had been breached by an invading army.²⁵ In Spain the Napoleonic invasion not only meant that the increasingly tenuous sovereignty over its American colonies was effectively broken but also that sovereignty of the metropolitan state itself was severely threatened by the imperial desires of post-Revolutionary France.

Enlightened modernity after 1808, was (in Europe at least) increasingly tempered by local compunctions about the threat it posed to the organicity of the "national" culture. This compunction was less prevalent among colonial revolutionary creoles for whom it

²⁵ See Balibar, "Fichte and the Internal Border: On the *Addresses to the German Nation*"

was difficult to imagine the nation into existence along organicist lines on account of the racial heterogeneity of the population and because the war against Spain effectively broke any effective nostalgia for the metropolitan culture as the source of a usable past. For them, the project of Enlightenment was an unfettered ally in the construction of a “new” society out of the ashes of decolonization. And for this reason, for traveling intellectuals like Bolívar and Bello, the fragmentation of the Americas was seen as a failure to bring to fruition their “national” projects along enlightened lines. This is also why there is no necessary contradiction (nor bad faith) in the fact that Villarrutia returned to Guatemala as a colonial judge and at the same time engaged in reformist journalism. In the late 1790s and early 1800s, Villarrutia’s project of enlightened reformism belonged squarely within an imperial geographical imaginary, albeit one in which the unquestioned authority of the metropole was no longer sustainable and in which the ills that affected the periphery were also visible at the center.

These anecdotes illustrate what is absent in Anderson’s account of the rise of national imagining in the colonial Americas, which is the importance of the traveling colonial intellectual who in the pilgrimage to the metropole and beyond was able to reconceptualize the meaning of the Americas in the increasingly integrated interpretive grid of Enlightenment modernity. This is not to say that capitalist penetration, Enlightenment literature, print-capitalism, and bureaucratic strictures did not each play a role in the process of imagining creole nation-states into being. Furthermore, although creole resentments at peninsular privileges that were denied them certainly played an important role in motivating creole intellectuals to contest the *status quo* of colonial governance, contesting that governance was more probably a product of coming into contact in the metropole with the anxieties at the heart of imperial rule. Why were young creoles like Bolívar and his crowd in disfavor with the crown? Because they could see the

true state of affairs in the metropole and could demystify with their very presence the fantasies about the Americas and the *americanos* that naturalized imperial dominion. But the tenuousness of that dominion must have been palpable if in nothing else than the paranoid kernel of the imperial anxieties that motivated imperial fantasizing.

THE MISSING ALLÁ IN ANDERSON'S RIZAL

If Anderson's attention is insistently drawn to *local* processes and away from the imperial dynamics of representation and dignity that made creole national imaginings possible, this bias is even more pronounced in his reading of José Rizal's anticolonial novel *Noli me tângere* (1887). This novel has often been taken as a foundational text of Filipino nationalism and in Anderson's account it assumes this role in very concrete ways. For if the novel and the newspaper play a special role in Anderson's account of the rise of nationalism globally one of Anderson's primary examples of this relationship is Rizal's *Noli* because, he argues, Rizal's novel expresses the traits characteristic not only of print-capitalist representation but also of national imaginings, namely a homogenous empty time in which an unproblematized "we Filipinos" can be evoked with sociological density. But, as suggested in the case of colonial intellectuals like Villarrutia, Hostos or Martí, Rizal's novel was produced within an imperial ideoscape and for all of its concern for sociological density at the local level, the novel self-consciously evokes imperial relations of power and thematizes their counterintervention. This is not to say that Rizal himself did not intend for his novel to *produce* proto-nationalist imaginings, but the novel's political orientations are meant to have their effect in an imperial system of power that excluded indigenous Filipinos like Rizal from full integration.

Rizal is clear about what he saw as the roots of "national consciousness" and it had more to do with colonial social structures straining under the weight of cosmopolitan and transnational processes than with print-capitalism. In his landmark essay "Filipinas

dentro de cien años,” Rizal stridently critiques the reactionary policies that attempted to reign in the historical forces that were then affecting the Philippines and in so doing announces the emergence of a “national consciousness.”

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. Se cuenta con una numerosa clase ilustrada dentro y fuera del Archipiélago, clase creada y aumentada cada vez más y más por las torpezas de ciertos gobernantes, obligando á los habitantes á expatriarse, á ilustrarse en el extranjero, y se mantiene y lucha gracias á las excitaciones y al sistema de ojeo emprendido. Esta clase cuyo número aumenta progresivamente está en comunicación constante con el resto de las islas y si hoy no forma más que el cerebro del país, dentro de algunos años formará todo su sistema nervioso y manifestará su existencia en todos sus actos. (434)

Rizal is clearly exaggerating at times in this passage but that performance is key to understanding his diagnosis. The problem he wishes to correct (“torpezas de ciertos gobernantes”) —an echo of the perennial “Viva el Rey, muera el mal gobierno”— is precisely what has “despertado el espíritu de la nación” and the solution to the rise of this feeling is *buen gobierno* (i.e. political rights for “Filipinos”). The agent of this unification is the traveling member of the ever-extending “clase ilustrada” that is in contact with all of the islands of the archipelago and which has now formed the “cerebro del país” and soon enough will form its entire nervous system. Rizal’s exaggeration *is* the message. That political repression has united “todos los habitantes de las Islas” is wielded as a threat to metropolitan and colonial communities of readers obsessed with the “integridad nacional en Filipinas” and as a charge to fellow “habitantes.” The key to the emergence of the “clase ilustrada” is linked to Anderson’s notion of colonial pilgrimages. That is, travel and long distance communication are the conditions for the imaginary unification of the disparate islands into one nation and the unification of all their inhabitants under one label: Filipino. Rizal makes this connection between the

bureaucratic and political journeys both within the colony, and also —and perhaps more importantly— journeys to the metropolis and beyond:

Cierto que la unión no es todavía del todo completa, pero á ella van encaminadas las medidas de *buen* gobierno, las deportaciones, las vejaciones que los vecinos en sus pueblos sufren, la movilidad de los funcionarios, la escasez de los centros de enseñanza que hace que la juventud de todas las islas se reunan y aprendan á conocerse. Los viajes á Europa contribuyen también no poco á estrechar estas relaciones, pues en el extranjero sellan su sentimiento patrio los habitantes de las provincias más distantes, desde los marineros hasta los más ricos negociantes y al espectáculo de las libertades modernas y al recuerdo de las desgracias del hogar, se abrazan y se llaman hermanos. (484)

This leads us to the second of the perceived ambivalences in Anderson's use of the novel as an instrument for evoking "national imaginings": the problem of audience in the novel. Here we will take on the emblematic case of Rizal's *Noli* that is, as we noted above, central to Anderson's theorizations. Jonathan Culler takes Anderson to task on his ambivalent claims for the identity of the implied community of readers. In *Imagined Communities* Anderson claims that Rizal's opening description of Manila and the "house on Analoague street" where a dinner party was about to take place which the narrator will "describe in such a way that it may still be recognized" not only "conjures up the imagined community" but "the would-be recognizers are we-Filipino-readers." Yet, as Culler points out, Anderson returns in his 1998 book *Spectre of Comparisons* to the question of audience in the same opening chapter with regard to the following passage in which the narrator addresses the reader directly:

Pues que no hay porteros ni criados que pidan o pregunten por el billete de invitación, subiremos, ¡oh tú que me lees, amigo o enemigo! si es que te atraen a ti los acordes de la orquesta, la luz o el significativo clin-clan de la vajilla y de los cubiertos, y quieres ver cómo son las reuniones allá en la Perla del Oriente.

And Anderson's translation of the same passage:

Since there are no porters or servants requesting or asking to see invitation cards, let us proceed upstairs, O reader mine, be you enemy or friend, if you are drawn to the strains of the orchestra, the light(s) or or the suggestive clinking of dishes

and trays, and if you wish to see how parties are given in the Pearl of the Orient.
(*Spectre* 240)

Culler points out two anomalies in Anderson's rendering of this passage both connected to the problem of audience. First, Anderson remarkably elides a word of crucial importance in his translation: the word *allá* in "cómo son las reuniones allá en la Perla del Oriente."²⁶ The second is Anderson's reading of the significance of the phrase "¡oh tú que me lees, amigo o enemigo!" The problem arises in connection with the former claim in *Imagined Communities* that the implied readers were "we-Filipino-readers" whereas Anderson in the later essay suggests that identity of the reader is here (amigo/enemigo) "marvelously problematic." Anderson goes on to wonder, "Who are these enemies? Surely not other Filipinos? Surely not Spaniards? After all, the *Noli* was written to inspire the nationalism of Filipino youth, and the Filipino people! What on earth would Spanish readers be doing 'inside it'?" (240). Culler's article goes a long way to answering these rhetorical questions by taking them seriously. Indeed, for Culler, the ambivalence of the novel's relation to the emergence of something like an "imagined community" is "because it addresses readers in a distinctly open way" (49). This openness is evident, he suggests not only in the missing *allá*—Rizal's narrator is not in the Philippines but describing it from afar (Europe)—but also in the friend/enemy distinction.

Let me outline a further elaboration of Culler's critique of Anderson as a way of underscoring the often missing imperial/colonial element in analyses of the late colonial Filipino writers we are considering. First, the missing *allá*. It is hard to tell whether the missing word in Anderson's translation is here truly symptomatic of a systematic bias or

²⁶ Culler's critique of Anderson's translation is especially painful given the context in which this passage occurs in Anderson's own book. In the chapter Anderson ruthlessly chides (posthumously of course) the "alcoholic anti-American diplomat" Leon Ma. Guerrero's translation of Rizal's *Noli* that is "fatally flawed by systematic bowdlerization in the name of official nationalism." (*Spectre* 233)

simply an innocent oversight. There are things that point to a symptomatic possibility. First, Anderson addressed this *allá* in his response to Culler in the same collection of essays with a curious mix of humility (or perhaps embarrassment) and analytical recalcitrance. He concedes the error (of course) and even acknowledges its larger implications for the identity of the audience (“*Allá* is necessary only for people living far away from the Philippines, who know little about it, and hence might have some curiosity about its social life.” [229]) but asserts that the *allá* is more complicated than it at first seems, for the protagonist of the novel (Crisóstomo Ibarra) also imagines an *allá* (Europe) when he visits the botanical gardens in Manila. From this Anderson concludes (contrary to Culler’s notion of the distinct openness of the novel’s way of addressing its reader) that “among Rizal’s intended readers were non-Spanish Europeans” and that “it is unlikely that all the anthropological detail noted by Jonathan [Culler] in the opening chapter of *Noli Me Tangere* was meant for Spaniards, but rather for his potential political allies in Northern Europe [...] including Blumentritt, who knew the colony well from books but had never been there, and whom Rizal hoped one day would make a visit.” (229) What is Anderson’s particular aversion to the inclusion of “Spaniards” in the possible intended audience (“What on earth would Spanish readers be doing ‘inside it’?”)?

Of course, Anderson’s objections to Spanish inclusion in the intended readership of the novel are in part counterintuitive. Rizal began writing the book in Spain and finished it in “Northern Europe” (Paris and Berlin). Rizal wrote the book in Spanish which was hardly a good choice if he wanted to attract and interpellate “Northern European allies”. Rizal did mention once in a letter to Ferdinand Blumentritt that if his *Noli* turned out to be a failure, he planned to write a novel in French, but he quickly repented of the idea, saying that the French already had too many books. Rizal made

efforts to get the book into Spain after it was printed, and fretted over delays when his Filipino allies in Spain had not bothered to pick up the package. Rizal also worried over review articles that his book received in the Spanish press and his ally Blumentritt tirelessly promoted Rizal's book through articles, letters and pamphlets published in Spain and elsewhere in the hispanophone world. And finally, when the Filipino newspaper *La Solidaridad* appeared in Spain in 1889, Rizal's novel (and its reception) were the topics of many articles.

At the same time, Anderson is correct in his assertion that Rizal's oft-declared purpose for writing the novel was "written to inspire the nationalism of Filipino youth, and the Filipino people!" (*Spectre* 240). But Anderson in effect narrows the reading public to mainly the "amigos," excepting the concession in a footnote that "Rizal certainly expected copies of his novels to fall into the hands of the colonial regime and the hated friars, and doubtless enjoyed the prospect of their squirming at his biting barbs." Culler responds that this is an admission on Anderson's part that "Spaniards" must have been included but what is clear in Anderson's response to Culler, and also not entirely clear in Culler's "Spaniards" is that for Anderson, the "colonial regime" is local and does not include "Spanish readers" (i.e. metropolitan rather than colonial readers). But Culler argues, I think correctly, that the novel's address to the reader as differentiated between "friend and enemy" is not only open-ended (i.e. *must not exclude* or *include* explicitly) but also is crucial to the complex processes of identification and disidentification given space in the novel in which we may find an echo of the "establishment of a place" that Michel de Certeau attributed to the work of writing.

When José Rizal's *Noli me tangere* addresses the reader, "O you who read me, friend or enemy," the distinction between friend and enemy, on which the political events that make the nation will come to depend, is exposed as not external to the novel but as a possibility that arises within the novel. The community of readers that arises from a novel is one in which readers may be

both friend and enemy, at once insider and outsider. If politics depends upon the distinction between friend and enemy, deciding who is which or ranging oneself on one side or the other, the novel provides a space within which the distinction can arise, prior to those distinctions.” (49)

Why not imagine Rizal’s audience not as unnecessarily limited or incidental (Anderson) but, as Culler seems to suggest, as precisely *structured* by the amigo/enemigo distinction and performed precisely within the registers of the “imperial fantasy” that structures social (and literary) relations between “colonial” *literatos* like Rizal and the larger currents of the increasingly “global” literary system? As I suggested above, the Spanish literary system is an open system in the sense that it is itself part of a “global” literary system whose tentacles have extended to Rizal’s *Filipinas* and beyond. If Rizal refers to Filipino members of the “clase ilustrada” as residing in Europe (not España), this points to the fact that the Spanish imperial system (of which the Philippines was only the most “colonial” part) was culturally open to modernity and the validation that modernity brings, and therefore open to cosmopolitan gestures on the part of its “colonial” subjects. It does not mean that Rizal wished to bypass Spain on his road to political dignity, but rather that that road detoured through Paris, Berlin and London, as well as through Hong Kong, Yokohama and San Francisco.

In short, what Anderson’s account of Rizal’s readership underscores is an important component in the scene in which nationalism emerges: the imperial and cosmopolitan dimension of traveling culture. One senses that Anderson’s aversion to this aspect of emergent nationalisms stems first, from his suspicion of intellectual complicities in “official nationalism” against the “spontaneous popular nationalisms” that he admires and second, from a drive to curb “Eurocentric provincialism” that the history of Euroimperialism has gone so far to institutionalize.²⁷ However, to focus too narrowly

²⁷ See *Imagined Communities* p. xiii

does not make the institutional, cultural and political reality of Euroimperialism vanish, nor does it conveniently restrict it to the colonial scene, as Anderson seems inclined to do. Rather it simply erases an important and meaningful component of anticolonial struggle: dialogue with metropolitan procedures of representation. In this way, Culler's critique of Anderson attempts to restore to the novel the insider/outsider proper to the autoethnographic text. But this is an autoethnographic text that has made the metropolitan—and indeed the cosmopolitan—pilgrimage to bring the “contact zone” to the heart of the literary and political system that is strenuously trying to keep it at the margins.

Drawing in part from Pratt's analysis of autoethnographic texts and from Anderson's theories of the rise of nationalism, Caroline Hau has noticed this inside/outside structure in the narrative voice of José Rizal's *Noli me tângere*. For Hau, Rizal's adoption of this positionality in the novel—a profoundly dialogical “narrative double stance”—proposes the seemingly innovative and anticolonial identification of the “native” with the “modern” in the figure of the narrator of the novel (closely identified with the biographical Rizal) who is able to represent (in both the literary and political senses) the social reality of the Philippines. Rizal's narrator is both a participant and an outside observer of the society he “represents” in his novel. Or as Hau puts it in relation to Rizal's famous evocation of the “social cancer” (colonialism) that plagued the body of the *patria*, Rizal (as narrator) was both “the doctor who diagnoses the social cancer and [...] the patient who suffers from the disease.” (66) This figure of the “modern native” was indeed a powerful rhetorical counterpoint to the logic of colonial representation against which Rizal and other Filipino intellectuals militated. But beyond the inside/outside logic of speaking “of” and “for” that Hau has identified in Rizal's *Noli* the positionality of autoethnographic writing, as Pratt noted, is Janus-like in that it

simultaneously speaks to/for multiple reading publics who are bound to read the text very differently. For what is often missed in the consideration of writing from the contact zone is that the autoethnographic text not only speaks of/for the colonized from the imperial “periphery” but also speaks to/for and often *from* a metropolitan location.

Hau considers the inside/outside aspect of Rizal’s positionality at length with respect to the complex culture of colonial society in the Philippines. She argues that scholarship on Rizal’s novel has tended to identify Rizal and his novel with the “unfinished” project of nation building by unproblematically accepting Rizal as the emblem of the “modern native,” while downplaying or ignoring other possible (and surely more problematic) receptions of the novel—and the figure of Rizal himself—by the subaltern sectors of Philippine society. Hau suggests that Rizal’s novel “register[s] the presence of an ‘excess’ of competing cognitive standpoints that derive from the colonial experience of various inhabitants in the Philippines, and complicate the novel’s rhetoric of universal historical development, change, and progress.” (53) It is this interiorized, colonial “excess” that she wishes to recover in her reading of nationalist literature in the Philippines.

Indeed, in *Necessary Fictions*, Hau considers Rizal’s foundational importance to a national(ist) literary tradition that makes of literature a primary vehicle for national imaginings that continues through the present in the Philippines. Her project is to trace the continuing “legacy of the colonial past and historically determined problems of the present.” (6) Her attention to Rizal’s novels as foundational fictions points to a historical failure on the part of nationalist imaginings to be rid of their colonial legacies. She points to, and I would argue, herself participates in a tradition of anticolonial thought that has run through the history of the project of nationalism in the Philippines and continues to

validate, insofar as this is still possible — and distort (as she rightly points out)— a discourse of nationalism in the Philippines today.

Hau rightly argues that “to admit the continuing relevance of Rizal and other national heroes to the present is to admit that the vicissitudes of the nation’s history necessarily complicate the ideals of freedom and progress to which the nation aspires.”(6) The continuing evocation of Rizal’s foundational importance is “fraught with hope and risk” for it in turn evokes what Lydia Liu has in another colonial context called the “sovereignty complex” that persists at the heart of Filipino nationalist projects.²⁸ This is to say that nationalist imaginings in colonial, intercolonial, neocolonial and postcolonial Philippines retain an anticolonial impulse precisely because those national imaginings continued to be haunted by a spectre of colonialism that has continuously shape shifted. But like Anderson, I think, Hau’s insistent attention to the interiority of the nation state —to its local scene— and the failures of the inside/outside intelligentsia to come fully to grips with —and to re-present— the (un)knowable communities that inhabit its landscape is to forget that Rizal’s struggle was not only to bring to consciousness “la masa no contaminada del pueblo de las provincias” as an idealized “true” national body in league with the silenced “clase ilustrada,” but also to account for “esos ridículos personajes” that populated the pages of his novel.

THE SPECTRES AND DEMONS OF EMPIRE

With the notion of the *spectre of colonialism*, I do not wish to suggest that colonialism did not and does not continue to impose “particularly recalcitrant material constraints on the symbolic and practical capacities of the colonized to realize their freedom” (Hau 53), but rather to highlight the persistent role of imagination and fantasy in the circuits of desire that shape the responses of (anticolonial) nationalisms in relation

²⁸ See Liu, pp. 196-7

to the attractions and coercions of “imperial desire” identified by Liu. It is precisely the emergence of the *modern intellectual* that engenders both the possibility of the “fantasy of the nation” and the contradictions of its inside/outside construction. Furthermore, I wish here to reference with this term a curious impulse in Anderson’s translation of Rizal’s “el demonio de las comparaciones” that serves as Anderson’s title to his book *Spectre of Comparisons*. Rizal’s “demonio” both ironizes and participates in the fantasmagoria of Spanish colonial desire in a characteristic juxtaposition of an enchanted folk-religious socioscape of the *frailocratic* Philippines with the *modern* notion of the secular and sovereign (European) nation. Anderson transfers Rizal’s “demonio” into a decidedly secular register (with Marxist overtones) and flattens the transculturated nature of Rizal’s book that Anderson means to defend in his criticism of existing translations of Rizal’s novel. What is more —as I will have occasion to point out in the next chapter— Rizal’s *demonio de las comparaciones* has an echo in the travel fantasies of Jules Verne whose *Five Weeks in a Balloon* Rizal read as a youth. The protagonist, Samuel Ferguson was, upon his return to England in 1850, “more than ever possessed by the demon of discovery [plus que jamais possédé du démon des découvertes]”

Rizal’s novel had a profound effect on colonial/imperial politics precisely because it was able to harness and marshal the paranoia latent in Spanish imperial fantasies about its colony and its inhabitants. Carolyn Hau rightly points out that the “source of the colonizers’ frustration and paranoia lies precisely in their inability to control the ways in which meaning circulates and proliferates.” (85) But it is important to point out that that paranoia was synergistically heightened in the novel through its projection of multiple “communities of readers” not only *allá* in the colony but also *allá* in the metropolis and *allá* in the cosmopolis. All of these “communities of readers” shared in breaking down not only the “olvido” which left the colony at the mercy of bureaucrats and friars, but

also worked toward the elimination of the indignities suffered by those “Filipinos” that Rizal and other intellectuals made visible far beyond the colonial contact zone.

In part what I am saying here is that to consider the literary writing of anticolonial thinkers like José Rizal or (as we shall see in the final chapter) Antonio Luna only insofar as it might have a bearing on Philippine (proto)nationalism is to unnecessarily narrow the field in which this work was imagined, produced and consumed. What Anderson’s misreading of Rizal’s novel reveals is the curious tendency to limit transnational phenomena (i.e. imperial, global modes of exchange, or Pratt’s “planetary consciousness”) to the unnecessarily narrow stage of the colony as proto-nation, while at the same time making claims for the “modular” (i.e. transnational) character of nationalism itself. But, as Hau suggests, the perpetually “unfinished project” of the nation remains haunted by the spectre of colonialism and harrassed by the demon of comparison long past the end of direct rule.

Chapter 2: *La juventud filipina: La Solidaridad*, Travel and the Metropolitan Contact Zone

The aim of the previous chapter was to show, in general outlines, the importance of travel and “metropolitan contact” in the formation of national thinking for José Rizal by comparing these factors to analogous cases such as his contemporaries José Martí, Eugenio María de Hostos, and Rubén Darío, and a few illustrative examples of creole travelers like the pre-Independence intellectual Villarrutia and the post-Independence intellectual Sarmiento. The binding thread that joins these figures is their relation to the psychodrama of modernity as it is filtered through an imperial world view. With the possible exception of Sarmiento, I argued—following Hostos’s definition—that each of these travelers were secular *pilgrims* who sought to restructure the meaning of geopolitical relations of authority by intervening in the representational system that produces those meanings. Following Raymond Williams’s notion of the knowable community, I suggested that these writers brought to light those (un)knowable communities that an imperial outlook rendered invisible. What is more, those previously unknowable communities were made visible through the analogic concept of solidarity and could be seen to exist across the borders of difference that the imperial systems strenuously try to maintain. And finally, I argued that by establishing “contact zones” in the heart of imperial culture—whether in the metropolis itself or in some *analogous* center—these writers availed themselves of the authority of those new positionalities in order to intervene both from within and outside of the Spanish imperial system they were working to decolonize.

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the establishment of a Filipino contact zone in metropolitan Spain and to account for the origins of this project by considering

social and economic changes taking place in the Philippines in the latter half of the nineteenth century. I will concentrate, again, in this chapter on the figure of José Rizal both before, during and after his trip to Madrid and beyond. I will also describe in general terms the establishment of the Filipino newspaper *La Solidaridad* whereby to outline some of the strategies of authority employed by Filipino intellectuals in the “metropolitan contact zone.” One of my contentions in this chapter will be that these strategies and activities undertaken by Filipino intellectuals have been often understood too much in light of the Philippine Revolution and the rise of Filipino nationalism. Without minimizing the foundational importance of Rizal’s writing or the publication of *La Solidaridad* in the rise of a discourse of Filipino nationalism, I wish to highlight here the centrality of the *imperial* context in which these Filipino intellectuals both read and wrote in order to understand their intervention in an *imperial* system of representation.

LA SOLIDARIDAD AND ANTICOLONIAL SOLIDARITY

Filipino intellectual activity coalesced into a recognizable anticolonial movement in the early 1880s. This was a time when Filipino intellectuals labored to alter a political and social system that was rigidly structured according to “special laws” that reinforced what historian Partha Chatterjee has called “the colonial difference,” whereby the domain of the state is monopolized by structures that work to preserve the “alienness of the ruling group” (Chatterjee 9). In the colonial Philippines the ruling aliens were, of course, Peninsular-born Spaniards who under the traditional imperative of the colonial difference enjoyed a system of official and quasi-official privileges. For their part, the creole, mestizo, Chinese, and indigenous inhabitants of the colonial Philippines bore the burden of a hierarchized system of restrictions, controls and humiliations that served to reinforce the privileges of the ruling groups and the divisions among the subordinated groups. In part in order to escape these indignities, and, of course, for any number of individual

reasons, Filipinos began to travel to Europe in steady numbers in the early 1880s where they established *colonias* in major cities of Spain, Europe and Asia. These *colonias* soon began forming associations, publishing pamphlets and later newspapers with a reformist agenda. By the end of the decade, a loose association of Filipinos in the colony, the metropole and beyond in major cities of Europe and Asia had organized a network of intellectual and economic support for a strident reformist campaign (the so-called Propaganda Movement) that they championed most vigorously in their fortnightly newspaper *La Solidaridad*.²⁹

La Solidaridad was the culminating product of a sustained effort by Filipinos to construct what I have been calling a metropolitan contact zone. John David Blanco has convincingly traced the political and ethical roots of this effort to the ecclesiastical struggles of the 1860s in the Philippines over competition between the regular (exclusively Peninsular) and secular (largely Filipino) clergy for jurisdiction over local parishes. The struggle to defend the rights of the secular and mostly native-born Filipino clergy was first led by Father Pedro Peláez and Father Mariano Gómez and later by Peláez's protege Father José Burgos.³⁰ At issue was the dispensation of local parishes among the two groups which the regular clergy had filled in the apparent absence of sufficient numbers of qualified secular priests. But by the mid-century an expanding body of trained secular priests was combined with the added pressure exerted by the return of the Jesuit order to the Philippines. Control of local parishes was a source of great economic and political benefit to the regular orders they wished to hold on to them at all costs.³¹ To complicate matters, Peninsular and imperial politics became inextricably imbricated in this struggle as it coincided with a wave of liberal reformism that followed

²⁹ The standard work on this movement is Schumacher, *The Propaganda Movement*.

³⁰ See Schumacher, *Revolutionary Clergy* p. 6-7

³¹ See Schumacher *Revolutionary Clergy*, pp. 1-12

the fall of the Bourbon monarchy in September of 1868 together with a wave of imperialist panic over the outbreak of a separatist campaign in Cuba. In this way, the relatively limited ecclesiastical struggle for parishes became connected to a constellation of ideological and political conflicts then tearing at the fibers of the empire. The cause of the secular clergy became a “Filipino” cause and was therefore linked to the activities of a rising local bourgeoisie, with Peninsular constitutional liberalism and, in the eyes of its enemies, with separatist “filibusterismo.” While on the other hand, the cause of the regular clergy was made in terms of its ability to safeguard metropolitan interests against the spectre of a growing separatist threat.

John David Blanco points to at least two consequences of this conflict that are important to my project. First, the conflict marks a passage from the “interior politics” of the colonial representational system to the “politics of publicity” since some of the most important documents in the controversy were published in the Peninsular press:³²

At the end of Burgos’s *Manifiesto*, when the author asserts the “derechos imprescindibles,” “inalienable rights” of the secular clergy, we can thus understand his appropriation of a constitutional slogan (which has its roots in natural law) on at least two levels. First, it frames the secular controversy in terms of the larger ideological struggle between constitutional and colonial reform: an issue that widened the scope and horizon of an emergent Filipino public opinion by tying the Philippines directly to the political debates in the Spanish press. Second, it publicly opens the Philippines (and the government that administers it) to the judgment and critique of a reading public outside it, thereby blowing open the closed circuit of colonial government ruled by Special Laws.” (Blanco 280)

Blanco identifies the second consequence of this controversy in the *Manifiesto* of Father Burgos as the emergence of a “Filipino” identity as an *ethical* community that breaks down the logic of what Blanco calls “colonial apartheid.” That is, Father Burgos was a Filipino-born creole as was his mentor Father Peláez. But the majority of the secular clergy whose rights they defended were either mestizo or indigenous Filipinos (*indios*).

³² Blanco, p. 264

Therefore, “a significant part of the Manifesto must defend a pan-ethnic, native-born Filipino prestige over and against the degradation of *indios* by racism.” (272) In order for this defensive strategy to work, Blanco argues, the social distinctions between the creole Burgos and the *indio* and mestizo members of the secular clergy had to “‘melt away’ for a Filipino politics and culture to exist” (274):

Neither race nor class therefore enable the Creoles to claim the same identity as that of the *indio* secular clergy; yet ethical virtue (*honra*) or ethical nobility (*hidalguía*) in the expression of loyal sentiments provides Burgos with the translating term capable of conceptually dismantling the interior politics of colonial apartheid. (275)

Father Burgos’s responses in the Peninsular press to the insults of the religious orders against the prestige of the secular clergy was momentous because it occasioned an important discursive shift in the meaning of “Filipino” as the “closed” political system of the colony gave way to a “politics of publicity.” But in addition to this important discursive shift, the fight over parishes had political consequences that reverberated far beyond the immediate institutional confines of that struggle. In the heightened political circumstances after 1868 which saw the near-simultaneous outbreak of an anticolonial war in Cuba and the removal of the Bourbon Monarch in the Peninsula, even modest reformism acquired the stark outlines of separatist insurrection in the paranoia propagated by the apologists of a reactionary status quo in the Philippines. In this atmosphere, secular reformists from an emerging “Filipino” middle class were easily conflated with ecclesiastical reformers under the spectral mantle of insurrection against Peninsular authority in the Philippines. The spark that set the house ablaze was provided by an 1872 uprising in the Cavite garrison which led to the trial and public execution for sedition of Father Burgos and Father Mariano Gómez and the aging Father Jacinto Zamora on Bagumbayan Field. The execution of the three secular priests, two of whom had played a primary role in the dispute over the parishes, had a direct effect on the formation of the

metropolitan contact zone. That is, a number of prominent Creole and mestizo liberals who prior to 1872 had been active reformists were exiled to Guam and subsequently moved their families to Hong Kong, London, Paris and Madrid. These exiles, among them Máximo Paterno, Antonio Regidor, Joaquín Pardo de Tavera, and José María Basa, were, in part, the beginnings of a diasporic Filipino intelligentsia and served as nodal points of what would become in the 1880s and 1890s a network of financial, intellectual and political assistance that connected a semi-clandestine Philippines-based activism to the “open” reformist agitation of the Filipino colonies in Madrid and Barcelona. Furthermore, there was a direct genealogical connection for many of the young Filipino activists in Spain and the consequences of the 1872 Cavite uprising. For example, José Rizal’s older brother Paciano had been a protege of Father Burgos as a student in Manila, Pedro Paterno was the son of the exiled Máximo Paterno, and Marcelo del Pilar’s older brother Toribio (a secular priest) was exiled.³³

When José Rizal arrived in Madrid in the summer of 1882 to study medicine, he met there an already existing *colonia filipina*. The fact that he lived in an apartment with other Filipino students and was quickly integrated into the social network of the *colonia* was important not only because it made his adjustment to metropolitan life immeasurably easier, but was decisive because he perceived in that group the base for the political project he had already hatched with his older brother Paciano. For Rizal was not the only Filipino in Madrid committed to restructuring of political relations between the Philippines and the Peninsula. Rather, as we saw above in the case of Liberal reformers or the controversy over the secular parishes, Rizal and other young Filipinos inherited a political legacy that after the tumultuous decade that ran from 1868-1878, re-emerged in the Peninsula under the decidedly more flexible circumstances of the early 1880s.

³³ See Schumacher, *Revolutionary Clergy* p. 37.

During the ten-year colonial war in Cuba, Peninsular politics were particularly volatile. The turmoil came to a head with the liberal Revolution of 1868, and included the Restoration of a constitutional monarchy under Amadeo de Saboya (1870), his abdication (1873), the Cavite uprising (1872), another Carlist war (1872), the declaration of the First Republic (1873), its fall (1874), the Restoration of the Bourbon Monarchy (1874) and ended with the declaration of peace in Cuba at Zanjón (1878). In February of 1881 Sagasta's Liberal-Fusionist government replaced the more conservative government of Cánovas del Castillo and opened the door to a new moderate Liberal reformism in the Philippines and to the influence of liberal Filipinos in official circles in Madrid.

Before Rizal, other young Filipinos were already active in Peninsular politics and in the Peninsular press. Pedro Paterno published a collection of poems *Sampaguitas* (1880) and cultivated ties to Sagasta's Liberal-Fusionist infrastructure as well as to a network of influential journalists and publishers of moderate yet influential periodicals like *El Imparcial*, *El Liberal*, and *La Ilustración Española y Americana*. Graciano López Jaena affiliated himself with the Democratic party of Ruiz Zorrilla and began writing pro-Filipino articles in the Democratic and Republican papers such as *El Progreso* (Madrid) and *La Publicidad* (Barcelona) as early as 1883.

The early strategies of the Filipino reformists —the *laborantes* as they were sometimes called— included banquets in which they fêted sympathetic Ministerial officials and politicians and to which they invited the press; direct insertion of pro-Filipino articles in the newspapers of Madrid and Barcelona; participation in learned societies such as the Ateneos of Madrid and Barcelona; and finally various attempts to establish pro-Filipino newspapers. After several troubled attempts to get a pro-Filipino paper going in the Peninsula, in 1889 the Filipino *laborantes* established the fortnightly periodical *La Solidaridad* in Barcelona. They did so in close collaboration with a Manila-

based funding network organized principally through Filipino Freemasonry and its Peninsular networks. By the time this newspaper was founded, Pedro Paterno had already published several books in Madrid including the already mentioned *Sampaguitas* (1880) and his *costumbrista* novel *Ninay* (1885). José Rizal had also published in Berlin his anticolonial novel *Noli me tângere* and was already considered a dangerous agitator by his reactionary enemies both in the Peninsula and in the Philippines.

For my purposes, what distinguished *La Solidaridad* from these previous literary and journalistic efforts by Filipino *laborantes* was that it made visible the network of anticolonial solidarity that had previously been largely invisible. In other words, what became perceptible in the pages of *La Solidaridad* was a multitude of communities of readers that served to fragment a consolidated imperial “we” that was the moral backbone of metropolitan ways of perceiving its periphery. These communities of readers could be arrayed meaningfully into “friends” and “enemies” through relations of solidarity and struggle. This effort served, in turn, to fragment the “imperial consensus” that characterized metropolitan attitudes toward the political status of the remaining overseas territories.

Given this profile, it is necessary, however, to note the strategies of authority of which the writers of *La Solidaridad* availed themselves in order to speak and be heard in the metropole, in the Philippines, and beyond. At the heart of these strategies was the all-consuming metropolitan paranoia regarding colonial separatism. That is, any “Filipino” who dared criticize the colonial order was easily labeled a “filibustero” (separatist) by imperial apologists and therefore easily dismissed as *antiespañol*. That is, like Hostos, Filipino writers faced the problem of authorizing themselves to speak and be heard in a metropolitan society insistent on the silent obedience of the colonies but driven to distraction by the threat of separatism. For Hostos the novel was the authorizing vehicle

that allowed him to bypass the resistances of the “imperial consensus” for it allowed him to bring into being a figure of anticolonial authority which was as yet impossible in the metropole.

Quería que *Bayoán*, personificación de la duda activa, se presentara como juez de España colonial en las Antillas, y la condenara; que se presentara como intérprete del deseo de las Antillas en España, y lo expresara con la claridad más transparente: "las Antillas estarán con España, si hay derechos para ellas; contra España, si continúa la época de dominación". (*Bayoán* 16)

Hostos's ultimatum was potentially devastating to the imperial consensus not merely because it raised the spectre of separatism but because separatism functions in Hostos's novel as a goad to force a dialogue. Facing similar circumstances in 1889 that Hostos had faced in the early 1860s, Filipino *laborantes* in Spain adopted a similar strategy. For while they went to great lengths to proclaim their allegiance to Spain, they did not renounce the emotional power contained in the Peninsular paranoia about the loss of the colonies. Rather, they turned the threat into an advantage by obsessively disavowing separatist intentions, but naming it as an unavoidable alternative to their moderate demands. Those demands were that the Philippines be assimilated politically and culturally to the Peninsula as another national province rather than as a colony of the crown. José Rizal explained in a letter to his friend and fellow *laborante* Mariano Ponce the utility of writing in the Peninsula. but warned Ponce of worrying too much about the “literary” aspect of this intervention and advised him to “think and feel correctly” and a politically efficacious writing would follow:

El que V. haya tenido poco éxito en los periódicos no quiere decir que no sirva para escribir. No todos somos ni nacemos periodistas, ni los literatos son periodistas todos. Tengo para mí que la cuestión de escribir con más ó menos literatura es cosa secundaria: lo principal es pensar y sentir rectamente, trabajar por un objeto y luego la pluma se encargará de transmitirlo. Lo principal que se debe exigir al filipino de nuestra generación no es ser literato, sino ser buen hombre, buen ciudadano que ayude con su cabeza, su corazón y si acaso con sus brazos al progreso de su país. Con la cabeza y con el corazón podemos y debemos

trabajar siempre; con los brazos, cuando llegue el momento. Ahora el instrumento principal del corazón y de la cabeza es la pluma. Ahora, no nos parezca el instrumento como el objeto primordial; á veces con uno malo se hacen obras muy grandes, dígalo el bolo filipino. A veces con una mala literatura purden decirse verdades grandes. (*Epistolario* 2:21)

La Solidaridad was an *anticolonial* newspaper without being (yet, perhaps) a *nationalist* publication not simply because its contributors repeatedly professed an officially assimilationist program, but because *La Solidaridad* was conceived as a strategic intervention into the imperial system of representational authority. There were, in fact, important disagreements among the contributors to *La Solidaridad* as to the correct way to proceed and even regarding the ultimate political aspirations of the publication and the network it represented. But all of its contributors understood *La Solidaridad* to be a temporary strategy and promoted the various components of its official platform of political assimilation, i.e. parliamentary representation, uniformity of the civil and penal codes, Hispanization of the Philippines, freedom of the press in the Philippines, expulsion of the Religious orders, and educational reforms as equally temporary strategies toward achieving the long range goal of full political and cultural dignity for Filipinos. Therefore, that was initially only conceivable within the imperial system. But, of course, these strategies had to be indirectly expressed or championed as ends in themselves in order for Filipino intellectuals to speak and be heard in a Peninsular society in thrall to its imperial fantasies and troubled by paranoid feelings about its place in the “interpretive grid of modernity.”

To get an idea for how these strategies of authority worked in *La Solidaridad*, I will now turn to the first editorial column published in the periodical (February 15, 1889) and appropriately titled “Nuestros propósitos.” This article, which outlines the intentions of the group of editors (Graciano López Jaena, Mariano Ponce, and Marcelo H. del Pilar), is, in important ways somewhat uncharacteristic in its self-representation from later

editorials in later editions of the paper, but the unusual character of this first editorial can help us glimpse the strategies employed by its editors and contributors throughout its six-year existence in the Peninsula.

Like Hostos's *Bayoán*, *La Solidaridad* would attempt to be an *intérprete* of Filipino desires in the metropole but also like Hostos's *Bayoán*, its editors face the dilemma of how to authorize themselves to speak and be heard. Part of that strategy of authority consisted in simply making visible in the metropole the very existence of *el deseo de Filipinas* in a system of representation structured around strictly controlled access to authority. While for Hostos, the entrypoint was the sentimental economy of the novel, in *La Solidaridad* the open forum of the modern newspaper provided the framework of authority that allowed its writers to speak publicly. But writing a novel or publishing a newspaper was not enough, for one had to overcome the obstacles of entrenched metropolitan disdain and indifference toward the desires of those who inhabited its colonies. Colonial intellectuals had to approach the problem of authority with an array of strategies to defeat a system structured on their silence. As Hostos posed the problem, the colonial intellectual who wished to restructure the meaning of the metropole's relation to its colonies had to answer difficult strategic questions:

¿Cómo decir a la altiva metrópoli, que toda su historia en América era inicua?
¿Cómo hacer entender a las Antillas que, si era bueno todavía esperar, era ya inútil esperar? ¿Cómo conseguir que un libro de propaganda antiespañola se leyera en España y se dejara leer por España en las Antillas? ¿Cómo hacer aplaudir de los escritores y de los críticos españoles un libro nuevo y un escritor novel que se atrevía a pensar en alta voz lo que nadie osaba decirse en el oído?
(Bayoán 13)

Unlike Hostos, Filipino *laborantes* did not, or rather *could* not, directly advocate for political separatism from the metropole. Nevertheless, their program of liberal reforms faced rigid resistance both in the Philippines and in the Peninsula and for indigenous and mestizo Filipinos to advocate changes to the metropolitan society

immediately elicited paranoid fantasies of “filibusterismo.” Therefore, the editors of *La Solidaridad* used a complex series of strategies to authorize themselves to say to the “altiva metrópoli” that much of its history in the Philippines had been wicked and that, if reforms were not undertaken immediately, separatism would be the inevitable consequence. Their campaign had to be cloaked in explicit declarations of fealty to Spain, and, as we shall see in the case of “Nuestros propósitos,” they even resorted, at least initially, to a little imperial cross-dressing in order to authorize themselves to speak *to* and *for* the metropolitan society.

“Nuestros propósitos” fills the entire first page of the first issue so that the only other information available to the reader regarding the nature of the new publication is the title, the subtitle, the issue information, and the masthead containing subscription information, address of the paper and price of posting an announcement. Of this information, only the subtitle (“Quincenario democrático”) gives a sense of the social and political orientation of *La Solidaridad*, even if the title betrays certain political overtones. But the subtitle squarely identifies the paper in the constellation of Peninsular politics to the left of the political centrism of the Cánovas-Sagasta *turnismo*. Looking back at this first issue from the perspective of its eventual historical significance in the struggle for Filipino rights, it is remarkable that the Philippines are not mentioned until the penultimate paragraph on the first page. In other words, there is a striking resistance to define the “we” who speaks with the byline “La Redacción.” And as we shall see as the article advances, this “we” identifies itself geographically along ethical rather than moral lines. In so doing, the article restructures the *imperial* way of looking at the “provincias españolas de Ultramar” by reformulating the “imperial consensus” along distinctly ethical lines. In other words, the writers of the article, who seem to have been Mariano Ponce

and Graciano López Jaena,³⁴ pass themselves off as metropolitans gazing outward to the overseas provinces. This was certainly the case geographically, but the fact that they were not only Filipinos (born in the colony) but *indios* and *mestizos* enhances the significance of this erasure.

The article begins with a customary salute to the other newspapers that is *de rigueur* for all new publications, and a courtesy that established newspapers offered in return to newcomers. Despite the conventionality of this gesture and its expressions of modesty, this *saludo* brings to the fore some important elements in the “geographic imaginary” of *La Solidaridad*. First of all, the newspaper locates itself geographically first in Spain and more particularly in Barcelona. But more than this, the authors express confidence that, having fulfilled this “most elemental” duty of courtesy, their publication will be accepted *ethically* (“con amor y benevolencia”) into the community of periodicals of the Peninsula:

Faltaríamos á un deber, el más elemental de cortesía, si al comienzo de nuestras tareas no tributásemos, ante todo, saludo sincero á toda la prensa española en general, y á la barcelonesa en particular, confiados que acogerán con amor y benevolencia nuestra modesta publicación. (*La Solidaridad* 1:2)

This *saludo* places this ethical burden immediately on the community of readers (here conceived as the community of publications) to accept this new publication without first showing its true intentions. This is important, of course, because the “prensa española” is by no means a unified community, political, morally or ethically. Rather, the press is divided into camps and parties, enemies and friends that express an array of political and social positionalities. Furthermore, because newspapers are local —that is they are

³⁴ See the Editor’s note in Graciano López Jaena, *Discursos y artículos varios*, p. 228. For my own part I think that the article was probably written by Graciano López Jaena (rather than by Mariano Ponce or Marcelo del Pilar) because the strange adoption of a metropolitan positionality in this editorial is observable in López Jaena’s early journalistic contributions to Peninsular newspapers. See for example his article “Los Indios de Filipinas” (1887) in *Discursos* pp. 138-40. He begins the article by declaring: “*Nuestras posesiones en Oceanía son, por desgracia, aquí poco conocidas*” (138, my emphasis).

published from a particular locale— they can be imagined as sharing a common point of view on the world and to share, however narrowly, a sense of belonging to the place where they are published. But this is not the only sense of the community invoked in this *saludo* since it is a *saludo a la prensa*. That is, it is an expression of professional and intellectual belonging which, whatever their political and social differences, these writers share a certain professional identity with the writers of other newspapers.

This sense of professional solidarity, somewhat surprisingly leads the writers to declare that they do not intend to fill a void in the Peninsular press but rather to share the difficulties of the journalistic endeavor. Again here, the “we” of *La Solidaridad* still does not mark itself off from the community of the press nor from its projected community of readers:

En tiempos como *los nuestros*, habiendo periódicos para *todos* los gustos, Revistas para *todas* las inteligencias, no cabe decir que venimos en el estadio de la prensa á llenar un vacío; sólo *pretendemos, reclamamos*, un lugar entre sus filas para compartir con ellos los sinsabores del combate, las fatigas de la lucha que, sin tregua, sostiene con denodado el periodismo español. (2)

But, of course, *La Solidaridad* did come to fill a void in the Peninsular press and here that intention is deliberately suppressed. Rather than reveal their identity, they demand a place among the ranks of Spanish journalism. The martial language of this passage is, of course, conventional, but the *demand* of a place combined with the emphasis on the bitterness of the journalistic struggle gives occasion for pause. From whom do the editors demand a place? And if the editors of *La Solidaridad* only intend to share in the difficulty of the struggle that without truce Spanish journalism is waging, *against* whom are they struggling? The answer to that question is somewhat slow in coming in this article and, again, the only obvious splitting of the “we” of *La Solidaridad* from its addressed community of readers has been its geographical indications (that it is published in Barcelona) and its political subtitle (“Quincenarion democrático”). Only in the third

paragraph do more indications of the socio-political profile of the paper become visible in the paper's declared orientation to the question of political modernity.

Modestas, modestísimas, son nuestras aspiraciones. Nuestro programa, por demás sencillo, sencillísimo es: combatir toda reacción, impedir todo retroceso, aplaudir, aceptar toda idea liberal, defender todo progreso; en una palabra: un propagandista más de todos los ideales de la democracia, aspirando que impere en todos los pueblos de aquende y allende los mares. (1:2)

This “most modest” aspiration to fight all regression and defend all forms of progress is taken here as a universal ideal that provides the touchstone of a foundational dichotomy between the proponents of progress and the apologists of regression. Is this the struggle in which all Spanish journalism is engaged? Clearly not all Spanish publications espouse this democratic program, but *La Solidaridad* here demands a place in the struggle of the Spanish press without clarifying how the points of contention are to be defined and even who is a friend and who an enemy; rather, it is left to the reader to decide whether they are on the side of progress or reaction. But an anti-imperial ethical commitment is veiled behind the familiar imperial geographic expression “aquende y allende los mares,” since what is desired is not the maintenance of the imperial political system in which *aquende* means “we metropolitans” and *allende* means “they colonials,” but rather the imperial geographic imaginary is invoked in a desire that democracy—which is tantamount to sovereign self-determination—reign among *all peoples* on this side and that side of the ocean. What is not mentioned is who is responsible for the fact that democracy does not rule among all peoples.

The writers of *La Solidaridad* have adopted the unmarked position of the imperial “we” for they are not *españoles filipinos, españoles americanos, indios, criollos, o mestizos*, but rather they have demanded a place among the metropolitan “we” that does not need further identification. But having assumed this privileged positionality, they have attached a universal political supplement to the “we” in the form of their democratic

aspirations. What “we” metropolitans want is political dignity for all. To this end, *La Solidaridad* proposes to be a clearinghouse for redemptory ideas of all kinds. The “we” who speak in *La Solidaridad* have authorized themselves to speak *to* and *for* the “national we,” but that national identity is supplemented with redemptory idea of universal democracy. In fact, this campaign to promote “toda idea de progreso” is carried out with the tools of the “politics of publicity” that John David Blanco noted in the emergence of a public sphere in the Philippines:

Los fines, pues, de *La Solidaridad* están definidos en recoger, recopilar, las ideas redefinidos que diariamente se vierten en el campo de la política, en los terrenos de las ciencias, artes, letras, comercio, agricultura é industria.

También discutiremos todas las cuestiones que se refieran á intereses generales de la nación, buscando soluciones en sentido altamente nacional y democrático. (1:2)

What is not clear in this program is what the problems are that need solutions nor who is responsible for them. What is absent, at least on the surface of the “national we” evoked here is the paranoia that comes with the “politics of publicity.” This paranoia is only visible indirectly, for lurking beneath the upbeat tenor of this democratic program is, in fact, a vigorous condemnation of imperial society which appears only as a negative image. For example, they promise the following: “soluciones” to unnamed problems; a world of journalism in which “we” demand a place without naming either who might reject us or on what grounds; emphasis on the fact that Spanish journalism struggles ceaselessly against an unidentified foe. The point to all of this is to project a unified ethical community onto the idea of the national “we” which authorizes *La Solidaridad* to speak *to* and *for* that “national we.” In this way, *La Solidaridad* mimics the imperial consensus when it turns its attention to the “provincias españolas de Ultramar.” It adopts a metropolitan positionality from which it is possible to speak with the authority of an undivided “we metropolitans” and this authority to speak is guaranteed by a claim to do

so in the name of the “intereses generales de la nación,” and when they turn to the “pueblos de Ultramar,” they can declare that *La Solidaridad*’s political program “no está circunscrito á ningún sistema, á ninguna escuela cerrados.” But despite this claim to be free from the limitations imposed by any system or school of thought, *La Solidaridad*’s political program contains the ethical supplement of democratic political values. That is, *La Solidaridad* has in mind the “intereses generales de la nación, buscando soluciones en sentido altamente nacional y democrático.” (1:2 my emphasis). This democratic supplement to the national “we” is an example of what I call *prosthetic authority*. This authority is “prosthetic” in that it supplements a missing authority with a ready-made substitute. Here a “prosthetic” supplement for a missing authority is appropriated in at least two ways. The first is the authority contained in the newspaper form itself. Filipino activists understood the power of the politics of publicity and knew that publishing a pro-Filipino would open the door to their participation in the public sphere of imperial governance that was officially closed to them in the Philippines. By publishing a newspaper in Barcelona they assume not only the prestige of print, but also the prestige of a major metropolitan location. For this reason they “demand” a place in the arena of the press and perhaps for this reason they are circumspect about revealing their “true” identity as Filipinos. The second “prosthesis” here is the democratic supplement to the idea of the nation put forward in the paper. That is, the political ideology of democracy is modular in nature and can be simply attached to the idea of the nation in order to restructure the meaning of the nation in a stroke by rendering newly visible *knowable* political communities *within* the nation who share relations of solidarity with other political communities beyond the nation. In other words, to attach the prosthetic authority of democracy to the Spanish nation is to change the idea of “España” from a moral community into an ethical one.

The article first turns its gaze toward the Antilles. And with this change in perspective, the veiled “political program” of *La Solidaridad* begins to reveal itself in concrete fashion. If in the metropole the newspaper will search for *soluciones* it is in the overseas provinces that the problems become visible. First by expressing support for the “justas y legítimas aspiraciones” of the Antilles, the paper promises to be “un órgano que refleje sus necesidades, dando á conocer, para que se remedien, los males que á aquellos apartados pueblos afligen,” *La Solidaridad* also promises to consider with an open mind the political and economic problems that “nublan el cielo cubano y puertorriqueño.” A stark contrast marks this turn in the attention from the “intereses generales de la nación” to the problems of the overseas provinces. If in the metropolitan space, the problems and the enemies who cause them are only perceptible negatively through the promise of their solution, in the overseas provinces, the problems are directly and starkly drawn:

Sin contemplaciones, pero sin apasionamiento, hará evidente la gangrena que corroe á aquellas sociedades, toda suerte de inmoralidad que se cometa la administración de justicia, económica y gobierno de nuestras preciadas Antillas, cuyo presente y porvenir preocupan á todos los partidos y gobiernos. (1:2)

With this campaign to make visible the “gangrena” that consumes the overseas provinces in the pages of *La Solidaridad* we can glimpse the structures of a metropolitan contact zone” with its multiple communities of readers and complex forms of address. *La Solidaridad* promises not only to be a nexus of all “ideas redentoras” in the Peninsula, but also to be a link for the expression of the “justas y legítimas aspiraciones” of the Antilles. Like Hostos’s *Bayoán*, *La Solidaridad* reconfigures the imperial system of representation in order to simultaneously judge and condemn the metropole and to be an *intérprete del deseo filipino en la metrópoli*:

¿Cómo decir a la altiva metrópoli, que toda su historia en América era inicua?
¿Cómo hacer entender a las Antillas que, si era bueno todavía esperar, era ya inútil esperar? ¿Cómo conseguir que un libro de propaganda antiespañola se leyera en España y se dejara leer por España en las Antillas? ¿Cómo hacer

aplaudir de los escritores y de los críticos españoles un libro nuevo y un escritor novel que se atrevía a pensar en alta voz lo que nadie osaba decirse en el oído?
(Bayoán 13)

Not only are the problems of the overseas provinces to be directly related (“sin contemplaciones”) but the source of those problems can be named directly: the corrupt Administration. In contrast to the clear enemy (official corruption in the Antilles), the metropolitan “we” remains undivided in an ethical relation of concern that transcends particular political affiliations (“cuyo presente y porvenir preocupan á todos los partidos y gobiernos”). Having established this ethical relation between the unified “metropolitan we” and its concern for the problems of the overseas provinces, the article finally turns its attention to the Philippines where it will spend the last third of its space. The authors single out the Philippines not by some professed affiliation (hiding the fact that they *are*, in fact Filipinos) or personal interest, but rather by virtue of this ethical relation of concern for the Philippines as the most needy of the *provincias de Ultramar* since, unlike Cuba and Puerto Rico, they lack parliamentary representation:

En cuanto á Filipinas, siendo aquellas islas las más necesitadas de amparo, careciendo como carecen de representación en Cortes, consagraremos preferente atención, cumpliendo así con un deber patriótico, á la defensa del interés democrático en aquellas islas. (1:2)

This “preferente atención” will, of course be nearly exclusive in the coming issues of *La Solidaridad* since this periodical is an organ of Filipino reformists. But the strategy of tracing lines of solidarity among the remaining colonies was an important gesture throughout the life of the paper but also in this particular performance of consolidated metropolitan concern for the Overseas provinces. In both cases this gesture of solidarity is important in at least two ways. First, it is an authorizing gesture to defuse the charge of personal or institutional interest (in the sense of having something to gain) by framing the argument in terms of ethical principles that transcend local concerns. Second, this gesture

of solidarity gives the illusion of power with which to provoke feelings of paranoia in those accustomed to disregarding the “problems” with the *status quo*.

Having established a positionality from which to speak with authority, the writers begin not only describe the problems in the Philippines, but they set about provoking that paranoia by giving a systematic overview of the problem to which they will find “soluciones en sentido altamente nacional y democrático.” First, they identify the enemy: “Aquella población de ocho millones de almas no ha de ser, no debe ser patrimonio exclusivo de la teocracia y del tradicionalismo” (1:4). Second, they describe the history of democracy in the Philippines and its official suppression:

El archipiélago filipino, desde los primeros albores de *nuestra* era constitucional tomaba parte en nuestro Parlamento, habiendo sido consultado y escuchado en la formación de la ley fundamental del Estado de 1812. Pero en el año 1837 se le arrancó tan importante derecho de su personalidad nacional, y se le arrancó á título de labrar con tal mutilación la felicidad de sus habitantes. (1:4)

Third, they lament the official and popular “desconocimiento, el olvido y la indiferencia” with which “todos los partidos políticos” have tacitly regarded the Philippines since the institutionalization of the special colonial laws in the 1837 constitution. But now, the editors argue, even when the need to “estudiar y remediar sus males, que afectan hasta al decoro mismo de la metrópoli,” is obvious, these metropolitan political parties proclaim the need to put off any remedies for the very reason that “la llaga es profunda y de carácter mortífero.”

The ethical imperative of democratic principles which is attached to the meaning of the relationship between the metropole to the Philippines is supplemented, as it were , with the goading power of paranoia to urge a return to the political ethics of the 1812 constitution. Under the democratic principles of the Cádiz Junta, the Philippines sent representatives to the constitutional convention and with this exercised an “importante derecho de su personalidad nacional.” With the institutionalization of the special laws, of

1837, however, the Philippines became the “patrimonio exclusivo de la teocracia y del tradicionalismo” and has since been systematically ignored by all political parties. Now, the consequences of that mode of relating to the Philippines were becoming increasingly visible, through the “politics of publicity,” and beginning to affect the “decoro de la metrópoli.” Because the problems in the Philippines continued to be met with ignorance and indifference by the “metropolitan we,” new factors were threatening the sustainability of that relationship. Not only were new social and economic forces influencing the meaning of the relation of the Spanish metropole to the Philippines but the problems engendered by metropolitan ignorance and complacency threatened kill the relationship altogether. That is, with the image of a deep and deadly wound (“la llaga es profunda y de carácter mortífero.”) in Philippines affairs, the editors of *La Solidaridad* raise for the first time the spectre of separatism as a consequence of metropolitan inaction.

If the metropolitan attitude to the Philippines had been that of “desconocimiento, olvido e indiferencia,” other nations had begun to exploit this inaction of the Spanish metropole. Not only did Spain not benefit from the commercial development of its colony, but its reputation as an imperial nation (“el decoro de la metrópoli”) was adversely affected in the eyes of “naciones extranjeras”:

Diverso procedimiento emplean las naciones extranjeras: la prensa británica y la de allende los Pirineos dedican luminosos trabajos relativos á la feracidad de aquel suelo; y, por de pronto, mientras España duerme, todos sus intereses agrícolas, industriales y comerciales, excepción hecha de los de carácter monástico, todos son derrotados allí por el comercio extranjero. (1:4)

Only the monastic orders (“la teocracia y el tradicionalismo” referred to above) are benefitting from the present relationship between the metropole and the Philippines, while other nations are producing “luminosos trabajos relativos á la feracidad de aquel suelo.” And while Spain sleeps, other nations are busy exploiting the agricultural,

industrial and commercial benefits that should belong to the metropole. The threat of separatism alluded to with the “llaga profunda y de carácter mortífero” is addressed explicitly in the penultimate paragraph of the article when it invokes the retentionist mantra of “la integridad española en Filipinas” in order to make visible the consequences of the interventions of other more active nations in Philippine society while España has insisted on putting off the inevitable changes that come with the introduction of modernity in the Archipelago:

A la integridad española en Filipinas no favorece el desconocimiento de nuestro archipiélago; aquel país tiene puestos los oídos a la voz del siglo; allí palpitan aspiraciones legítimas á una vida mejor, y no conceptuamos nada político el sistema de ahogar tales aspiraciones con nuestro clásico «ya lo veremos». (1:4)

La Solidaridad began its campaign for colonial reforms by constructing what I have been calling a “metropolitan contact zone” whose outlines are visible in this first article. Again, the components that make up this new contact zone are similar to those which imperial culture uses to structure the colonial contact zone at its periphery. That is, the metropolitan contact zone depends on making visible new relations of authority with which to contest the authority of imperialism. It is not simply a matter of Filipino students living in Spain and experiencing firsthand the “reality” of metropolitan life. For as Raymond Williams reminded us, that “reality” is not simply a matter of making knowable what is really there, but rather is a matter of point of view:

For what is knowable is not only a function of objects —of what is there to be known. It is also a function of subjects, of observers— of what is desired and what needs to be known. And what we have then to see, as throughout, in the country writing, is not only the reality of the rural community; it is the observer’s position in and towards it; a position which is part of the community being known. (165)

To establish a “metropolitan contact zone,” Filipino intellectuals had to strategically construct their “position in and towards” metropolitan culture. But they also had to articulate what was desired and what needed to be known about a metropolitan society

restructured as “nacional y democrática.” On the basis of those restructured feelings about the meaning of the “metropolitan we” they were able, in turn, to restructure the meaning of the imperial periphery in the metropole.

But, as the failure of Hostos’s *Bayoán* to overcome the “guerra de silencio” with which it was met in the Peninsula, this ethical restructuring would not be enough without the powerful weapon of a redeployed imperial paranoia. To enhance metropolitan fears of separatism in the colonies and the disdain of “las naciones extranjeras,” they made explicit new communities of readers who not only shared common interests in the democratic principles of *La Solidaridad*, but also constituted other relations of authority that increasingly bypassed the rigid structures of imperial control: “aquel país tiene puestos los oídos a la voz del siglo; allí palpitan aspiraciones legítimas á una vida mejor” (1:4).

The fully elaborated “metropolitan contact zone” that emerges in the pages of *La Solidaridad* was not the work of one day or even of a single group of intellectuals, but rather had its historical and ideological roots in the experience of modernity in the Archipelago itself and the inevitable growing pains that came with the introduction of capitalist modernity there. The remainder of this chapter concerns the processes that led a person like José Rizal not only to travel to the metropole but also to travel to the metropole with an elaborate sense of his duty there as a Filipino intellectual to restructure the meaning of imperial relations. If we saw above some of the political consequences of the events of 1872 on young intellectuals like José Rizal or Marcelo del Pilar, we should now turn to other social and cultural factors that structured the emergence of a metropolitan contact zone.

MODERNITY AND COSMOPOLITAN DESIRE IN THE “COLONY”

In the Philippines of the middle nineteenth century, important changes were taking place under the pressure of the integration of the Spanish “colony” into the circuits of global commercial and cultural exchange. These changes began to pick up pace dramatically with the opening of Philippine ports to foreign commerce beginning with Manila in 1839 and extending to Iloilo in 1855 and Cebu in 1860 bringing British, American, German and French commercial houses to these Filipino ports. The opening of the Suez Canal in 1869 cut the distance between the metropole and its outlying colony nearly in half, and the advent of steam-driven shipping cut the time and cost of travel dramatically. These changes brought increased bureaucratization to the Philippines not only in the administrative sectors, but also mirrored the expansion of the agricultural and commercial sectors into export products such as sugar, hemp (abaca), copra, coffee and tobacco. This bureaucratic expansion exerted pressure on the educational apparatus of the colony to produce increasing numbers of professional and semi-professional bureaucrats. Michael Cullinane has noted that although access to important administrative positions was restricted to Peninsular Spaniards,

the expansion of the bureaucracy led to a greatly increased participation by Filipinos in all areas of the colonial administration, [...and] provided ample employment opportunities for a small but influential body of moderately educated Filipinos, who by the 1880s were competing for the highest positions available to them in the colonial government and resident commercial houses. (13)

Not only did this professionalized urban sector provide new social and cultural formations in colonial life, but the wealth produced by the expanding agricultural production produced new forms of power among mestizo and indigenous Filipinos.³⁵ As in other parts of the Hispanic world shaped by the imperatives and habits of the *ciudad*

³⁵ For a recent description of the emergence of these new social sectors in the latter half of the nineteenth century and their social and political consequences, see Cullinane, *Ilustrado Politics*, pp. 8-48.

letrada, education was the gateway to social prestige in the Philippines and writing was an essential instrument of power.

In response to this educational pressure to provide such employees, as well as to the influence exerted by social and political changes taking place in the Peninsula, the educational sector was steadily expanded. The return of the Jesuits in 1859 had an immediate impact on this expansion at the primary level, with the founding of the Philippine Normal School in 1863, and at the secondary level, with their assumption of control over Manila's Ateneo Municipal in 1865. The Ateneo's curriculum diverged substantially from the largely scholastic methods taught at schools such as San Juan de Letrán and the University of Sto. Tomás, not only because it included technical education (such courses in agronomy, business and engineering), but also by dint of its emphasis on arts and letters.³⁶ The Ateneo was also socially very different from the other institutions of secondary education in the colonial Philippines in that it emphasized in its pedagogical as well as social regimen, a *de facto* meritocracy in which the students of all social and ethnic backgrounds competed for prestige without (at least within the classroom) the influence of the rule of the colonial difference. Despite its conservative political leanings, the educational regime of the Jesuit order in the Philippines had a decisive impact on social relations among those "Filipino" elites from various social, geographic and ethnic backgrounds who came of age in the post-1868 era. Its particular mix of modernizing pragmatism, social egalitarianism and conservative cosmopolitanism meant that within the walls of the Ateneo, forms of social and cultural capital became accessible to members of the subordinated sectors of the colonial hierarchy and with them, new avenues to social power became accessible outside the walls of the Ateneo. In a letter to

³⁶ See Palma *Biografía* p. 17.

Ferdinand Blumentritt, Rizal commented on the influence that the Ateneo had on his generation of “Filipinos” then living, studying, and *writing* in Madrid.

Nuestra juventud no debe dedicarse al amor ni á las ciencias estáticas especulativas, como lo hace la juventud de las naciones felices: todos tenemos que sacrificar algo en aras de la política, aunque no tuviéramos ganas de hacerlo. Eso lo comprenden nuestros amigos que editan nuestro periódico [*España en Filipinas*] en Madrid; son jóvenes criollos de ascendencia española, mestizos sangleyes y malayos; pero nos llamamos sólo filipinos; casi todos hemos sido educados por los Jesuitas que por cierto no nos inculcaron el amor á la patria, ¡pero nos enseñaron lo bello y lo mejor! (*Cartas entre Blumentritt*, I, 131)

Like Hostos’s *peregrino*, Rizal’s “juventud” could not live as those of “naciones felices.” But also like Martí’s *viajero justo*, Rizal’s youth came to perceive that the racialized categories instituted in the Philippines under the imperatives of the colonial difference were political fictions whose power over the imagination vanished from the change metropolitan vantage point. This is not to say that racialized differences did not matter in the metropole. As I shall have occasion to point out in the case of Antonio Luna in another section of this dissertation, indigenous and mestizo Filipinos like Rizal and Luna were often a spectacle on the streets of Madrid or Paris.³⁷ In fact, if we are to believe Javier Gómez de la Serna—one of Rizal’s creole “amigos” who collaborated in the pages of *España en Filipinas*—Rizal himself doubted the final elimination of racial prejudices between the “Filipinos” in Madrid. According to Gómez de la Serna, Rizal once told him after one of their political arguments, “Tú no puedes ser de los nuestros” When asked why, Rizal replied pointing to the creole’s face, “por el distinto color de nuestra piel.”³⁸ But despite these doubts, Rizal’s comment to Blumentritt reveals that his restructured meaning of the word “filipino” was taken up self-consciously for reasons of political

³⁷In his article “Rizal” Javier Gómez de la Serna recounts the following anecdote about Rizal in Paris: “En una reunión unos franceses dijeron burlescamente al verle: —¡Un chino!, ¡Un chino! Rizal devolvió la burla con la frase más sangrienta para esos majaderos: —¡Prusianos! ¡Prusianos! les dijo sarcásticamente. El escándalo fue monumental.” (“Rizal” *El Renacimiento*, March 12, 1904). For Luna, see chapter 4 below.

³⁸See Javier Gómez de la Serna, “Rizal” in *El Renacimiento* March 12, 1904.

solidarity (“pero nos llamamos sólo filipinos”). For Rizal, a new political way of feeling the meaning of “filipino” emerged not only in the common experience of colonial origin in the new social matrix of the metropole but rather in a restructuring of the political meaning of “nosotros.” This is not to say that this new political sense of “we Filipinos” did not have to do with the local conditions obtaining in the colony. As Rizal himself points out, the commonalities among the diasporic “filipinos” in Madrid extended back to their colonial education where new forms of solidarity became visible under the particular conditions of their common Jesuit education. In this way, Rizal’s evocation of “nuestra juventud” in this passage is closer to that group Anderson describes in his chapter on the “last wave” of anticolonial nationalism: namely the “schooled youth” of twentieth-century anticolonial nationalism, than it is to his Caracas newspaper-reader described in his chapter “Creole Pioneers”. As Anderson explains,

there is a characteristic feature of the emerging nationalist intelligentsias in the [twentieth century] colonies which to some degree marks them off from the vernacularizing nationalist intelligentsias of nineteenth-century Europe. Almost invariably they were very young, and attached a complex political significance to their youth [...] Both in Europe and the colonies ‘young’ and ‘youth’ signified dynamism, progress, self-sacrificing idealism and revolutionary will. But in Europe ‘young’ had little in the way of definable sociological contours. [...] In the colonies things were very different. Youth meant above all, the *first* generation in any significant numbers to have acquired European education, marking them off linguistically and culturally from their parents’ generation, as well as from the vast bulk of their colonized agemates. [...] In the colonies, then, by ‘Youth’ we mean ‘Schooled Youth,’ at least at the start. This in turn reminds us again of the unique role played by the colonial school-systems in promoting colonial nationalism. (118-20)

But for all of its correct emphasis on the importance of the colonial educational system in the production of nationalist movements, what is missing in Anderson, and what is present in Rizal’s description, is the importance of the anticolonial pilgrimage. This pilgrimage was, as it was for all of the writers we are considering in this chapter, essentially connected to education (Rizal, Martí and Hostos all studied in Madrid). But,

what is key to this pilgrimage is not simply access to new forms of authority and prestige, but rather the experience of encountering in the metropole and beyond political and geographic solidarities that profoundly re-shaped their views of the colonial question and the function of literature in the endeavor to solve it. Rizal's statement to Blumentritt, quoted above, reveals both the sentimental dilemma of the colonial intellectual and the importance of a changed perspective on the colony when seen from afar. Suspended between the personal (*amor*) and the universal (*ciencias estáticas*), the colonial intellectual is not a self-possessed traveler but a pilgrim for whom the voyage promises the passage to a full-fledged personal and collective dignity. The fragmented identities structured by the "colonial difference" did not allow for the kind of political solidarities available in the social life in the *colonia filipina* in Madrid, Barcelona or Paris. Nor could young pilgrims like Rizal find the same equanimity in the colonies that they encountered in the solitude of the British Museum or the Biblioteque National. This is not to say that the experience of travel alone accounts for the emergence of a nationalist program among these itinerant filipinos (or Cubans, Puerto Ricans, etc.) but rather, the seeds of disaffection sown in the distressing "personal facts, the incidents of a family" in the colonial order were combined with new forms of communal experience and discursive authority with which to correct that order and restore, both personally and collectively, a trampled dignity.

Part of the importance of travel through the centers and peripheries for these "youth" was the perspective that it afforded on the problems of the Philippines. That perspective was comparative not only in the sense that in Spain and Europe Rizal met other "Filipinos" whose circumstances and feelings were similar to his own, but also in that Madrid was only one metropolitan power among many, and the Philippines only one periphery among many. If it was in the classrooms of the Ateneo that Rizal first learned

the power of literature and learning as pathways to universal values (“lo bello y lo mejor”) and a means of recuperating a (limited) social dignity that had been suppressed by the “colonial difference,” it was in travel —and the knowledge and prestige that came with it— that Rizal pursued the authority to “speak the truth to power.”

As Rizal’s statement also confirms, the duty to “speak the truth to power” is not felt by the “juventud de las naciones felices” who are free to dedicate themselves to the pursuits of happiness or truth. For the anticolonial pilgrim, these pursuits must be sacrificed on the altar of politics. This not only confirms Anderson’s observation about the difference between the “youth” of Europe and the “youth” of the colonies, but it goes some way to identifying what Hostos meant by his statement that begins this chapter: “Vosotros, los que en vez de vivir, peregrináis, seguid con paso firme: la desdicha que os espera es tan gloriosa, que no la trocaréis por la inútil felicidad de los felices. Los que no peregrinan, que no lean.” To understand the meaning of this experience of travel and its intellectual processes, it is necessary to turn again to the colonial scene as the site of production of that “schooled youth” that, in travelling, became a nationalist movement.

THE COLONIAL LITERARY SYSTEM IN THE PHILIPPINES

An important change that shaped this “schooled youth” in the colonial Philippines during the middle decades of the nineteenth century was the emergence of a colonial literary system that included newspapers (staffed by semi-professional journalists); scientific, ethnographic and literary publications; a burgeoning book trade that included local publication; the growth of personal and institutional libraries; and the uneven integration of this colonial literary system into the circuits of metropolitan and cosmopolitan literary production. With the growth of the literary field, access to economic and cultural capital (mainly in the form of access to education) increasingly extended not only to mestizo and indigenous social groups in Manila, but also in the

provinces of the Archipelago. The literary system began, especially in the 1870s, to incorporate these social groups not only as consumers but also as writers and even publishers. José Rizal and Marcelo del Pilar (among others) wrote articles for the short-lived but influential *Diariong Tagalog*. Despite its short life span, this paper passed a number of important milestones in the changing shape of the colonial literary scene. First, it was, according to bibliographer Wenceslao Retana, the first colonial paper run by “Filipinos” and it was the first bilingual (Spanish/Tagalog) newspaper in the Philippines. But because of the strictures of the colonial difference, it was necessary for the publishers of the newspaper to enlist the protective aid of a sympathetic Peninsular to deflect political suspicion:

El *Diariong Tagalog* fue el primer diario bilingüe de la Prensa filipina. Lo creó, puede decirse, la fecunda iniciativa de Marcelo H. del Pilar, gran tagalista y político muy calificado, a quien no faltó el apoyo material de algunos campatriotas suyos. Como la tendencia del papel era esencialmente reformista, los filipinos del *Diariong* tuvieron buen cuidado de poner al frente, a guisa de director-pantalla, al notable periodista peninsular D. Francisco Calvo Muñoz, que por entonces ocupaba en Manila un alto cargo en Hacienda. La publicación mencionada, por su tendencia y espíritu, duró unos meses tan solo. (Retana, *Vida* 60 n. 51)

Rizal wrote a number of articles for the newspaper, though only a few of them were actually published because the newspaper was suspended after only five months.³⁹

The *Diariong Tagalog* assumed, if only briefly, the vanguard in reflecting demographic and geographic changes occurring in the Manila literary scene both socially and linguistically. The paper represented a complex series of integrations of colonial society into the metropolitan and even cosmopolitan literary systems. Not only was it the first bilingual paper, and integrated the voices of diasporic intellectuals like Rizal, but it attempted to systematically incorporate the rural provinces around Manila as an

³⁹ See Retana, *Vida* p. 60. See also Retana, *Aparato bibliográfico* p. 1597.

important part of its subscriber base.⁴⁰ The journalistic trade had, until the late 1870s, been dominated by displaced Peninsulars some of whom had experience in Peninsular journalism while others took advantage of the primitive state of journalism in the middle decades to become *gacetilleros*. As late as 1894 Antonio Chápuli Navarro —himself one of the *grafómanos* that he chides— humorously described the origins of many Peninsular “chicos de la prensa” in Manila:

Casi todos ellos tienen idéntico ó parecido origen: fueron á Filipinas con sendas credenciales, se enamoraron, les dieron calabazas, vengáronse de la ingrata escribiendo un soneto, lo enviaron á un periódico, y... ¡ahí tiene usted el comienzo feliz de su historia literaria!... Ya envalentonados con el éxito de su primera tentativa, suelen atreverse con un articulejo en que nos cuentan las peripecias de un viaje a «carromata» ó las desventuras de un amor contrariado. El periódico agraciado con tan espontánea colaboración, se apresura á dar á conocer los trabajos del neófito; éste sigue matando el tiempo en emborronar cuartillas, y al ver que sus extravagancias con recibidas con gratitud, acaba por hacerse visible en la Redacción. (195-6)

If the humor here lies in the exaggeration, one gets the sense that Chápuli is not far off the mark insofar as Peninsular writers were concerned. By the late 1870s and into the 1880s, however, the literary field in the Philippines was increasingly open to the participation —as both readers and especially writers— of other social groups. Creoles like Pedro de Govantes who followed his Peninsular father’s footsteps in Filipino journalism was together with the Peninsular José Felipe del Pan the main force behind the influential *Revista Filipina* (1879). José del Pan’s own son Rafael became an influential creole journalist both before 1898 and into the American period.

But more importantly in the case of José Rizal and the writers that later founded *La Solidaridad* in Spain, the Filipino and the metropolitan literary systems were undergoing new forms of integration that included not only “Filipinos” from the creole class but also members of the mestizo and indigenous social orders. An important

⁴⁰ See Paciano Rizal’s letter to his brother José in *Epistolario Rizalino* 1:20.

example of this double integration was the *Revista del Liceo Artístico-Literario de Manila*.

To clarify this point, let me give an example of a minor literary polemic between the *Revista* and the *Diario de Manila*. In the prospectus to the *Revista del Liceo Artístico-Literario de Manila*, the editors explained that with the re-launching (in 1881) the purpose of publication was to

difundir los conocimientos científicos y artísticos y la afición á las letras y á las artes en esta provincia ultramarina española, tan poco adelantada en ambos ramos de la actividad del espíritu. Además, un país rico en extremo para la indagación científica y para el progreso del arte, y oculto aún á las miras del mundo sabio, como es este de las Islas Filipinas, necesita de una obra periódica que, al paso que importe los adelantos de los pueblos cultos en las altas esferas del conocimiento y de las actividad sistemática, vaya mostrando á estos los riquísimos tesoros que en punto á material del estudio y de la vida artística encierra. (Retana Aparato 1578-9)

What is more, the new publication announced that its pages were open to collaboration from “todas las personas dedicadas al cultivo de las ciencias y las artes; y humildemente el *Liceo* se dirige (sic) á cuantos escritores y artistas nacionales y extranjeros lean estas líneas” (1579). This address to “artistas nacionales y extranjeros” was a standard way to refer to people inside and outside of the imperial system. In other words, in the traditional conception, a writer from Madrid or Manila was an “artista nacional” while a writer from Leitmeritz, for example, would be an “artista extranjero.” This gesture was cosmopolitan in nature and highlights the desire to integrate the colonial literary system directly into the global circuits of cultural authority (i.e the arts and sciences) without depending on the mediation of the metropole. And in fact the publishers could boast *humildemente* that

La *Revista* cuenta en diversos puntos con varios sócios (sic) ausentes, que son sus corresponsales literarios; contando además en las principales poblaciones del Globo con expertos y activos corresponsales económicos. Esta publicación dará a luz artículos y trabajos doctrinales de ciencia, de arte y de los ordinarios; poesías, los trabajos originales de los sócios en las veladas funciones del *Liceo*; una sección oficial de los actos de la Sociedad; artículos traducidos de los mejores

autores extranjeros; otros escogidos de las Revistas y publicaciones científicas, y cuantas noticias sobre ciencias y artes puedan tener algún interés. (1579)

The *Diario de Manila*, which was a generally conservative and often reactionary voice in the colonial press, responded negatively to the prospectus. At issue was not the advisability of the endeavor itself but rather the claim by the *Revista del Liceo Artístico-Literario de Manila* to be the first publication in the Archipelago dedicated exclusively to this endeavor. The editors of the *Diario de Manila* responded to the “error” of the *Revista*’s claim “como recuerdo de justicia que se debe á ilustradas revistas que han dejado aquí provechosa huella.” (1579). All of the periodicals “justly remembered” (*La Ilustración Filipina*, *la Revista de Filipinas*, *el Oriente* y *La Ilustración de Oriente*), argued the *Diario*,

han insertado artículos dignos de aprecio, relacionados con el progreso moral y material del archipiélago, con su historia, sus costumbres, sus producciones; han dado á conocer las fuentes de su prosperidad, sus bellezas naturales, la multiplicidad de sus razas y han penetrado muchas veces, con criterio práctico, en el campo de la investigación haciendo apreciables sus estudios en el exterior y contribuyendo á que se forme idea aproximada del archipiélago. (1579)

The ambiguity of the phrase “en el exterior” underscores what is at stake in this polemic beyond the question of priority. Does “el exterior” here mean “in the metropole” or does it mean in countries outside the Hispanic imperial system? The answer is not clear, but one suspects that lurking behind the *Diario de Manila*’s protest is the sense that new forms of literary authority were emerging in the cramped Manila public sphere that threatened Peninsular control of the representational economy. Not only were new social groups in fact reconstruing the meaning of imperial relations, but as the ambitious gesture of the *Revista* makes plain, cosmopolitan desires were increasingly prevalent in literary Manila. The pedagogical mission of the Liceo, unlike the political chauvinism that characterized the *Diario de Manila*, set about incrementally incorporating writers like Rizal who despite their literary education had few outlets for participation in literary

Manila. In short, a generation of young Filipino students began to emerge into self-consciousness in the colony. But, as Anderson pointed out, this colonial youth was qualitatively different than contemporary youth movements in, as Rizal called them, “las naciones felices.” This colonial “schooled youth” emerged with definite sociological characteristics that was largely missing in the youth Europe. In the Philippines of the latter half of the nineteenth century, to be part of the *juventud filipina* meant to belong to a Hispanized and educated, yet subordinated colonial elite that was increasingly eager to make a place for itself in the culture of modernity.

THE EMERGENCE OF THE *JUVENTUD FILIPINA*

In this way, the *Revista del Liceo Artístico-Literario de Manila* is important in biographical scholarship on José Rizal and that of Filipino nationalism generally because of the fact that Rizal won consecutive literary prizes in contests sponsored by the Liceo and published in its *Revista*. The first prize, won in 1879 in a segregated contest (“concurso de naturales y mestizos”), was for a poem (“A la juventud filipina”) in which many, including his biographer Retana saw *algo* of the nationalist impulse that was to shape his later writing. The second prize, won the following year (1880) was awarded for a prose allegory (“El consejo de los dioses”) written in commemoration of the 264th anniversary of the death of Cervantes. This time, the competition was integrated and included among the contestants a number of professional journalists and University professors.⁴¹ The second prize, for example, went to the Peninsular writer N. Puzo, who according to an article later published in *La Solidaridad*⁴² was a well known writer for the *Diario de Manila*. Rizal’s participation in these contests has rightfully been adduced as evidence of his literary calling, but it is important to point out the seriousness of

⁴¹ See Retana *Vida*, p. 34.

⁴² June 15, 1891.

Rizal's attitude toward literary participation. In part this can be attributed to the social conditions at the Ateneo alluded to above and the particular prestige attached to literary endeavors there. Rizal, for example, continued as president of the *Academia Literaria* at the Ateneo even after graduating.⁴³ But as the prize-winning compositions themselves attest, Rizal was deeply concerned with making a place not just in Manila, but in the imperial system and beyond for an emerging class of Filipino intellectuals. In the first, "A la juventud filipina" he addressed that group directly, inciting it to lift its head, learn, and join the fray:

[...]

Baja con la luz grata
de las artes y ciencias a la arena,
juventud, y desata
la pesada cadena
que tu genio poético encadena.

Ve que en la ardiente zona
dó moraron las sombras, el hispano
esplendente corona
con pía y sabia mano
ofrece al hijo de este suelo indiano.

[...]

¡Corred!, que sacra llama
del genio el lauro coronar espera,
esparciendo la Fama
con trompa pregonera

⁴³ See Palma, *Biografía*, p. 27.

el nombre del mortal por la ancha esfera. (Rizal, *Poesía* 92)

The poem is a celebration of the contest itself, and in it Rizal urges the contestants in each of the categories (poetry, music, history, painting) to present their most ingenious work. What this passage makes clear is that literature was a way to throw off the shackles of colonial subjection (“desata/la pesada cadena/que tu genio poético encadena”). But what is perhaps less apparent here is the performativity of its enthusiasm for the contest itself. The poem addresses the rising class of mestizo and indigenous intellectuals directly, but in so doing, it indirectly instructs those not addressed (“el hispano”) as to what the contest and the prizes to be awarded really mean. Because this contest was segregated, the winner in each category would be either a mestizo or indigenous participant. And, of course, by virtue of this segregation, the winners would have to bear the stigma of a second-rate prize. Rizal’s enthusiasm for the contest and the urgency with which he spurs on his fellow participants also scripts the attitude of the judges (“el hispano/ esplendente corona/ con pía y sabia mano/ ofrece al hijo de este suelo indiano”). What Rizal’s poem in fact performs is the presence of an emerging community of writers and artists whose very seriousness can overcome the stigma of subordination through earnest effort, and in the process, Rizal’s poem is an invitation to the judges to take the work of the mestizo and indigenous contestants equally seriously by working against their predisposition to condescend. It is this reclaimed dignity for the endeavor that gives the poem *ese algo* that Retana calls its “hálito nacionalista.” But it is not necessary to see here a Revolutionary impulse—insofar as this means imagining Filipino political independence—nor is it possible to construe Rizal’s “juventud filipina” as a community evoked “apolitically” as Anderson suggests in the case of the Creole newspaper reader where “in time, of course, it was only to be expected that political elements would enter in” (*Imagined Communities* 62). Rather, more like for the “schooled youth” of twentieth

century anticolonial movements, to be “young” in Manila meant to read and write, which in turn meant to assume a social location that was at odds with the system of privileges and humiliations that preserved the alienness of the ruling group.

The following year Rizal again entered a literary contest sponsored by the Liceo, but this time he competed not only against other members of the Filipino youth, but also against established colonial writers. If Rizal’s first prize-winning entry at the Liceo thematized the desire for full entry of a new intellectual class, his second prize-winning composition —no longer subject to the stigma of segregation— allegorized that very integration. Rizal wrote a one-act drama in prose to celebrate the anniversary of the death of Cervantes with the title “El consejo de los dioses” in which he dramatized the heavenly debate in Zeus’s Olympic court over Cervantes’s apotheosis on the day of his death. The composition carried the subtitle “alegoría” inviting his readers to connect the admittance of Cervantes into the world of the immortals to the struggles of Filipino youth to enter cultural modernity. The point of contact between Cervantes’s apotheosis and Rizal’s literary ambitions for himself and his fellow Filipino youth was the common occasion of the literary prize. In the case of Cervantes, his literary rivals are Homer and Virgil, and in the case of the Filipino youth, one imagines, their rivals are the peninsular and creole Spaniards against whom they are permitted to compete for the first time.

He begins “El consejo de los dioses” with the following epigraph: “Con el recuerdo del pasado entro en el porvenir.” This interplay of memory and the future acquires a “planetary” dimension in the allegory of Cervantes’s literary apotheosis. This apotheosis is an imperial allegory that stages another literary competition before an Olympic court in which the literary merits of Cervantes are pitted against those of Homer and Virgil. After advocates for the superiority of each writer (Juno for Homer, Venus for Virgil) have presented their respective cases, Minerva stands up to nominate Cervantes

who despite the obscurity of his origins (the imperial province of *Hesperia*) and personal hardship produced a work of literature of universal value:

Hay en la antigua HESPERIA, más allá de los Pirineos, un hombre cuya fama ha atravesado ya el espacio que separa al mundo de los inmortales del Olimpo, ligera cual rápida centella. De ignorado y oscuro que era, pasó a ser juguete de la envidia y ruines pasiones, abrumado por la desgracia, triste destino de los grandes genios. No parece otra cosa sino que el mundo, extrayendo del TÁRTARO todos los padecimientos y torturas, los ha acumulado sobre su infeliz persona. Mas a pesar de tántos sufrimientos e injusticias, no ha querido devolver a sus semejantes todo el dolor que de ellos recibiera, sino por piadoso y demasiado grande para vengarse, trató de corregirles y educarles, dando a luz su obra inmortal: el *Don Quijote*. Hablo, pues, de CERVANTES, de ese hijo de la ESPAÑA, que más tarde será su orgullo, y que ahora parece en la más espantosa miseria. (“Consejo” 5)

The literary contest, the provincial origins and the suffering make the allegorical meaning of this composition clear, and its message of redemption follows the historical scheme set out in the epigraph “Con el recuerdo del pasado entro en el porvenir.” Like Cervantes, Rizal’s “juventud filipina” may be *ignorada y oscura* and live *ahora* under the most *espantosa miseria* but, despite the many *sufrimientos e injusticias* from *sus semejantes*, they will not seek revenge but rather try to *corregirles y educarles*.

This is not the place to tease out all of the allegorical implications for Rizal and his generation, but let it suffice to point out a few important components to this allegory of integration. The “recuerdo del pasado” with which Rizal enters the future is multiple. First, it is the personal and collective memory of colonial misery. Rizal, like Cervantes, had been “herido y cautivo por muchos” (7) about the time that he wrote this composition because as an *indio* he had not saluted in the dark of night a *bulto* that turned out to be an officer of the Civil Guard:

Cuando tenía diecisiete años me agredieron y encarcelaron á pesar de estar herido, y me amenazaron con el destierro, solamente porque en una noche oscura no me quité el sombrero al pasar yo delante de un teniente de la Guardia Civil. Acudí en queja al Capitán General, pero no me hicieron justicia; mi herida tardó dos semanas en sanar. (*Rizal-Blumentritt* 107)

In his letter to Blumentritt where he tells the story he does so to explain his motives for writing his novel (*Noli me tângere*) that accompanies the letter itself. In the letter, written five years after “El consejo de los dioses”, Rizal reveals that his motives for writing the allegory were similar to those that motivated him to write the novel. Yet if the novel is a much more sophisticated literary creation than this youthful allegory, Rizal’s political attitudes toward the injustices of colonial rule had also matured. That is, if an incident in which Rizal had personally felt the heavy hand of colonial injustice had led him to write this allegory in order to “teach and correct” the colonizers, by the time he wrote the *Noli me tângere* he had begun to conceive of the problem of colonial injustice systematically for to the accidents of his personal life he had begun to consult and contest “total record” that has constructed the meaning of the Philippines. Again to return to the letter to Blumentritt cited above:

Le envío un libro: es mi primer libro, á pesar de que ya he escrito much antes de ese y obtuve algunos premios en certámenes. Es el primer libro imparcial y atrevido sobre la vida de los tagalos. Los filipinos encontrarán en él la historia de los últimos diez años; espero que úd. notará cuán diferentes son mis descripciones de las de los otros escritores. el gobierno y los frailes probablemente atacarán la obra, rebatiendo mis argumentos; pero yo confío en el Dios de la Verdad y en las personas que han visto nuestros sufrimientos de cerca. Aquí contesto todos los conceptos falsos que se han escrito contra nosotros y todos los insultos con que se ha querido deprimirnos. Espero que Vd. lo comprenderá bien. (*Rizal-Blumentritt* 106-7)

As this letter attests, the *recuerdo* of the personal violence done against him stayed with Rizal as a motivating force far beyond the composition of “El consejo de los dioses” but to this personal memory he has added the testimonies of “las personas que han visto nuestros sufrimientos de cerca” in order to contest the “conceptos falsos” that had been written “contra nosotros.” But this memory of injustice is not the only memory that stays with Rizal when he left the Philippines for Europe. For what this letter, written from Berlin as he had just received the first and only print run of his anticolonial novel, the

memory of having won “algunos certámenes” —and he is here referring specifically to the literary contests of the Liceo— were still important to Rizal even as the author of a much more mature work.

Hidden behind the allegorical screen of the apotheosis of Cervantes lie the rancorous seeds of Rizal’s later work but also the evidence of Rizal’s literary ambitions. Just as Cervantes’s *Quijote* “es el látigo que castiga y corrige sin que derrame sangre, pero excitando a risas; es el néctar que encierra las virtudes de la amarga medicina,” Rizal’s own allegory prefers to return insult with instruction veiled in the *néctar* of laughter.

By 1887, Rizal had lost faith in his imperial audiences’ ability to get the subtlety of the humor and in the *Noli* had settled on a more direct (he calls it “impartial”) description of colonial injustice. Important differences separate the eighteen-year-old author of “El consejo de los dioses” from the twenty-five-year-old author of the *Noli me tângere*. Most important among them had been the five year experience of living and traveling in Spain and Europe. His letter to Blumentritt was written from Berlin where he wrote the novel and learned German, joined the Berlin Ethnographic Society and conferred with Orientalist scholars and geographers. But beyond this, Rizal’s cosmopolitan contacts with Blumentritt and others, combined with his experience as part of the *colonia filipina de Madrid*, put him in a position to do favors for such highly placed people as the son of then Minister of State Segismundo Moret:

Referente á mi visita á los profesores Jagor y Virchow, he cambiado de opinión. El hijo del ministro Moret, un semi-amigo mío, está aquí y tiene recomendaciones de T.P. de Tavera⁴⁴ para ambos profesores; no poseyendo aún el Sr. Moret el alemán, él desea le acompañe yo cuando haga sus visitas. Una recomendación de Ud. ó un anuncio de mi visita, creo que sería de gran servicio para mí. (*Cartas Rizal-Blumentritt* 44)

⁴⁴ A Filipino creole bibliographer, medical doctor and historian with whom Rizal had cordial but not intimate relations.

As his voluminous correspondence with Blumentritt attests, Rizal's time in Europe was spent precisely in libraries submitting the "personal facts, the incidents of a family, to a total record." In other words, what significantly separates "El consejo de los dioses" from his *Noli* and what gives it its complexity and sophistication is precisely its attention to this "total record" and its program of contesting "todos los conceptos falsos que se han escrito contra nosotros y todos los insultos con que se ha querido deprimirnos."

But what is already apparent in the "Consejo" as an allegory of integration is his sense for the geographical nature of the problem and the geographical aspect of the solution. If Cervantes could rise through diligence and talent from his humble provincial origins to the heights of an Olympic apotheosis, so could Rizal's *juventud filipina* if their case could be adequately made before an impartial court of opinion. The problem was, of course, that the closed circles of the colonial literary system did not make it possible for Fame to cross, as it had in the case of Cervantes, with the rapidity of a thunderbolt, "el espacio que separa al mundo de los inmortales del Olimpo." But through this, and other competitions, the word could begin to spread that the *juventud filipina* had competed with Peninsular Spaniards and won before a blind and impartial jury.

This moment of triumph is allegorized in the figure of the goddess Justice who arrives to settle the debate over which of the three writers (Juno's Homer, Venus's Vergil, or Athena's Cervantes) was to carry the day. Jove demands that the blindfolded and impartial Justice place the tomes of their works in her balance where they are found to be equally meritorious. With this, each is awarded a different prize. To Cervantes goes laurel and "mientras que la Fama publicará por el mundo la sentencia del Destino, y el cantor Apolo entonará un himno al nuevo astro, que desde hoy brillará en el cielo de la gloria y ocupará un asiento en el templo de la Inmortalidad" (Retana *Aparato* 1586). This apotheosis is, of course, a direct echo of the stanza quoted above from "A la juventud

filipina” (“¡Corred!, que sacra llama/ del genio el lauro coronar espera,/ esparciendo la Fama/ con trompa pregonera/ el nombre del mortal por la ancha esfera.) for if Cervantes can be admitted into the firmament of universal literature (“la Fama publicará por el mundo la sentencia”) then deserving mestizos and indigenous writers and artists ought to receive just consideration and universal admiration (“por la ancha esfera”).

This allegorical apotheosis is perhaps an index of Rizal’s personal literary ambitions, and of the confidence with which he approached the contest sponsored by the Liceo. But if Rizal’s literary ambitions were already high in 1880, it is also clear that like Hostos, Rizal “veía que la conquista de un nombre literario es la conquista de un poder.” And with Hostos he might have said, “El poder me hacía falta para servir inmediatamente a mi país, olvidado, vejado, escarnecido. En él había yo concebido la mayor parte de las ideas que quería expresar, de él había yo traído la idea capital a que desde entonces me consagraba” (*Bayoán* 12-13). Like Hostos, Rizal was a *peregrino* before he left for the metropole, but only after having traveled there and beyond did he hit upon the strategies necessary to combine his ambition with actual power to change the relationship that defined him as a colonial. But in his “Consejo de los dioses,” the effects of the integration of the colonial literary system with that of the metropole and *beyond*, was already visible, and the utility of literature as a pathway to dignity was already apparent to the young Rizal.

RIZAL’S “LOS VIAJES” AND THE ANTICOLONIAL PILGRIMAGE

Although there are many previous examples of the integration of the colonial and metropolitan literary systems, the *Diariong Tagalog* was an important if brief step toward the participation of Filipinos in that system in the colonial contact zone whose multilingual character became suddenly visible in the pages of the new newspaper. But what may be of more importance here was the initial collaboration in the *Diariong* by

Filipinos like Rizal who were then members of the *colonia filipina* in Madrid. The articles Rizal wrote in 1882 for the *Diariong Tagalog* present a young Rizal eager yet reflective about his new positionality not only as a Filipino and a Spaniard but also as a cosmopolitan. His early literary essays, written for the *Diariong*, express not only his eagerness to embrace the modern authority that travel and writing have thrust upon him, but also anxiety about his duty to the *patria* that he has left behind.⁴⁵ In one of those essays written for *Diariong Tagalog* but not published because the paper had ceased publication, a twenty-one-year-old Rizal reflects on the experience of travel in a narrative of the progress of humankind. The essay, called “Los viajes,” begins with the question, “¿Quién es el que no ha viajado?”

¿Quién es el que no ha viajado? ¿Quién no ama los viajes, si son el sueño de la juventud al sentir por primera vez la conciencia de la vida, si son un libro para la edad madura, cuando el ansia de saber ocupa el espíritu, y, en fin, son el último adiós del anciano cuando se despide del Mundo para emprender el más misterioso de los caminos. (18)

The first question is not easily answered because it hovers over distinctions of demography, identity and prestige. That is, the question potentially poses three separate questions: Who travels and who doesn't? What kind of person has not traveled? What status does the person who has not traveled have? Regardless of the emphasis of the question, the answer is the same: nobody. That is, *everyone* travels (at least metaphorically “el más misterioso de los caminos”) and you are *nobody* if you don't travel. But the metaphorical sense of the “journey” quickly cedes in the essay to the more literal activities of physical travel and travel reading. If, in these more literal modes of travel, we return to the demographic question of who travels and who doesn't in places like the Philippines of the 1880s, it is clear that the answer is far from everyone. At the

⁴⁵ For an incisive treatment of Rizal's sense of duty to his *patria* including a reading of “Los viajes,” see Blanco, “*Encomium Admirabile*”

heart of this question is the anxiety produced by a world organized in spatial hierarchies for a person who inhabits a subaltern location. But this anxiety only arises in the consciousness of the person aware of the *desire* to travel and this desire is the product of travel reading. In the colonial Philippines it was the *juventud filipina* that could glimpse the importance of travel in overcoming the inequities of the colonial difference. In other words, it became clear to “colonial youths” like Rizal that the way to gain access to an impartial court of opinion was to travel and engage in the politics of publicity.

Rizal’s question (“¿Quién es el que no ha viajado?”) is reminiscent of Rubén Darío’s famous formulation “¿Quién que ES no es romántico?” in his poem “Los pinos” (1907) Like Rizal’s “¿Quién es el que no ha viajado?” Darío’s question is enigmatic. But more than this binds Darío’s poem to Rizal’s question and Rizal’s essay to Darío’s question. First of all, both concern the figure of the *viajero* or, rather, the *peregrino*. Darío’s poem describes the solitary traveler’s sense for the unity of the world by noting the beauty and brotherhood of the pine trees throughout the Mediterranean world. But the poem is more than an ode to the landscape in which pine trees exist, for that landscape is imperial: “Tocó vuestra frente la alada sandalia;/habéis sido mástil, proscenio, curul./¡oh pinos solares, oh pinos de Italia,/bañados de gracia, de gloria, de azul” (185) The pines of Italy, are not only beautiful to behold, but they as masts, proscenia, curule chairs have provided the emblems and instruments of imperial power that makes their beauty meaningful. For Darío, it is only in the consciousness of the traveler that the *analogous* value of pine trees everywhere can come into existence. The person who stays put can only see pine trees as incidental to the landscape and not systematically related to a way of looking at that landscape and rendering it meaningful in geopolitical terms. In other words, to travel, in the literal sense, and to read and write allows the poet to make the imperial meaning of the landscape his own and to make a place for himself within that

landscape. In the case of Darío, this meant claiming for himself and for Hispanic culture generally, the imperial culture of the Mediterranean against the materialist imperialism of the northern members of the concert of imperial nations that now included the United States (“oh pinos del Norte sois bellos también!”). Darío here, then, reconfigures the meaning of culture and imperialism (among other things) not only by making the landscape and the cultural tradition of the greco-roman Mediterranean his own through travel and writing, but also by condemning those who would be insensitive to the meaning of *this* imperial tradition. When Darío asks, “¿Quién que ES no es romántico?” the overdetermined complexity of the question does not only depend on the identity of the subject of “SOMOS” and or the difficulty of determining the meaning of “ES,” but also on the polyvalence of the term “romántico.” For here the meaning of “romántico” is not limited to the nineteenth-century literary movement nor even to a particular aesthetic sensibility, but contains within it a “roman” core that ties it to the revindication of the relevance of greco-roman sensibilities (“pretéritas normas”) in the modern and imperial world:

Románticos SOMOS ...¿Quién que ES no es romántico?

Aquél que no sienta ni amor ni dolor,

aquél que NO sepa de beso y de cántico,

que se ahorque de un pino: será lo mejor...

Yo, no, yo persisto. Pretéritas normas

confirman mi anhelo, mi ser, mi existir.

YO soy el amante de ensueños y formas

que viene de lejos y va al porvenir.⁴⁶

⁴⁶ Rubén Darío, “Canción de los pinos,” *Poesía completa* p. 795.

Like Darío's "pretéritas normas," Rizal's claim has a pedigree, and its genealogy is imperial. Rizal suggests that travel is at the heart of progress, that it is the "great lever of civilization." Beginning with the Greeks who went to Egypt to learn and continuing through the "afrancesamiento" of modern civilization, travel has been the mechanism for progress:

En todos los tiempos y en todas las edades de la Historia, los viajes han sido la palanca poderosa de la civilización, porque sólo en los viajes se forman, educan e ilustran el corazón y el espíritu, porque sólo en los viajes se ven y estudian todos los adelantos: Geología, Geografía, Política, Etnología, Lingüística, Meteorología, Historia, Fauna, Flora, Estadística, Escultura, Arquitectura, y Pintura, etc., todo cuanto forma parte del saber humano, pasan y se exponen a los ojos del viajero. (20)

Despite Rizal's claim for the antiquity of the importance of travel, his sense of its purpose is distinctly modern. Not only does travel enable such modern sciences as geography and ethnology, but his sense for the "advances" (adelantos) is geographically inflected by the prevailing imperial order. "Las naciones modernas han comprendido la ventaja que se saca de esta clase de estudios y todas sus tendencias se reducen a multiplicar las comunicaciones" (22). To travel is to have an identity and that identity is relational; to see the world is to know one's place in it. But at the heart of Rizal's enthusiasm for travel, there is an anxiety that springs from his distrust of representation because even if to read travel literature means—as Certeau suggested—vicariously "despoiling the wealth of Egypt to enjoy it" oneself, with that pleasure comes the sense for one's real place in the world. As it is for Darío, for Rizal, to travel is to be, to possess oneself, to have an identity. It is to have access to the University library; it is to experience the Imperial city firsthand; it is to see other lifeways that confirm "la identidad universal del hombre" discovered by Martí's *viajero justo*. "Es innato en el hombre el deseo de viajar como el saber." (18) For Rizal, this "innate" desire can be elicited by travel literature. But this desire comes with a burden for those to whom the

trajectory of travel takes one from the periphery to the center rather than the reverse. If the *desire to travel* is universal in mankind, not so the material conditions of possibility. For Rizal, the beginnings of these conditions of possibility arise out of the disquiet elicited in the young colonial by travel reading:

No leais a los niños el *Robinson* ni el *Gulliver*, si no queréis que os abrumen con preguntas acerca de esos países, cuyos encantos hicieran su imaginación sensible; no pintéis a los jóvenes las emociones, las peripecias, las aventuras en países extraños o desconocidos; quitad de sus ojos Julio Verne, Mayne Reid, por que sino, turbaréis sus noches, y agregaréis a sus nacientes deseos, múltiples y vehementes ya, otro aún que les haga sufrir la sujeción o la modestia de su fortuna. ¡Hay tanto atractivo en las desconocidas maravillas, tanta seducción en la contemplación de la naturaleza! (18)

For the colonial Rizal, this means to add further to those already “multiple and vehement” desire that make colonial youths suffer “la sujeción o la modestia de su fortuna.”

As Rizal’s injunction against travel writing (“quitad de sus ojos Julio Verne”) demonstrates, the desires and pleasures elicited by travel literature are experienced differently by metropolitan and colonial readers. In Jules Verne’s *Five Weeks in a Balloon*, Samuel Ferguson’s return to England after incessant (colonial) traveling finds him “more than ever possessed by the demon of discovery” (plus que jamais possédé du démon des découvertes), but when Rizal’s own hero Crisóstomo Ibarra of *Noli me tângere* returns home to the Philippines after years of traveling in Europe, he is possessed by the “demon of comparisons” (*el demonio de las comparaciones*) because of the feeling that one feels in the constant evocation of the *allá* in the experience of travel.

In other words, for Rizal, it is the *personal* experience of travel that brings about a “revolution” in the ideas of a person who for the first time leaves his homeland in a way that reading about distant places cannot.

El que sólo conociera la superficie de la tierra, la topografía de un país por los mapas y planos que desde su gabinete examinase, tendrá una idea, no diré que no,

pero una idea semejante a la que tendría de una ópera de Meyerber o Rossini, el que sólo la conociera por las revistas de los periódicos. [...] ¡Qué emociones, qué sensaciones tan variadas no agitan a cada paso el corazón cuando se viaja en un país extraño y desconocido! Allí todo es nuevo: costumbres, idiomas, fisonomías, edificios, etc., todo es digno de observarse y meditarse. (21)

What is missing in the various forms of representing *distintos países* is not only the wholeness of a sensorial experience that any particular medium of art or discipline of knowledge must by its very nature fragment, but also the emotional experience of remembering home as it is evoked by the experience of seeing other geographies and lifeways. This experience of travel is that described by Raymond Williams in his distinction between feeling and argument: “So that while country and city have this profound importance, in their differing ways, my feelings are held, before argument starts” (Williams 6). These feelings are as personal, concrete, and specific as the arguments are structural, analogous, and systematic. It is for this reason that while representations of travel can elicit the *desire for travel* and can afford emotionally seductive fantasies, only the personal experience itself can begin to assuage the suffering caused by “la sujeción o la modestia de su fortuna.” While landscape painting, Rizal says, may be able to represent the content of a landscape and even “algo más” (aestheticization),

lo que nunca puede robarse a la naturaleza es esa viva impresión que ella sola sabe y puede comunicar, ese movimiento, esa vida en la música de sus aves y árboles, en ese aroma o perfume propio del lugar, en ese no sé que de inexplicable que el viajero siente y no define y que parece despierta en él remotos recuerdos de felices días, pesares, alegrías que se fueron para no volver; amor olvidado, una imagen querida de su juventud desvanecida en medio del torbellino del mundo, seres que ya no existen, amistades . . . ¿qué sé yo más? (21)

But not only are representations of the experience of travel necessarily partial and unable to evoke fully the phantasms of one’s own identity, they are productive of a false sense of one’s place in the world. In other words, when the protagonist Ibarra returns to

Manila after seven years' absence, the city's landscape and lifeways evoke in him the memory of another *allá* just as in the young Rizal, the landscape and lifeways of Aden, Suez or Barcelona evoked. And just as Rizal sees travel as “la palanca poderosa de la civilización, porque sólo en los viajes se forman, educan e ilustran el corazón y el espíritu, porque sólo en los viajes se ven y estudian todos los adelantos,” it is in travel that one recovers those “held feelings” that were lost in the “torbellino del mundo.” Whereas the imperial traveler is possessed by the “demon of discoveries,” the colonial traveler is tortured by the “demon of comparisons” because to evoke the memory of home and the images of a “lost Eden” of childhood innocence—a time when one was as yet unaware of the *need* to travel—the return home only serves to confirm the depth of the disparity between the “hermosas naciones de Europa.” When Ibarra returns home to the Philippines at the beginning of Rizal's *Noli me tângere*, he walks the streets of Manila amid bemused memories of his youth there and the fact that nothing has changed in his seven-year-absence.

El jardín botánico ahuyentó sus risueños recuerdos: el demonio de las comparaciones le puso delante los jardines botánicos de Europa, en los países donde se necesitan mucha voluntad y mucho oro para que brote una hoja y abra su cáliz una flor, aun más, hasta los de las colonias, ricos y bien cuidados y abiertos todos al público. Ibarra apartó la vista, miró á su derecha y allí vió á la antigua Manila, rodeada aún de sus murallas y fosos, como una joven anémica envuelta en un vestido de los buenos tiempos de su abuela.

La vista del mar que se pierde á lo lejos!...

—¡A la otra ribera está Europa! pensaba el joven; ¡Europa con sus hermosas naciones agitándose continuamente, buscando la felicidad, soñando todas las mañanas y desengañándose al ocultarse el sol...feliz en medio de sus catástrofes!
(*Noli* 43)

Rizal's Ibarra is a parody of the imperial travel writer who in his representations marks with the utmost clarity the moral distinctions between “we Europeans” and the “they” being visited and described. But for the imperial travel writer such as the Verne's Samuel

Fergusson, this interplay of contrasts is the pleasure of confirming his advantageous position in the “interpretive grid of modernity,” and on returning home to the rapturous applause of the Royal Geographical Society, No. 3 Waterloo Place, London, he is possessed by the “demon of discovery” that soon sends him out for more such adventures. And for the imperial reader (his rapturous audience), his travel report is, as Certeau reminds us, the momentary and vicarious repetition of the “lost paradise.” For the imperial reader who shares with the imperial travel writer a moral perspective on the meaning of the peripheral regions of the globe, the reader is not responsible for the details, for the facts, but can “forget himself” in the enjoyment of the wealth of Egypt. “Reading takes no measures against the erosion of time (one forgets oneself and also forgets), it does not keep what it acquires, or it does so poorly, and each of the places through which it passes is a repetition of the lost paradise” (Certeau 174). By contrast, for the colonial traveler who returns home to fulfill his obligations is not possessed by the demon of discoveries but rather by the demon of comparisons. Ibarra is not met with applause and congratulations, but rather with the bitter reality of colonial corruption and injustice. He does not calmly meditate in a packed hall but anxiously in the solitude of a decrepit garden. For the young reader in the colonies, travel reading will first sensitize his imagination, then interrupt his sleep, and finally make him suffer the “*sujeción o la modestia de su fortuna*.” This is because imperial travel writing is not written for the colonial and cannot therefore lead to the momentary repetition of the lost paradise, but will rather bring suffering. But for the colonial intellectual, travel itself not only can bring back the memories of an innocent past before the “*torbellino de la vida*” stirred up those simpler emotions, but also it can help assuage the anxiety produced by imperial travel writing for the colonial. For those representations create false impressions and misplaced anxieties that the *experience* of travel is able to correct and assuage.

Rectifícanse sus juicios y sus ideas; desvanécense muchas preocupaciones, examina de cerca lo que antes fue juzgado sin ser visto, halla cosas nuevas que le sugieren nuevos pensamientos, admira al hombre en su grandeza, como en su miseria le compadece; el antiguo y ciego exclusivismo se trueca en universal y fraternal aprecio del resto de la tierra y deja de una vez de ser el eco de ajenas opiniones para expresar las suyas propias, sugeridas por apreciaciones directas e inmediatos conocimientos. El trato de las gentes, cierta calma y sensato criterio en todos los actos, la reflexión profunda, un conocimiento práctico en todas las artes y ciencias, si no profundo y completo, al menos indeleble y seguro; hé aquí las ventajas que puede sacar de un viaje un espíritu atento y estudioso. (22)

Through travel, a person becomes calm, assured and able to express his own opinions. The enabling trope in Rizal's essay is modernity with its narrative of universal progress. But Rizal's optimistic cosmopolitanism is haunted by the inequities engendered by modernity itself. The representations that he has come to doubt are themselves the product of the *desire* that drives the young Rizal to the centers of imperial Europe. But a key difference is operative in Rizal's experience of travel from those European imperial travelers of the nineteenth century that had so inflamed Rizal's imagination and disturbed his sleep: Rizal's is a journey *toward* modernity and back while theirs (insofar as they involve the imperial periphery) were inevitably constructed as journeys *away* from modernity and back. A different psychology is born of the modern pilgrimage that Rizal takes than that of the capitalist adventurer, colonial official or the tourist of exotic lands. In the entire essay, Rizal never mentions either the Philippines or Spain, but lurking behind the text are the indignities of the colonial difference. Reading in the colony both excites desire and makes one suffer over the consciousness of one's own "sujeción o la modestia de su fortuna." If through travel reading a colonial youth like Rizal could be made to feel these indignities, travel is an avenue to escape the colonial difference through a panorama of reflective surfaces that simultaneously point the way to progress and evoke the woeful memories of the traveler's own history of subjection.

Rizal ends the essay with a glorious encomium to commercial and intellectual exchange as an ushering in of a “fraternidad universal” in which travelers will return not with tales (representations) of their travels, but rather “por este medio un viajero lleva a su país los buenos usos que ha visto en los otros y trata de aplicarlos *con las necesarias modificaciones*; otro, las riquezas y artículos de que el suyo carece.” (22 my emphasis). What emerges, for the young Rizal, is a cosmopolitan order driven by commerce, communications and travel —what now would go under the term “globalization”— in which all *países* would mutually benefit one another. But each *país* adapts the lessons learned from travel “with the necessary modifications” to accommodate the idiosyncracies (and thereby the dignity) of the local. In this exchange Rizal does not perceive, or at least prefers to ignore for the moment, the vast power differential that modern travel was rapidly institutionalizing on the imperial periphery. In 1882, Euroimperialist nations had not yet “partitioned” Africa nor “opened” China. For this reason, Rizal sees as immensely encouraging that

La India ha abierto ya sus grandiosos templos y enseña sus ídolos colosales, como la China, las puertas de sus murallas, exponiendo sus raros y maravillosos productos. El África y el Polo abren sus grandes desiertos y se sentarán dentro de poco en el banquete del progreso, siendo deudores a Lowinstone, Stanley y Nordens Kjold de su adelanto y felicidad. (23)

In 1882, Rizal was yet unable to imagine that the global order brought about by travelers like Livingstone and Stanley would turn out to be a paltry feast for the inhabitants of the upper Nile or upper India, and that these inhabitants would never be able to pay the debt they owed for their “advancement and happiness.” In time Rizal would have occasion to recast his enthusiasm for travel and commerce in the distraught figure of Crisótomo Ibarra. But what is visible behind the enthusiasm for “Los viajes” is both the sense that the authority of cosmopolitan modernity was a pathway out of

colonial subjection, and at the same time, that this pathway was assailed by misgivings about travel writing.

These misgivings would turn to indignation soon enough for Rizal and much of his literary production would consist of a systematic effort to counterbalance the legacy of colonialist representations of the Philippines. If in “Los viajes” Rizal does not quite get to the heart of the “psychodrama” of progress, he does taste the first fruits of the dignity that comes with expressing “opiniones propias.” But the colonial system built around the need to preserve the “alienness of the ruling group” was not yet receptive to his opinions. Rather, it was in thrall to the imperial fantasy that assuaged the anxieties engendered by modernity and its procedures of representation. And it was against these imperial fantasies that the collaborators of *La Solidaridad* worked to strategically dismantle.

Chapter 3: “El Sentimiento de la Dignidad Ultrajada”: Spain and the “New” Imperial Consensus

In the previous chapters I have outlined the efforts of intellectuals from the periphery of the Hispanic imperial system to intervene in the construction of the meaning of imperial relations in the last decades of the nineteenth century. I have argued that the processes of integration produced by modernization produced the conditions of possibility for such an intervention. Peripheral intellectuals like José Rizal or his Antillean contemporaries José Martí or Eugenio María de Hostos authorized themselves to speak by changing their positionality with respect to the imperial system to which their homelands belonged they struggled to overcome the indignities of the colonial difference. At least initially, these intellectuals turned to writing as an available form of authority with which to restructure the imperial community of readers by calling into view previously unknown communities of readers both inside and outside of the Hispanic imperial system. If peripheral intellectuals attempted to establish an anticolonial vanguard in the metropole, they did so by presenting themselves as vectors of a cosmopolitan modernity.

But, as already suggested, these efforts were met with various strategies of resistance in peninsular intellectual and political circles. Like Hostos, Martí and Rizal found peninsular intellectuals who were sympathetic to their cause insofar as problems in the colonies provided useful ammunition in partisan struggles in the peninsula for influence in the government. Hostos himself forged close ties with liberal and republican intellectuals who were in the 1860s struggling to restructure the Spanish political system along more democratic lines. Martí joined Spanish Freemasons and other political intellectual groups that advocated political reforms in the Peninsula and in the colonies.

Rizal and his cohort of Filipino intellectuals who published *La Solidaridad* cultivated a broad-based political network in the Peninsula that included Cabinet Ministers, Senators and Deputies, newspaper publishers and journalists, professors and public intellectuals in their efforts to advocate effectively for colonial reform. Yet the solidarity of these peninsular allies quickly reached its limit when the question of the ultimate independence of any of the remaining “provincias de Ultramar” was considered. To put this another way, peninsular intellectuals of the Restoration were quite willing and often eager to discuss and advocate various reforms for the overseas administration of the Antilles or Cuba but virtually none was willing to countenance the prospect of the eventual severing of ties between the Peninsula and its remaining imperial periphery. Within this broad imperial consensus peninsular intellectuals disagreed widely regarding the proper way to ward off a universally feared separatist threat.

In the historiography of Restoration Spain, imperial matters tend to take a back seat to the more central concerns of domestic (i.e. “national”) political, cultural and economic development. Yet when seen from the perspective of the imperial periphery, “domestic” matters acquire a distinctly “global” importance. The purpose of this chapter is to describe in its general outlines the role of a metropolitan imperial consensus in the “national” cultural field. The central argument of this chapter is that the meaning of the imperial periphery changed dramatically in the latter half of the nineteenth century under the pressure exerted by the so-called “new imperialism” of northern European states like France, England, Holland, Belgium and Germany. The “new” imperialism that began to take shape as early as the 1830 French invasion of Algeria, assumed a consolidated form especially after 1870, and peaked in intensity during the “scramble for Africa” that followed the 1885 Berlin Conference where the European powers agreed to the rules of imperial direct rule and commercial relations in Africa and Asia.

How did the meaning of Spain's remaining imperial periphery change as imperialist expansion suffused European international relations? How was the effect of these changing feelings expressed in the Hispanic cultural field? And how did these developments affect the meaning of the Philippines in the imperial imaginary. To answer these questions I first turn to the resurgence of militarized imperialism in Spain under the O'Donnell government in 1859-60 which not only launched the so-called African Campaign Tetuán in Morocco but also engaged in neo-imperial interventions in Asia and the Americas. To trace the impact of these events in the cultural field I consider the case of Gaspar Núñez de Arce who went to Africa as a war correspondent and note the impact of his chronicles from the war on a young Emilia Pardo Bazán. Secondly, I turn to the legislative negotiation of the legal status of the Philippines in the Hispanic imperial system after the imposition of the colonial "special laws" of the Constitution of 1837 and continuing through the period marked by the consolidation of liberal and even Republican power. In this overview I argue that the Philippines was reimagined in the imperial system as the "most colonial" part of the remaining empire and contrasted to the assimilable "overseas provinces" in the Antilles. And finally I discuss an example of imperial travel writing about the Philippines in order to gauge the emergence of the discourses of the "new" imperialism in metropolitan thinking about the Philippines.

Virtually all Spanish and Filipino writers about the nineteenth-century Philippines lament the general lack of metropolitan knowledge about its Pacific colony. But, if writers about the Philippines prior to the 1880s generally divided into two principal political groups, all were remarkably united on the ultimate goal of their analysis: the preservation of the Philippines for Spain. The first group, which first came to power in the colonial administration in the wake of the 1868 liberal revolt against Isabel II, were politically committed to modernization and in the Philippines generally preferred

moderate to mild reforms that tended toward a gentle assimilation of the inhabitants of the Philippines to peninsular culture. These writers, who were often Filipino-born creoles or peninsular officials with decidedly liberal leanings, published newspapers, reports and occasionally fiction in which they promoted the steady integration of the Philippines into the cultural and commercial circuits of modernity. The other main camp in pre-1880s writing about the *cuestión de Filipinas* was decidedly more conservative (often with unacknowledged Carlist leanings) and came down on the side of an entrenched traditionalism which hoped to proscribe the introduction of assimilationist reforms and to preserve the “traditional” respect that *indios* (indigenous Filipinos) felt toward the Catholic religion and the Spanish Monarchy. If these two opposing prescriptions for the solution to the problems in the Philippines largely replicated the liberal/conservative divide that characterized metropolitan political and social conflict in the nineteenth century, both sides lamented the lack of metropolitan attention to Philippine matters and also were equally committed to the retention of the Philippines for Spain at all cost. Since the late 1860s, writers from both sides of these debates occasionally published their arguments in the Peninsula in the form of newspaper articles, official reports or even as a rare piece of fiction. But it is safe to say that prior to 1880 the colonial literary field was only very slightly integrated with the metropolitan literary field.

But in the 1880s a combination of factors made the Philippines suddenly more visible to metropolitan Spaniards. Part of that visibility was due to the steadily increasing participation through the decade of a group of Filipino intellectuals in the literary system of the Peninsula and the Archipelago and the generally increased integration of these two literary systems. But international politics and official public relations campaigns also played an important part. A narrowly averted imperial debacle with Bismarck’s Germany over competing claims to the Caroline Islands in 1885 and two colonial

expositions (first in Madrid in 1887 and again in Barcelona in 1889) literally brought the Philippines and the other Pacific possessions before the eyes of the metropolitan public. Partially in response to this new visibility, toward the middle of the decade a new colonialist discourse began to emerge in the writing of a small cadre of Manila-based peninsular writers who advocated a distinct prescription for the *cuestión de Filipinas* and this prescription explicitly followed the discourse of the “new” imperialism then emerging clearly all around Europe to justify and manage Euroimperial expansion in Africa and Asia. This new discourse, founded on the doctrines of the new “scientific” discourses of race advocated an anti-assimilationist modernizing colonialism to compete with the two models (secularizing modernity or Catholic traditionalism). This new colonialism was, in part a response to assimilationist reformism but more importantly for the purposes of this study, it was a direct response to the irruption of Filipino intellectuals into the metropolitan literary and political system.

The sudden emergence of the Philippines into metropolitan consciousness was not entirely coincidental but was the product of the rise of a new form of colonialism as it took hold in the imperial centers of Europe in the middle decades of the nineteenth century and flourished at century’s end. This so-called “new” Euroimperialism replaced the commercial privateering that had characterized British and Dutch colonial strategies in the tropics through the 17th and 18th centuries with a new form of militarized direct rule organized through the bourgeois state and meant to safeguard metropolitan commercial interests from the twin threats of international competition and indigenous resistance. This “new” imperialism was also characterized by the fact that it became a direct extension of the struggle over the “balance of power” in the “concert of nations” in the nineteenth century. For this reason the causes of this new imperialism are both complex and contradictory in the case of each “national” government’s relation to European

diplomatic relations of prestige. For example, some highly industrialized national economies pursued colonial expansion, at least in part, with an eye to safeguarding external markets and sources of prized raw materials. However, other nations whose level of industrialization was relatively low, such as Italy, Spain, or even France pursued policies of imperial expansion at the end of the nineteenth century. The purpose of this chapter is not to settle on a single or even satisfactory explanation of the historical causes of the rise of popular and elite enthusiasm for Hispanic imperialism in the metropole, but rather to trace some of the consequences of these shifts in the cultural field especially in the case of the meaning of the Philippines in the metropolitan political and cultural imaginary.

The rise of the “new” direct-rule commercial colonialism was accompanied by an emerging discourse of “scientific” racism which came to replace racial ideologies proper to the older missionary or trader imperial systems of the 16th, 17th and 18th centuries. Robert J.C. Young has noted the gradual shift in the nineteenth century away from Enlightenment humanist universalisms that posited the differences among human communities as variations on a common theme (i.e. as “same but different”) toward the “nineteenth century’s darker aphorism: ‘different — and also different, unequal.’ (Young 92). Young argues that this shift can be detected away from the Enlightenment conception and toward a scientific racism in connection with the “economic self-interest” that such a conception of race promised: “no one bothered too much about the differences between the races until it was to the West’s economic advantage to profit from slavery or to defend it against the Abolitionists” (92). Young argues further that the popular acceptance, in Britain at least, of the “permanent racial superiority” of Europeans could be linked causally to three important events in the period 1857-1865: the Indian ‘Mutiny’

(1857), the American Civil War and the question of slavery (1861-64), and the brutal suppression of the Jamaica Insurrection (1865). Young argues:

The new theories were presented in scientific terms, but racial theory was in fact always fundamentally populist in presentation and tone. The deliberately popular appeal of racial theory enabled it to develop strongly at a cultural level. In the imperial phase, from the 1880s onwards, the cultural ideology of race became so dominant that racial superiority, and its attendant virtue of civilization, took over even from economic gain or Christian missionary work as the presiding, justifying idea of the empire. The two came together in the phrase with which the English began to describe themselves: the 'imperial race.' (92)

It is no surprise that the effective combination of self-flattery with economic interest was an attractive model for Euroimperialists. And it is clear that the combination of new doctrines of free trade, the industrial need for raw materials, increasingly of the tropical sort, and the rapidly consolidating discipline of scientific racialism all combined to create a potent fuel for Europimperial expansion into Africa and Asia in the latter half of the nineteenth century. Yet it is less clear that these doctrines necessarily flowed from actually existing needs in nineteenth century Spain. It seems more likely that the discourses of the new imperialism that began to appear in Spain as early as the 1850s were largely borrowed from other imperial systems and were more expressions of imperial desires than of the fortuitous coincidence of economic interest and self-flattery.

IMPERIAL CONTRADICTIONS: NÚÑEZ DE ARCE IN THE AFRICAN CAMPAIGN

Contemporaneously with the pivotal events identified by Young in the new conceptions of racialized colonialism, Spain also embarked on a spree of colonial adventures to enhance its status in the diplomatic circles of the *concierto de las naciones*. Under the ambitious plans of General Leopoldo O'Donnell to simultaneously rehabilitate the Spanish Military through the creation of a large standing force and the impulse to garner international accolades, Spain embarked on a campaign in Morocco over a dispute regarding encroachments by soldiers at Ceuta's garrison on Berber tribal lands in order to

collect firewood. War was declared in October 1859 and the peace restored in April of 1860 after Spanish soldiers under the general command of General O'Donnell himself had occupied Tetuán.

In this same period, Spanish forces from the Philippines, which were made up of largely indigenous soldiers and Spanish officers, attacked Tonkin in Cochinchina (now Vietnam) in league with French forces in order to punish the inhabitants for the alleged mistreatment of Spanish and French missionaries there. This attack paved the way for French colonial rule in Indochina over the next century. And across the Atlantic, Spanish forces also attended the armies of Napoleon III in the occupation of Mexico over unpaid debts. Despite the meagre material results for Spain of these new imperial adventures, the reaction from popular and intellectual sectors to these developments was uniformly enthusiastic. In fact, it was among the young liberal and even republican intelligentsia that the most enthusiastic *vivas* were heard to celebrate the African Campaign of 1859-60. Not only did this imperial campaign unify fractious Spain behind the rallying cry of defending its “pabellón imaculado” but this campaign solidified the power of the press in the realm of power.

In this respect the personal case of Gaspar Núñez de Arce is instructive. He was sent to Africa in 1860 as a war correspondent for the Progresista party newspaper *La Iberia*. In the field he was attached to General O'Donnell's command. Núñez de Arce got along well with the commander and according to his friend and biographer Castillo y Soriano, “aquellos memorables días fueron críticos para el porvenir de Núñez de Arce” (50). They were critical because General O'Donnell, whose political power base grew immensely after the victorious campaign in Africa, had while there made the most of the young journalists in the field. Castillo y Soriano explains that General O'Donnell

había agregado a su cuartel general y dispensado todo género de atenciones a los corresponsales de la Prensa madrileña, Núñez de Arce, Navarro Rodrigo y Pedro Antonio de Alarcón, comprendió, desde luego, cuánto podían ayudarle en sus empresas de hombre de Estado, aquellos tres jóvenes de gran entendimiento y legítimas aspiraciones” (Castillo y Soriano 53-4).

After the war, Núñez de Arce began a rapid but often turbulent climb from the obscurity of his provincial origins to the halls of power. He began as a functionary in the Overseas Ministry, was elected deputy in the Parliament, and as a long time adherent to Sagasta’s powerful political coalition, participated in the Revolution of 1868, and was briefly Overseas Minister in 1883 among his many political and intellectual positions in Restoration Spain. In this, Núñez de Arce was emblematic of the rise of an intellectual middle class in the turbulent decades of the 1850s to the 1880s for whom the press was a powerful pathway to power.

What is clear from the literary evidence related to the African Campaign was that its extremely modest material or political importance for Spain, did not eclipse its hold over the national imagination. For example, in her “Apuntes autobiográficos” that she included in the 1886 edition of her novel *Los pazos de Ulloa*, Emilia Pardo Bazán links the beginning of her literary ambitions to an episode from her childhood in Galicia:

Mi primer recuerdo literario se remonta a una fecha histórica señalada y ya distante: la terminación de la guerra de África, acontecimiento al cual rendí las primicias de mi musa. [...] Entre los diarios a que estaba suscrito mi padre, descollaba *La Iberia*, que dirigía su amigo y correligionario Calvo Asenio; y yo devoraba [...] todos los artículos, sueltos, gacetillas, romances y cartas del campamento, y el relato de todas las proezas de Prim, Ros de Olano y demás caudillos, que yo reputaba muy superiores a los Bernaldos y Roldanes. (*OC* 3:699)

The motivations behind the war were different depending on one’s political inclinations but the material consequences of the war were negligible, as Pardo Bazán points out in the same essay written in 1886: “no hay duda que si los españoles, como saben pelear y vencer, supiesen aprovechar el triunfo y comprender dónde está el verdadero de sus

empresas actualmente, grandes ventajas pudo reportarnos la estéril campaña de O'Donnell, que sólo nos valió una carga de ochavos morunos” (OC 3:699-700). The chronicles of the heroism of Prim and Ros de Olano that Pardo Bazán read in the columns of *La Iberia* were those of Núñez de Arce which were later collected in a book titled *Recuerdos de la campaña de Africa*. In the first chapter of the book, Núñez de Arce remembers fondly the first heady days of the conflict but only in their contrast to the discouraging history of the first half century since the Napoleonic invasions:

Ha habido acontecimientos a medida de todos los gustos y de todos los deseos; guerras nacionales, invasiones, guerras civiles, regencias, combates en mar y tierra, constituciones, absolutismo, calabozos, destierros, patíbulos, tormentos, tumultos populares, insurrecciones militares, intrigas de cuartel, intrigas de palacio, asambleas avanzadas y retrógradas, pronunciamientos, asesinatos jurídicos, escarapelas, músicas, canciones, palizas, procesiones y arcos de triunfo: nada, nada ha faltado a este medio siglo, que ha sido al mismo tiempo una sátira y una epopeya. (*Miscelánea* 110)

What had been missing in this whirlwind half-century, Núñez de Arce corrects himself by saying, was “un sacudimiento nacional que no dejase en nuestra historia ningún dejo amargo; una página elocuente que no estuviese escrita con la hiel de nuestras discordias y la sangre de la patria, herida siempre por sus propios hijos” (110). But more than just to heal the wounds of a half-century of combat between “las dos Españas,” the war was imperative to procure the diplomatic recognition of the *concierto de las naciones*:

Para *entrar dignamente en Europa*, en el sentido diplomático de esta frase, éranos de todo punto indispensable pasar por África; levantar el pensamiento por encima de nuestras agitaciones intestinas, para lanzarle con el supremo esfuerzo de nuestros soldados, valerosos, sí, pero desconocidos del mundo, sobre esas salvajes costas que se divisan desde nuestras playas, en las tardes serenas del estío, ¡nadie sabe si como una amenaza o como una aspiración! (110)

Again, as noted above in the passage from Pardo Bazán’s “Apuntes” the importance of this renewed imperialism was at once populist and internationalist in its performance. That is, the material benefits of the contest were unimportant to those who shared in its

triumphs and remembered its raptures long afterward. Again, this is Núñez de Arce describing the scene in Madrid during the days in which war was formally declared:

No entraré en aclaraciones sobre si la guerra se anticipó, ni sobre su conveniencia en el orden material, porque no es el objeto que pone la pluma en mis manos. Confieso ingenuamente que la cuestión de Africa no se ha *discutido*, se ha *sentido*; al primer anuncio de guerra el espíritu de raza que pasa de generación en generación como un río por su cauce, sin agotar nunca sus ondas, encendió la sangre en nuestras venas, y aceleró los latidos de todos los corazones. Yo seguí con júbilo *el impulso general*, no sólo porque resonaba en mi alma como en la del pueblo la arrebatadora voz de nuestras antiguas tradiciones, *sino porque conocía según antes he dicho, que era preciso reconquistar con un golpe atrevido la consideración de Europa, acostumbrado a mirar en nosotros la España* de las guerras civiles, de los pronunciamientos, de las «crisis ministeriales» y del desgobierno; *una España, en fin, pobre, extenuada, falta de aliento, envilecida, incapaz de blandir la enmohecida espada de sus héroes, y de turbar con un rasgo de audacia el largo sueño de su gloria.* [...] Dijérase que aplaudían con nuestras manos y vitoreaba con nuestro acento los ilustres varones de Covadonga, las Navas, Granada y Lepanto, *las preocupaciones de raza, el sentimiento de la dignidad ultrajada y las exigencias de la historia.* ¿Cómo no había de encontrar eco la mágica palabra que nos convocaba a la guerra contra el poder mahometano, allí [en las tribunas del Congreso] donde las sagradas imágenes de Pelayo, Guzmán el Bueno, el Cid e Isabel la Católica, fielmente representadas por el arte, parecían animarnos a la próxima contienda con el prestigio de sus nombres y el recuerdo de sus triunfos? (“Recuerdos” 111-12 my emphasis)

This passage remarkably captures the “preocupaciones de raza” and the “exigencias de la historia” that shaped Spanish feeling for its imperial legacy and its desire to salve its “sentimiento de la dignidad ultrajada” with new imperial conquests. Furthermore, the reanimated spirit of the *reconquista* (Pelayo, Guzmán el Bueno, el Cid e Isabel la Católica) was itself Janus faced in that to take up the battle cry of “¡Guerra al moro!” was to “reconquistar con un golpe atrevido la consideración de Europa.” Already apparent in this passage and the previous one are the footprints of the new colonialism in the racialized language, the civilizing impulse (“esas salvajes costas”) and the discourse of positivist international law that structured relations between nations through a dialectic of recognition. Even with a racialized conception of culture, what is not immediately

apparent in this passage but does appear in the subsequent dispatches sent by Núñez de Arce is the emerging fad of orientalism that emerges in Peninsular culture from this conflict not only in the writings of Núñez de Arce (in the conventional figures of exoticized and vicious men combined with the lure of the harem) but more famously in the paintings of Fortuny (e.g. “La batalla de Tetuán” and “Odalisca”).

Fortuny’s paintings of North African *costumbrista* scenes of village warriors (“Guerrero árabe,” or “Vendedor de tapices”), battle field savagery (“La batalla de Tetuán”) and the erotic interior spaces of the harem (“Odalisca”) that the traditional images of “moro” society evoked by Núñez de Arce’s phrase “el poder mahometano” and his gesture toward the heroes of the *reconquista* are in the African campaign juxtaposed to a more properly “European” taste for orientalist travel writing and pictorial fantasy. For example the final chapters of Núñez de Arce’s book describe Tetuán after its occupation by Spanish troops. Núñez de Arce’s first impression of the city was a mixture of civilized disgust and lurid fascination. The city had just been pillaged by the fleeing enemy troops, he says and the wreckage and carnage were everywhere visible. But added to the immediate consequences of the war, Núñez de Arce adds a layer of cultural critique: “La ciudad era un montón de basura; tenía, como decía con mucha gracia el alcalde moro, «una costra de trescientos años»” (223). This “costra” marks the historical period since the expulsion of the *moros* from the reconquered Peninsula and the Spanish soldiers set about properly civilizing tasks such as cleaning up the trash and renaming the streets “para que los soldados no se perdieran tan fácilmente en aquel laberinto de callejones y pasadizos” (223). And in a gesture to the christianizing spirit of the Reconquista and the Conquista of the Americas, the Soldiers even began setting up a church “y se adoptaron, en fin, cuantas providencias creyó el general Ríos conducentes al aseo y conservación de la plaza conquistada” (223).

Meanwhile, Núñez de Arce busied himself with exploring the streets of the city: “Yo, en alas de mi curiosidad, me dediqué sólo a investigar y recorrer el pueblo, que tenía para mí un encanto desconocido, y a hacer observaciones sobre las costumbres tradicionales de dos razas tan íntimamente unidas a la nuestra como las que viven en Tetuán” (223-4). But this chronicler of this new *conquista* is immediately faced with contradictory feelings toward the national history of the *reconquista* when he discovers that the Jewish and “moro” populations of Tetuán had preserved there the vestiges of a common history with their new conquerors:

En Tetuán hay una multitud de familias moras que se llaman Vargas, Fernández, Garcías, Barradas y Bohorques, así como entre los hebreos que hablan el castellano anticuado en sus giros y corrompido con algunas locuciones árabes, no faltan Sotos, Enríquez, Alvaredas y Gómez. No podría fácilmente expresar el efecto que produjo en mí la vista de estos desgraciados hijos de Abraham, que al cabo de más de trescientos años de destierro, todavía guardan con religioso respeto el idioma, que hablaron sus padres en los fértiles llanos de Castilla, y en los escabrosos montes de Aragón. ¡Cuánta fuerza de resistencia se necesita para cruzar a través de los siglos y de las generaciones sin perder ni el carácter, ni el lenguaje, ni la tradición, ni el recuerdo de la patria perdida! (224)

These Jewish Vargas and Fernández and “Arab” Sotos and Gómez had preserved in tact, the very legacy whose loss Núñez de Arce had lamented in the factionalism of the first half of the century and whose symbolic recuperation he imagined in the Senate chambers as the heroes of the *reconquista* seemed to applaud the declaration of war and the resumption of a glorious martial tradition. But here in Tetuán, he was surprised to discover that the same “patria perdida” had been fervently preserved through three hundred years of exile.

Núñez de Arce’s stay continues to provide contradictory feelings toward the inhabitants as well as toward the meaning of this new imperial conquest. On the one hand, the military triumph evoked in his mind the heroic tradition of the *reconquista* and yet the logic of that conquest borrowed its gestures from the modern logic of the

civilizing mission rather than the christianizing logic of the legacy of Spanish imperialism. This contradiction appears most starkly with respect to Núñez de Arce's desire to enter a mosque. The general staff has prohibited the soldiers to enter the mosques and Núñez de Arce agrees in principle even if his curiosity is piqued. The general was correct in issuing this order, Núñez de Arce says,

porque nada más digno de consideración que la fe de los pueblos y el santuario de la conciencia; y aun cuando la determinación suya me privó del gusto de conocer los ritos de los creyentes, no cesaré de aplaudirla, porque debió revelar a los ojos de Europa que no veíamos aún como en pasados tiempos a arrancar la creencia de ningún corazón con la punta de la espada.

With this confession of a frustrated desire, Núñez de Arce reminds his reader that the principal reason for this war was not to return nostalgically to the *reconquista* but rather to “preciso reconquistar con un golpe atrevido la consideración de Europa.”

The meaning of imperialism was shifting in Spain in the mid-nineteenth century and Núñez de Arce's texts is symptomatically contradictory in its rendering of the meaning of the African Campaign. On the one hand the delirium produced by a moment of national consensus in the desire to go to war with Morocco evoked a mythical past that predated the traumas of modernity that divided Spain against itself throughout the nineteenth century. The heroes of the *reconquista* depicted in the historical paintings lining the Senate chambers, seemed to look on approvingly and applaud the new imperialism. But at the same time, this new imperial gesture was meant not to reconcile Spain to its glorious martial traditions but rather to recover some of its lost prestige in the diplomatic circles of the *concerto de las naciones*. It is for these contradictions that the meaning of this imperial adventure was never entirely certain. As Núñez de Arce puts it, “No entraré en aclaraciones sobre si la guerra se anticipó, o sobre su conveniencia en el orden material, porque no es este el objeto que pone la pluma en mis manos. Confieso ingenuamente que la cuestión de África no se ha discutido, se ha sentido” (111). In its

material consequences, the African Campaign was virtually without importance. Soon after taking Tetuán, Spain, by previous agreement with England, abandoned the conquered city and signed a peace treaty with the Sultan of Morocco without retaining any material benefits from the sacrifice. In this sense, Núñez de Arce's naive confession that the *cuestión de Africa* had not been debated but rather had been felt is a clear expression of what I have been calling "imperial fantasy" and it is this propensity to evade discussion and debate in favor of a delirious sensation that characterizes the rise of the "new" imperialism in Spain. In fact, even the remaining overseas possessions were not materially beneficial to Spain in the last years of empire and although some reformers pointed this fact out in some detail, the idea of relinquishing what were in fact a serious drain on the national treasury, was literally unthinkable.

LIBERAL IMPERIALISTS AND THE REINVENTION OF THE PHILIPPINES AS A "COLONY"

In the Spanish imperial fantasy, the Philippines began to play a decisive role during the struggles over constitutionalism that emerged most acutely in the aftermath of the 1868 revolution. With the political consolidation of the liberal bourgeoisie in Spain in the mid century, a new set of political and cultural imperatives became operative in the administration of power and prestige in Spanish society. In part, the emergence of the "problem of modernity" as a concern of the liberal state led to the renegotiation of the relations of the central institutions of power (whether absolutist, democratic or hybrid) to the remaining imperial periphery and vice versa. The fervent Republicanism of the ideologues of the 1868 revolution quickly faded when faced with the colonial question. The outbreak of hostilities and their continuation throughout the decade following the Revolution meant that revolutionaries like Castelar and Serrano soon asserted their imperialist intentions. The disillusion suffered by intellectuals from the *provincias de*

Ultramar might be most poignantly demonstrated in the case of Eugenio María de Hostos, who as a student and activist in Spain had joined the revolutionary struggle against Absolutism in the hope of extending constitutional liberties (autonomy) to the Antilles. In his *Diario íntimo* he confesses:

Yo había hecho lo que había hecho no sólo por ser ciudadano de la libertad en todas partes, sino también porque yo quería sacar partido de la revolución española en favor de las Antillas. Las cartas cambiadas con Olazábal, Prim y Sagasta me hacían esperar un cambio inmediato en el gobierno de las Antillas, y como ese cambio no llegaba, yo estaba cada día más descontento de la revolución y de los hombres que la habían aprovechado. (Cited in C. Rama 212)

Hostos's disillusion was confirmed in exchanges with Castelar and Serrano in which the former told him frankly, "Sepa usted que primero soy español y después republicano" (212). Directing himself to Serrano, Hostos said, "Ustedes, la gente del gobierno español, se olvidan siempre de la dignidad de las Antillas" (212). If for the *provincial* Antilles, the disillusion of a reinvigorated imperialism were great, for the Philippines the contradictions of the 1868 revolution were perhaps even more striking.

After 1868, the legal status of the overseas possessions had to be renegotiated. Rather than a relationship established on the basis of theological, legal or philosophical premises as it had been in the period of the conquest, the emerging metropolitan policy to its periphery became one of convention. That is, the tradition of natural law was replaced with an emerging discourse of empirical or *positive* jurisprudence. Curiously, it was in the context of the constitutional debates of 1868-69 that the problematic status of the Philippines clearly emerged in racialized terms. Even in the aftermath of the September Revolution of 1868, when democratic fervor was running high, the assimilation of the Philippines was too much to tackle. But in the decidedly less democratic political milieu of the Restoration the debatable status of the Philippines became tacitly accepted as that of a "colony" (as opposed to the "provincial" status of Cuba and Puerto Rico). Along

with the emerging pragmatism of empirical approaches to the law, “modern” theories of race were also a contributing factor to the retrospective colonization of the Philippines (i.e. its conversion into a “state” colony) in the late nineteenth century. For example, when the question of parliamentary representation for the “provincias de Ultramar” arose in 1868, the democratic principles of the Revolution clashed directly with the practical difficulty of the inclusion of an enormous Philippine population. Francisco Silvela put the difficulty rather crudely in the following passage from the Constitutional debates:

Habiendo 20.000 blancos y 5 millones de indios, de los cuales 4.900.000 ignoran el castellano y no tienen comunicación intelectual con nosotros... ¿habíamos de establecer que vinieran sólo representantes de los 20.000 habitantes blancos, desechando los diputados de los 5 millones de indios? Es evidente que no. Teníamos que establecer que esos 5 millones enviaran sus diputados, y haciendo la cuenta de los diputados que corresponderían por cada 50.000 habitantes resultaría que tendríamos sobre 100 diputados que vendrían aquí hablando 33 dialectos...” (Cited in Celdrán Ruano 134)

That is, by no legalistic or philosophical principle were the Philippines reduced to the status of “colony” but rather on account of the demographic difficulty posed by its large racialized population to Spanish liberals’ yearning for a place in *la culta Europa*. In the *Asamblea constitucional* of 1868 Francisco Silvela made the connection to quasi-anthropological discourses of race (“semi-savage”) and the need for a special status for the Philippines:

¿Y habíamos de conceder esos derechos, habíamos de atribuir esa gran influencia a aquellas tribus *semisalvajes* que no hablan el castellano?... Es imposible establecer para el régimen interior de las islas Filipinas las leyes que se han dado para Cuba y Puerto Rico, donde hay una gran parte de población ilustrada que puede intervenir en nuestras deliberaciones.(Cited in Celdrán Ruano 134, emphasis in the original)

The simple answer to this dilemma was to simply deny the political practicality of such representation on the basis of available “anthropological” theories of racial inferiority and technological backwardness.

In the Philippines under administrations installed by the Revolutionary government, a similar pattern emerged. Both of the Governors General (Carlos María de la Torre and General Rafael Izquierdo) sent to the Philippines in the wake of the Revolution were committed liberals in Spain but remarkably conservative (or even reactionary) once in the Philippines. De la Torre spread the gospel of liberalism in the Islands but in a letter to the Overseas Minister rejected the “aplicación radical de los principios revolucionarios.” De la Torre even set up a commission in 1870 to petition for representation in the Spanish *Cortes* but the petition never got past the Overseas Minister.⁴⁷

The committed liberal Rafael Izquierdo⁴⁸ was even more adamant about the necessity of revolutionary principles in the Peninsula and reactionary practices in the Philippines. Celdrán Ruano notes that General Izquierdo was a “francmason declarado, había tomado parte en la Revolución de 1868, época en que fue gobernador civil de Madrid; también fue miembro de la Asamblea constituyente” (161 n. 52). Yet, he recommended the following in a letter to the Overseas Minister:

Aquí no debe de haber otra política que la conservadora. La libertad de enseñanza, la de prensa, el ejercicio de todos los derechos individuales, *todo, en fin, cuanto en la culta Europa constituye la vida y el progreso de los pueblos, aquí sólo serviría para dar armas a los enemigos de España, sin provecho para el país mismo, que, por el atraso en que yace, ni podría apreciar tales libertades, ni hacer uso de tales derechos.* (Quoted in Celdrán Ruano 161, my emphasis)

Here again Spain’s tenuous hold on “cuanto en la culta Europa constituye la vida y el progreso de los pueblos” is strengthened in its advantageous comparison to the “atraso” of the Islands. Furthermore, in Izquierdo’s concern we find a very powerful component of

⁴⁷ See Celdrán Ruano, p. 160-5. For a decidedly more positive version of de la Torre’s republicanism in the colony, see Sarkisyanz, pp. 94-103.

⁴⁸ Celdrán Ruano notes that “Izquierdo, francmason declarado, había tomado parte en la Revolución de 1868, época en que fue gobernador civil de Madrid; también fue miembro de la Asamblea constituyente.” (161 n. 52)

the liberal/conservative imperial fantasy: paranoia about the loss of the colonies. The “enemigos de España” were in the Philippines of 1872 part of revolt in the cuartel of Cavite that was easily and savagely put down by the colonial government⁴⁹ and led to the public execution of three “native” clergy and the exile of conspicuous reformers including Joaquín Pardo de Tavera, and Máximo Paterno whose Europe-based children would have important roles in the emergence of the Filipino literary system and its incursion into colonial politics. Adding significantly to the paranoia about separatism in the Philippines was, no doubt, the outbreak of anticolonial warfare in Cuba in 1868 where Revolutionary Spain’s “revolutionary principles” were sorely tested.

But Izquierdo’s conservatism in the Islands was not the simple pragmatism of a functionary faced with the “atraso” of the colonial infrastructure but rather it is a frantic project that transcended the partisan struggles that had led to the *Gloriosa*. In his justification for reactionary policies, we can find an echo in Núñez de Arce’s evocation of a unified Spain in its renewed colonial spirit.

Nada más natural que los que profesamos ideas liberales estemos acostumbrados a mirar con prevención, con desconfianza, y algunos con aversión a las órdenes religiosas. Nada más natural también que, después de conocer el estado del país, lo que aquí son los frailes, lo que han hecho y lo que pueden hacer, se considere a las órdenes religiosas como una necesidad para sostener el lazo de unión entre esta colonia y la madre patria. Y es que, al llegar aquí, *todo hombre de espíritu generoso y levantado no puede menos de prescindir de todo partido, de toda idea, de todo compromiso político, y concentrar todos su esfuerzos y sus aspiraciones en un solo pensamiento: el de la conservación de Filipinas para España.* (Quoted in Celdrán Ruano 162, my emphasis)

Even the hated friars turn out to be key allies to any “hombre de espíritu generoso y levantado” bent on the preservation of the Philippines for Spain at all costs.

⁴⁹ For an evaluation of the historical sources regarding the mythologies that have grown up around this mutiny and its place in the emergence of “national consciousness” in the Philippines, see Schumacher, “Published Sources”

It was during the constitutional debates of the Restoration that the special “colonial” status of the Philippines most clearly emerged. In the constitution of 1876 the “provincias de Ultramar” were to be governed by “leyes especiales” but while Cuba and Puerto Rico were given seats in Parliament, the Philippines was not mentioned and therefore implicitly distinguished from the Antillean “provinces.”⁵⁰ In the constitutional debates, however, the difference between Cuba (then up in arms) and the Philippines was underscored by the Filipino creole and conservative *diputado* Manuel Azcárraga. Azcárraga proposed making the uniqueness of the Philippines explicit in an amendment to article 89 that already extended “leyes especiales” to the overseas provinces and gave representation in Parliament to Cuba and Puerto Rico, alleging not only that “aquella colonia se puede considerar aún en su período de educación” but also that in the Philippines “no se domin[a] por la fuerza de las armas, que allí se domina simplemente por el prestigio de la raza, y hay que cuidar de no perder esa estimación.”⁵¹ Azcárraga’s amendment was not accepted and the “colonial” status of the Philippines remained implicit in the 1876 Constitution. However, the liberal desire for the practical conversion of the Philippines into a commercial colony coupled with concern over its potential loss either to insurrection or foreign intervention led to the *de facto* if not *de jure* acceptance of its unique “colonial” status as the following statement by the Ministro de Fomento, Fermín Lasala, makes clear:

[...] *no se ha creído* hasta ahora por los diversos gobiernos que ha habido que lo relativo a Filipinas estuviera en el mismo caso que lo relativo a Cuba y Puerto Rico. Siempre *se ha interpretado* que Cuba y Puerto Rico eran provincias españolas, en las cuales con tales o cuales modificaciones *podían y debían* regir las leyes constitucionales; pero hasta ahora que yo sepa, *nadie ha creído* que artículo ninguno de la Constitución *pudiera* regir en Filipinas; *se ha creído generalmente que aquel Archipiélago formaba parte del imperio colonial, que no*

⁵⁰ See Celdrán Ruano, p. 170.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 174

era propiamente provincia española, y bajo este punto de vista se han resuelto las cuestiones relativas a Filipinas. (Quoted in Celdrán Ruano 183, my emphasis)

Important here is not merely the legal pragmatism of the governance of the Philippines in comparison to the Antillean “provincias” but rather the belief regarding their difference. While in Cuba and Puerto Rico the same laws could and should (*podían y debían*) rule as those in effect in the Peninsula, “*nadie* ha creído” that such laws *could* (*podiera*) rule the Philippines. Despite the assimilationist language often invoked with regard to the Philippines (i.e. Azcárraga’s “período de educación”), what emerges in the very language of the general case in Spanish (“no se ha creído” “generalmente” “nadie”) is the same kind of Peninsular consensus and unity on the political status of the Philippines that we saw in Núñez de Arce and General Izquierdo. What drove this consensus was a comforting sense of racial superiority (“prestigio de la raza”) that cast the colonial government as a paternal care over eternal children in a state of “educación.” Metropolitan Spaniards could disagree about methodology but the point on which they all could agree, it seems, was that the Philippines had to be preserved *para España*. The former Ministro de Ultramar and liberal poet Víctor Balaguer advocated in the 1876 Constitutional Convention the political assimilation and commercial development of the Philippines but at the same time declared that Philippine affairs “no son cuestiones de política de partido; sería conveniente y patriótico que los hombres de todos los partidos se reunieran para declarar este punto causa común a todos, causa nacional” (Quoted in Celdrán Ruano 175).

What separated the Philippines from the Antilles in the minds of liberal and conservative imperialists of the post 1868 period was the troubling existence of a racialized other onto whom could be heaped the blame for the failures of the Philippines to assimilate Hispanic culture despite more than three centuries of direct colonial rule.

While the Antilles were properly “provincias españolas” this depended on a different kind of racialized consensus that excluded the Afro-Antilleans through the institution of slavery and the less formal institutions of races apartheid in Cuba and Puerto Rico. The Philippines did not need African slavery to satisfy its labor requirements for a burgeoning plantation economy in the nineteenth century owing to its numerous indigenous population and therefore the racialization of Filipinos obeyed a different socio-economic and political logic. Nevertheless, these debates about the political status reveal that the sheer size of the indigenous population of the Philippines posed a problem to the political and cultural assimilation of an increasingly racialized population.

In addition to a different racial configuration than the Antilles, what distinguished the Philippines as a special colony was that in a vaguely Haeckelian way, the Philippines of the late nineteenth century contained within it the recapitulation of all of the stages of Hispanic imperialism beginning with the *reconquista* and ending with capitalist modernity. In Mindanao and the Sulu Archipelago, Spanish soldiers continued to engage “moros” in the 1890s. The *conquista* of the hinterlands of the northern islands was never complete and continued through the period of Spanish rule. Especially with the return of the Jesuit order in the 1850s, the Philippines still contained the missionary effort initiated in the sixteenth century and the walled city of Manila was dominated by the religious communities that had long since lost their lucrative estates in the Peninsula to Mendizábal’s *desamortización*. In fact, in the Philippines the Religious communities not only retained their landed estates, but through extensive control of local parishes and a tight grip on colonial politics, the Philippines remained an important power base for the Spanish Religious through the nineteenth century. The vestiges of the Bourbon economic and bureaucratic reforms remained in effect well toward the end of the century. For example, the tobacco monopoly was only abandoned in 1881. And finally, beneath the

sociological layers of this colonial palimpsest, a new and vibrant capitalist society was breaking out and demanding new forms of authority in colonial society. It was out of this burgeoning capitalist society that Filipinos like Rizal emerged and began to demand a place for themselves in the broader world of modernity.

If the “ontogenesis” of late nineteenth century colonial society in the Philippines contained within its structures the living record of an imperial “phylogenesis” this peculiar social structure made describing social life in the Philippines a complicated and deeply contradictory business. For example, when the Overseas Minister Victor Balaguer organized the General Philippine Exposition in Madrid in 1887, the assemblage of people, products, art, scholarship and plants reproduced this phylogenetic montage for the Madrid public to make of it what they liked. The anthropological village contained displayed live “igorrotos” (animist uplanders), “moros” (muslims from the southern part of the Archipelago and “indios” (christian lowlanders) each in traditional clothing which they took off when not on display. For Balaguer, the purpose of the exposition was to promote a gentle assimilationist program of Hispanization and economic development. To this end, commercial products such as hemp cordage and sheaves of tobacco were displayed to demonstrate the economic potential of Philippine agriculture and industry, as were a wide variety of tropical fauna to demonstrate the fertility of the soil and the scientific interest of its abundant plant life. Similarly, religious art was displayed side by side with native handicrafts and modern Filipino artworks by accomplished and even famous painters.

In all of this the Philippines appeared in Madrid’s Retiro park in 1887 simultaneously as a problem and a solution to Spain’s imperial dilemmas. Regardless of ideological orientation, all writers on the Philippines of this period agreed on three things. The colony had a problematic relation to modernity that needed fixing. Second, the

Philippines held great promise as a source of future wealth and prestige. And third, there was a growing fear gathering around the issue of political separatism that was pushing opposing factions toward open conflict. I suggested above that in the 1880s two important new points of view emerged in the Philippines that attempted to address these three issues and solve them to their own advantage. The first group, which I have already described at some length, was the *juventud filipina* that began to participate not only in the cultural system of the colony but increasingly in the metropole as well. The second group, to which I will turn in the last section of this chapter was a new group of conservative modernizers who sought to harness the modernizing potential of the Philippines while maintaining and radicalizing through a “scientific” discourse of racial superiority the hierarchies of the “colonial difference.” Among the most visible of these latter apologists for the “new” imperialism in the Philippines was a small group of writers who lived in Manila and worked there as journalists and who increasingly published their work in peninsular newspapers and journals. One of these writers, Pablo Feced, used the pseudonym *Quiouquiap* and was the author of a series of articles published both in Manila and Madrid and later collected in book form with the title *Filipinas: esbozos y pinceladas* (1888) and published in Manila. It is to this book that I will turn briefly to conclude this chapter about the influence of the “new” imperialism on the Hispanic cultural field.

PABLO FECED’S *FILIPINAS*

Feced’s book is both a travel narrative meant to offer pleasure and a reformist tract meant to reconfigure the relationship between the metropole and its colony:

¿Y la utilidad de esta obrita? Dá á conocer los rasgos fisonómicos de una comarca, pedazo de la grande, remota Pátria; descorre en parte el velo que cubre razas, costumbres y maneras peculiarísimas de vida; esboza cuestiones trascendentes é inicia rumbos para el porvenir. Dá á conocer algo, allá y aún acá en parte principal desconocido, y no lo dudes, lector: siempre el conocimiento es fecundo. (5)

Feced's *Filipinas* is a travel narrative (libro de viajes) and it constituted a sustained apology for the colonizing mission of Spain in the Philippines in a distinctly modern and racist mode. Feced took the conventions of the travel writing (First person narrative, inside/outside point of view, a constructed metropolitan morality, and a dialectic of eroticism) and turned them to the purposes of his overall argument, namely that what the Philippines and Spain needed was sustained settler colonialism in order to take advantage of a docile workforce and abundant natural and commercial resources. His argument was essentially simple: the indigenous inhabitants of the Philippines could not and *should* not be assimilated to modernity because they represented not only an inferior race but also because they held out the promise of an abundant and inexpensive labor force in a properly modernized commercial colony. In short, his creed was *Filipinas para España* reversing the assimilationist program of *España para Filipinas*. For Feced, the fact of the material and social backwardness of the colony despite more than three centuries of direct rule demanded a solution and how one imagined the solution to the *cuestión de Filipinas* depended on one's answer to the fundamental question of racial superiority:

Y el problema fundamental de esta colonia, en cuanto a organización y régimen interno toca, puede formularse, en mi humilde juicio, en estos términos fundamentales: ¿Existe, o completa o aproximada siquiera, ecuación entre estas tribus oceánicas y la familia reina del planeta?

Quien afirmativamente responda, escriba en su bandera esta palabra: *asimilación*

Quien negativamente, escriba en la suya este otro mote: *leyes especiales y apropiadas*. (332-3)

Of course, Feced answered this question negatively and in disturbing (or pleasing) detail, depending on one's perspective. Luis Ángel Sánchez Gómez has suggested that Feced's articles published in *El Liberal* were "poco acordes con una ideología o aptitud «liberal»" ("Ellos y nosotros" 309). Perhaps Sánchez Gómez here assumes that to be "liberal"

precluded the kind of “scientific” racism that Feced’s book preaches and that anthropological methodologies (as well as the “liberal” policies of certain colonial officials) were somehow innocent of Feced’s virulent form of racism. But Feced’s contributions to *El Liberal*, Barrantes’s contributions to *La España moderna* and *La Ilustración Artística*, as well as Emilia Pardo Bazán’s admiration for both of them in the pages of *El Nuevo Teatro Crítico* clearly show a pattern of conviviality between the modernizing project of these publications and the comforting discourse of “scientific” forms of racism such as craneology and physical anthropology to say nothing of the habitual paternalism of colonial discourses of a more traditional sort. In fact, it was the “liberal” political and commercial sector in cooperation with the military command that promoted most stridently the reinvention of Spanish imperialism along the lines of state-sponsored commercial colonialism. This emerging cooperation was most visible in learned societies such as the Ateneo de Madrid with its associated congresses and the various liberal “centros de propaganda”. For example, Rafael Labra describes the decade of the 1880s as a decade of steady progress for liberal reformism in Spain in both the political as well as in the social and commercial sectors. For Labra, the decisive turning point was 1879 when the “convenio de Zanjón” officially ended ten years of colonial warfare in Cuba and outlawed Republicans were reintegrated into the political system. Beyond the political sphere, Labra explains, “se verifican otros hechos que [...] revelan cierta entonación de las energías expansivas y renovadoras del País” (*El Ateneo* 48). He lists these activities, all of which are decidedly “liberal” in nature:

Entre esos hechos destacan las campañas de la *Sociedad Geográfica*, las conferencias públicas del Círculo de la Unión Mercantil, el Fomento de las Artes y otros centros de propaganda, los debates de la *Academia Matritense de Jurisprudencia*, el establecimiento de la *Institución libre de enseñanza* de Madrid, los éxitos de la *Sociedad Abolicionista española* y la reorganización de los partidos republicanos en toda la Península. (48)

Of these liberal “centros de propaganda” *La Sociedad Geográfica*⁵² demonstrates the connection between liberal reformism, modernization, and a nascent Spanish imperialism/colonialism. In 1884, the *Sociedad* organized the Congreso español de Geografía Colonial y Mercantil which in turn saw the contemporaneous organization of the *Sociedad de Africanistas y Colonialistas*. This latter group organized “grandes mitins madrileños para determinar la acción española en Africa y la organización de algunas expediciones que entonces se hicieron al continente occidental africano [Equatorial Guinea] y que por lo pronto produjeron la toma de posesión del litoral del Sahara”⁵³ (Labra 49). These two societies were intimately associated and formally merged in 1887. Their activities were part of a multifarious “liberal” and commercial project of modernization of Spain not only in terms of its internal social and material infrastructure but also in terms of its standing in international relations. These concerns are apparent in Labra’s description of the activities of the *Sociedad Geográfica*:

Y aquella Sociedad trabajó lo indecible, desde 1878 a 1885, para la reunión del Congreso de Geografía Colonial y Mercantil de Madrid para la reforma de la enseñanza de la Geografía en nuestro país, para la defensa de los territorios españoles de Africa, sobre todo en Guinea, frente a las pretensiones de Francia. En esta hermosa campaña la Sociedad Geográfica se valió de los debates, periódicos y privados de sus socios, de numerosísimas conferencias públicas en el local de la Academia de la Historia, de innumerables y razonadas representaciones a las Cortes y al Gobierno, de algunos mitins en varios teatros de Madrid y de la redacción y publicación de folletos y monografías sobre puntos de importancia geográfica é internacional, así como la publicación de una Revista mensual y un *Boletín*. (Labra 49)

Feced’s “scientific” colonialism was quite “liberal” in 1885 when he began writing his columns. A perusal of the papers read at the Ateneo de Madrid in the period

⁵² The *Sociedad Geográfica* española was founded in Madrid in 1876 and included presidents of such diverse political persuasions as Fermín Caballero, Francisco Coello [General], Antonio Cánovas del Castillo and Segismundo Moret. See Labra p. 48.

⁵³ These colonialist endeavors were taken up on the heels of the Berlin conference of 1884-85 where Spain received the smallest “partition” of all the colonial participants.

of the Restoration, for example, shows a marked increase in colonial topics beginning in 1884 and continuing to 1898. Of course, not all or perhaps very many of the conferences expressed the radical racism of Feced's *Filipinas* but one gets the sense from the titles alone that interest in a renewed Spanish imperialism was integral to the Spanish prescription for national regeneration. It is true, of course, that not all "liberal" or "conservative" Spanish intellectuals shared his radical views on race in the Philippines, but most would take his propositions seriously on their "scientific" merits. But more than a theoretical principle, the "science" of colonialism proposed by Feced and admired by Pardo Bazán was cut from the same cloth as the aesthetic pleasures to be had from travel narratives of all sorts. His text's radical racism obeys aesthetic concerns more directly than it does any practical imperative to persuade policy makers in the metropole. Like other travel narratives, its pleasures and punishments depend on a play of moral contrasts between the space of reading and the space of writing and on a dialectic of eroticism and disdain.

If Feced's radicalized racism also tends to radicalize the moral contrasts between his metropolitan and colonial readers and the object of his writerly gaze, he self-consciously sublimates the erotic component of his narrative in order to preserve the purity of his position on race. In other words, while colonial sexuality is at least implicitly at the heart of his descriptions of the superiority, Feced locates the *atraso* in the colony to misguided principles left over from the era of the conquest whose goal was to assimilate the conquered through conversion to the metropolitan culture. But for Feced, this was a fundamentally misguided since the *indios* were, in his view, incapable of assimilating the "superior culture" of the Spaniards and this problem was compounded by the application of "sweet and maternal" laws. These assimilationist laws, Feced argues, had failed to bring about a desired modern prosperity in the Philippines:

A son de tambor y bajo el bejuco de los Padres, se alzaron penosamente estos miserables cobertizos donde la religión se alberga, [...] Las aguas vivificantes del bautismo corrieron, pues, sobre la dura piel sin penetrar en el alma, y la religión de Cristo quedó al exterior, como la medalla y el escapulario que del pescuezo cuelgan. [...] Y a estos altos ideales de resurrección de razas dormidas por la infusión de una superior cultura, acompañaron aquí leyes blandas, dulces y *maternales*, inspiradas en no menos ideales amores; procedimientos y conducta que luchan todavía estérilmente contra la imposición de seculares hábitos, del clima y la fisiología. (211-12)

To counter the effects of these “maternal” laws, Feced proposes that a thorough revamping of the colonial regime take a decidedly masculine turn in order to reinstate the appropriate gendering of race relations in the colony. Filipinos do not need to learn to read and write Spanish or Latin, he argues, but need the “escuela del trabajo” and the “aguijón de la necesidad” because that is what “virile and productive people do”:

No, la educación del niño y la educación de una raza, exigen alimentación tónica y fortificante; disciplina enérgica, tutela diaria, acicate e impulso; el aguijón de la necesidad y el yugo del deber, la escuela del trabajo y la obligación del esfuerzo. Tales son los pueblos productores y viriles. No pidamos tanto a estas razas inferiores, pero no contribuyamos por los menos a afeminarlas más. Empecemos siquiera por encaminarlas en la dirección de sus aptitudes naturales y rudimentarias, y empecemos por poner artes y oficios en el lugar que hoy ocupan estudios profesionales y científicos. Hoy parece proyectarse algo en este sentido, en hora bendita. (214)

In the figure of Pablo Feced, were combined several of the most important currents of the “new” imperialism of the late nineteenth century. Not only did he advocate a “modern” form of settler colonialism to replace the assimilationist model favored by the liberal imperialists but he understood as well the value of literature in the promotion of his ideological program in the metropole and in the colony. He not only adapted “scientific” racist theories to the circumstances obtaining in the Philippines but he also understood the value of carrying on a literary campaign against the most serious challenge to his colonial model: the *colonia filipina* that was living and writing in the Peninsula and beyond. Though his arguments were structured around a radicalized

difference to solve the problem of the “failures” of Spanish colonialism in the Philippines, Pablo Feced shared with other Spaniards the deeply felt conviction that the imperial periphery had to be preserved whatever the cost. That is, though Spaniards might argue about methodology, or about the proper future for Spanish colonialism in the Philippines, none could countenance their loss, not even the Republicans. What is more, the Philippines in the last two decades of the nineteenth century suddenly loomed large in the national imaginary much like Africa had in the 1860s and provided ample opportunities to indulge self-congratulatory fantasies about the meaning of Hispanic imperialism. If Emilia Pardo Bazán cut her literary teeth on a refurbished Hispanic imperialism as it was provided to her by Núñez de Arce in the pages of *La Iberia*, in Feced’s *Filipinas*, she would find an equally satisfying imperial fantasy during the height of her literary career.

Chapter 4: *Costumbrismo*, Travel Writing and the “Imperial Difference”

No quiero pararme mucho en la campaña de Feijoo contra las brujerías y supersticiones. Hay quien no se la agradece, antes opina que nos desacreditó algún tanto a los ojos extranjeros, haciendo que el país menos supersticioso de Europa cobrase reputación del más infestado de semejante plaga, y que hasta se nos atribuyesen errores que nadie había oído nombrar por aquí. No es del todo infundada esta apreciación: repito que Feijoo tenía una gran fuerza imaginativa, y que su curiosa fantasía gallega se recreaba (aunque condenándolas en nombre de la razón) con todas esas creencias absurdas, y repasaba en mágica linterna los duendes [...]. Convengamos, sí, en que de buena parte de estos embustes ni noticia se tenía en España, pero admitimos también que el refutar y desenmarañar supercherías semejantes fue el capítulo de diversión y recreo de aquel espíritu serio y honrado

Emilia Pardo Bazán, *Feijoo y su siglo*⁵⁴

Correcting *errores comunes* is tricky business as the above quote from Emilia Pardo Bazán’s treatise on the life and works of Father Feijoo makes clear. This is so because to correct an error is to first confess it publicly, and in writing and it is not always clear to what audience one is confessing. Furthermore, confessing has its own pleasures, and one can run on about it, revealing altogether too much or even inventing problems that don’t in reality exist. Even in a “serious and honorable” person like Feijoo, one’s *fantasía* can get the upper hand.

The problem for Feijoo’s critics was that Spain had a reputation to defend and his zeal for exposing all of the *errores comunes* of Spain in order to correct them became, his critics felt, a kind of source book for foreign travel writers to elaborate fantastic images of Spain. For Spanish intellectuals who were committed —like Feijoo— to the project of enlightened modernization, travel writing was a sore subject. As Luis Díaz Larios has explained,

⁵⁴ Pardo Bazán, OC 3:758-9.

Los españoles han sido muy sensibles a estos manejos ‘literarios’, casi tanto como aficionados los viajeros extranjeros a subrayar sus extravagancias. Los ilustrados primero, y después los liberales, siempre preocupados por impulsar la modernización del país aproximándolo a los modelos europeos, reaccionaron a menudo con una mezcla de humillación, despecho y orgullo contra aquellos visitantes que en su pintura de España abusaron del color local, la navaja en la liga, la montera y el trabuco, como de la Guardia Civil después. (111)

Pardo Bazán’s impulse to defend “España” from the judgment of “ojos extranjeros” participates in this tradition of anxiety over the international image of Spain described by Díaz Larios and reveals that the anxiety that modernizing Spanish intellectuals felt was not simply the product of foreign travel writing. Here, Feijoo’s enlightened intentions to root out “creencias absurdas” seem to reconfirm Spain’s reputation as the country “más infestado de semejante plaga, y que hasta se nos atribuyesen errores que nadie había oído nombrar por aquí” In reality, Pardo Bazán hastens to assure us, Spain is “el país menos supersticioso de Europa” but her anxiety over the legacy of Feijoo’s *Teatro Crítico Universal* reveals at least two important aspects of literary modernity in Spain. First, it demonstrates the anxiety produced by the process of the increasing integration of the world literary system in which writing was increasingly consumed by readers beyond the community of readers evoked by the text itself. That is, not only did was Spain’s backwardness available to “ojos extranjeros” in the sentimental travelogues of northern writers, but Spanish books also traveled or could be imagined to do so. Modernizing intellectuals worried that Spain needed to be protected from the false impressions created and circulated in writing. In other words, if Feijoo allowed his imagination to get the best of him, this is only dangerous when one imagines “foreign” readers getting the wrong impression.

The second aspect that this anxiety about the reception of writing about Spain beyond Spain’s borders reveals is the powerful influence of what David Harvey calls the “geographical imagination” produced by modernity and constitutive of the meaning of

one's place in it. What Harvey means by this is that modernity was not simply a matter of modernizations (i.e. market integration, enhanced technologies of travel and communication, urbanization, industrialization, etc.), but also a "psychodrama" of progress through which an interpretive grid of hierarchies "could be loosely thrown over the whole world" (271). This important spatial component to the *idea* of modernity meant that one's location in that grid entailed a valuated relationship to others with different coordinates in the same grid so that one could be precisely indexed geographically within that grid. Furthermore, with the steady accumulation of travel writing circulating through the literary system and reinforcing the meaning of modernity throughout, the spatial imaginary gradually filled the abstract outlines of the map with concrete details of life "here" and "out there." Modern identity, especially in the middle and late nineteenth century, then, was relational in that it implied a dialectic of recognition which entailed a "psychodrama" of place as it related to other locations which could be arrayed in meaningful hierarchies.

It is natural that this dialectic of recognition, which played out against the backdrop of modernity, depended on insistent (if not obsessive) representation. In the nineteenth century, new technologies of representation increased the intensity of the "psychodrama" of progress. New print technologies like the lithograph, the daguerreotype, photogravure, and the rotary press all made illustrated periodicals both possible and popular venues for representing other geographical spaces in direct juxtaposition with the local.

It bears pointing out that the boom in illustrated periodicals that began in the 1840s was as much motivated by a desire to represent the "out there" to a "local" community of readers as it was to represent the "local" to the "out there." In a sense, the illustrated press was a periodical form modeled on (and obsessed with) museums and

expositions that were rapidly populating nineteenth century cities. In Spain the case of the *Museo Universal/Ilustración Española y Americana* or (as we will see below) *La Ilustración de Madrid* are exemplary in this sense. Lithography allowed the reproduction of museum collections and art expositions as well as news photographs to communities of readers not only in the Peninsula but also throughout the Americas, the Philippines, and Europe. That the effort was neo-imperial is obvious in the lopsided content of the periodicals, with relatively scant space devoted to American art or writing. But these periodicals represent a concerted effort on the part of publishers and intellectuals to re-integrate the vast American reading publics into the circles of Peninsular intellectual and cultural production.

Similarly, commercial products from around the globe were increasingly available to urban consumers and international expositions became means for displaying the relative “modernity” of global populations in “typical” displays of industrial, cultural and economic development. In literature, the psychodrama of progress produced a wealth of travel literature of all sorts ranging among pilgrimages to the centers of civilization, orientalist voyages, exploration narratives of the “opening” of new colonial spaces, science fictional voyages to the center of the Earth or balloon trips over the heart of Africa, etc. Everything was interesting in this zeal to represent, and travel literature provided specific satisfactions and not a few anxieties.

The purpose of this chapter is to consider travel writing in Spain in the nineteenth century as a strategic response to the hierarchies of space imposed by the “interpretive grid of modernity.” Walter D. Mignolo has called the subordination of Spain in the family of Eurocolonial nations the articulation of an “imperial difference.” By extending Partha Chatterjee’s analysis of the “colonial difference” to the relations of power *among* empires, Mignolo argues that Eurocolonialism has been able to mask the true origins of

modernity in the colonial contact and the consequent development of the Atlantic commercial circuit during the 16th century. Euromodernity has preferred, Mignolo argues, to locate modernity with the rise of Enlightenment rationality in the 18th century in order to safeguard the exceptionalism and universalism at the heart of discourses of European modernity. The necessary sacrifice for this tale to cohere, it seems, was the rejection of Iberian power and its vast colonialisms of the 16th and 17th centuries as pre-modern in order to locate a “true” modernity in the “rational” north. Mignolo identifies this shift in Enlightenment thinkers such as Emanuel Kant who contrasted the modern “national characteristics” of England and France to the idiosyncracies of the Spanish national character:

The Spaniard’s bad side is that he does not learn from foreigners; that he does not travel in order to get acquainted with other nations; that he is centuries behind in the sciences. He resists any reform; he is proud of not having to work; he is of a romantic quality of spirit, as the bullfight shows; he is cruel, as the auto-da fé shows; and he displays in his taste an origin that is partly non-European. (cited in Mignolo 172-3)

Beyond the simplicity of this formula of “national characteristics” lurks the commonplaces of Enlightenment travel writing. Kant, who was a famous homebody, can quite naturally condemn Spaniards for their stubborn resistance to outside influence and their lack of enthusiasm for that most modern of all activities, travel. This particular characteristic (the idea that Spaniards did not travel) had particular stamina in the catalogue of national commonplaces about Spanish culture despite the curious fact that Spain still maintained the largest imperial apparatus in the world in the late 18th century when Kant wrote this, and therefore it is a patent absurdity to assert that Spaniards did not travel. But Kant’s observation points to a different mode of travel than the one required of Spaniards to maintain their hold on a vast colonial empire. Spaniards, Kant argues, did not travel, “in order to get acquainted with other nations.” Furthermore, even

if some Spaniards did travel extensively in the 18th century, they did not seem interested in writing about it. In other words, Spaniards were not travel writers in the 18th and well into the 19th centuries when travelers from other nations like England, France, Germany and the United States increasingly traveled and wrote their impressions for an community of readers avid for details about other lands. To put this another way, Kant could say that Spaniards did not travel because there were no Spanish travel texts to prove it. There was, however, a growing collection of travel writing about Spain available to readers in the North that tended to confirm the stock of commonly held ideas about Spain as a pre-modern society. If for Kant the pre-modern characteristics of Spanish society are held up as an indictment, in the nineteenth century (and beyond), the same elements of Spanish “atraso” would be fetishised as “romantic” or “picturesque” by sentimental travelers.

In the nineteenth century, Spain was a popular destination for these sentimental travelers who relished its “romantic” landscape and “medieval” culture. Among those travelers were famous literary figures like Victor Hugo or Alexander Dumas, or more obscure travelers like Domingo F. Sarmiento. Whatever their origins, travelers in Spain traded on a commonly held stock of conventional images of Spain’s “romantic,” “barbarous,” or “picturesque” backwardness and they all set about explaining the origins of these phenomena in loving detail. Sarmiento cites, for example, Dumas’s literary disposition toward Spain as an example of the kind of riches that a travel writer or a travel reader could expect to find in Spain. The romantic traveler in Spain did not go there to see modernity but rather what was left of traditional life: “Poco me importa la civilizacion de un pais; lo que yo busco es la poesia, la naturaleza, las costumbres” (Sarmiento 150). Sarmiento then laments that the traditional elements that characterize pre-modern Spain, were in fact disappearing yet the travelers continued to arrive looking for adventure:

En cuanto a pintoresco i poesía, la España posee sin embargo grandes riquezas, aunque por desgracia cada día va perdiendo algo de su orijinalidad primitiva. Ya hace por ejemplo cuatro años a que la diligencia no es detenida por los bandidos con aquellas largas carabinas que aun llevan consigo hasta hoi los muleteros, razgo que caracteriza a todas las sociedades primitivas, como los árabes, los esclavones, los españoles. Dos artistas franceses acaban en estos días de recorrer las montañas de la Ronda atravesando en mula el reino de Murcia, i continuando a pié su escursion, desde Sevilla a Madrid, sin haber tenido la felicidad de ser atacados por los bandidos como se lo habian prometido, a fin de descargar las carabinas de que se habian provisto, o tomar las de Villadiego, segun lo aconsejase la gravedad del caso. (Sarmiento 150)

Travel writing about Spain, then, produced a catalogue of images that were the source of both pride and shame for Spanish intellectuals who were interested in modernizing Spanish society in order to overcome Spain's subordination in Euromodernity. The central argument in this chapter is that travel writing emerged in nineteenth century Spain in three distinct modes or trajectories, namely *costumbrista* travel writing, *imperial* travel writing and the modern *pilgrimage*. Each of these modes traced a different trajectory through the hierarchies of space produced by modern difference and each articulated a different ethical relationship between the observer, the observed and the community of readers evoked in the text. Each of these modes of travel writing is a compensatory strategy meant to calm the anxieties produced by the "psychodrama" of progress and consolidated by the representational economy of the world literary system. Therefore, if travel writing worked to consolidate the premodern image of Spain in the eyes of foreign communities of readers, Spanish writers felt compelled to restructure the meaning of the modernization of Spain in these distinct modes of travel writing.

COSTUMBRISMO, ERRORES COMUNES, AND "OJOS EXTRANJEROS"

In Spain, *costumbrismo* arose as a literary strategy to codify the spatial component of the idea of the modern by effectively mapping and isolating culture in a

series of types or as freeze-frame images. These images were useful not only as a cultural bulwark against the changes wrought by modernization, but also because the idiosyncrasies of the local acted as a counterweight to the homogenizing character of the modern. Also, *costumbrista* writing served to correct the misrepresentations of Spanish *usos y costumbres* by travel writers from other locations in the grid of modernity. For example, in the prologue to her novel *La Gaviota* (1853) Fernán Caballero suggested that the proper path toward modernity was a moderate adaptation of “los positivos adelantos de otras naciones” to local conditions. Rather than allow Spain to be dragged along willy-nilly down “el mismo idéntico carril de aquella civilización,” she wished,

que nuestra Patria, abatida por tantas desgracias, se alzase independiente y por sí sola, contando con sus propias fuerzas y sus propias luces, adelantando y mejorando, sí, pero graduando prudentemente sus mejoras morales y materiales, y adaptándolas a su carácter, necesidades y propensiones. (125)

An important step toward this desired renaissance is not only to re-present Spanish society “bajo su verdadero punto de vista” but also to change the readers’ affective ties to the object of representation. That is “apreciar, amar y dar a conocer nuestra nacionalidad” (125). This “true” perspective and this affective attitude was absent, and indeed the “desdén en que yace [España] sumida” was, in part, the product of the internalization by Spaniards of the attitudes of foreign travelers who wrote about Spain to the “público europeo.” For both of these *errores comunes*, Fernán Caballero offered her novel as a corrective and this corrective is a matter of changing the representational point of view and the ethical stance that point of view entailed with respect to the object observed and represented:

Doloroso es que nuestro retrato sea casi siempre ejecutado por extranjeros, entre los cuales a veces sobra el talento, pero falta la condición esencial para sacar la semejanza, conocer el original. Quisiéramos que el público europeo tuviese una idea correcta de lo que es España, y de lo que somos los españoles; que se disipasen esas preocupaciones monstruosas conservadas y transmitidas de generación en generación en el vulgo, como las momias de Egipto. Y para ello es

indispensable que, en lugar de juzgar a los españoles pintados por manos extrañas, nos vean los demás pueblos, pintados por nosotros mismos. (125)

That in Fernán Caballero's *costumbrista* program of changing the affective ties of the reader to "nuestra nacionalidad" we hear an echo of Martí's notion of the "hombre real" is not necessarily the product of direct influence —though this is not impossible— but is rather the expression of the feeling of an intellectual in an *analogous* position in the "interpretive grid" of modernity. In the above passage we can perceive the construction of an integrated literary system where a "national" community of readers is increasingly connected to an international market of writing, reproduction and consumption. Fernán Caballero's intervention in this system, then, imagines turning what had been a one-way communication between literary France and (largely through France) literary England and beyond, into a multilateral literary conversation ("Quisiéramos que el público europeo tuviese una idea correcta de lo que es España, y de lo que somos los españoles"). But at the same time her intervention was intended to displace the influence of "European" literature on the attitudes of Spanish readers in order to correct their attitudes toward Spain itself. And finally, she intended through her writing to correct the "preocupaciones monstruosas" —a direct echo of Feijoo's theory of the recalcitrance of *errores comunes* to reasoned correction— that were the source of embarrassment to Spanish intellectuals in the first place. To do this she turned to the decidedly "modern" representational procedures of the "cuadro de costumbres" and its aesthetic concept of *lo pintoresco*.

The concept of *lo pintoresco* that informs the aesthetic procedures of *costumbrista* writing is modeled on painting with its organization of space and time in relation to the perspective of the exterior gaze of the viewer. That is, *costumbrismo* marks a *moral* distance between the reader and the *costumbres* represented since *costumbres* are

always “local mores” —or *moeurs locales* in the French version of *costumbrista* fiction (see Escobar 120)— rather than generalized moral systems. In this way, by arranging *cuadros de costumbres* in series within books and periodicals (often accompanied by *costumbrista* sketches), *costumbrismo* imitated in rather self-conscious fashion the organization of the museum. To perceive the *cuadro de costumbres* means to be outside its world of everyday practice. In other words, *costumbrismo* assumes what might be called an “anthropological” stance with respect to its object for only an outside observer could possibly recognize a *costumbrista* scene as picturesque. But as Fernán Caballero’s quote suggests, *costumbrista* writing articulated its discourse with a double addressee in mind: the text addresses its “corrective” message to an “internal” community of readers while simultaneously imagining an “external” community of readers (“el público europeo”) to whom the *cuadro* presents an “idea correcta de nuestra nacionalidad.” To counteract the splitting in the community of readers (“nuestra nacionalidad” vs. “el público europeo”), Fernán Caballero proposes an *ethical* way of reading the *costumbres locales* that bridges the moral gap between those customs and the national readers who do not (or no longer) share them.

But this endeavor comes with no small amount of anxiety about its “foreign” reception. If *costumbrismo* authorizes itself as an antidote to foreign travel accounts of Spanish culture by alleging a literary mimesis of a higher order (“la pura verdad”), its author runs the risk of being misperceived by “ojos extranjeros” as identical with its object of representation. For example, Fernán Caballero frets about the “estilo chancero” that characterizes the Spanish conversational habits reproduced in her novel and feels compelled to defend this Spanish style to foreign readers who might tire of being unable to understand its codes and subtle pleasures. But her explanation quickly changes from a

defense of the relative and conventional nature of taste into a diatribe against “European” mores in order to exact a kind of symbolic revenge for an anticipated insult from *allá*.

Este tono sostenidamente chancero se reputaría en la severidad y escogimiento del buen tono europeo, de poco fino; sin tener en cuenta que lo fino y lo no fino del trato son cosas convencionales. En cuanto a nosotros, nos parece en gran manera preferible al tono de amarga y picante ironía, tan común actualmente en la sociedad extranjera, y de que se sirven muchos, creyendo indicar con ella una gran superioridad, cuando lo que generalmente indica es una gran dosis de necedad y no poca de insolencia.

Los extranjeros se burlan de nosotros; tengan, pues, a bien perdonarnos el benigno ensayo de la ley del tali3n a que les sometemos en los tipos de ellos que en esta novela pintamos refiriendo la pura verdad. (126)

Costumbrista writing also promised a corrective for another modern anxiety which was the loss of the “local” to the homogenizing pressure of cosmopolitan modernity. In a collection of *costumbrista* articles whose title echoes Fern3n Caballero’s corrective (*Los espa3oles pintados por s3 mismos* (1851)), the authors give a different genealogy to the *costumbrista* impulse. The invention of the daguerrotype, they suggest rather mawkishly, threatens to alter the historical record for future generations of historians through the very proliferation of portraits. Historians, the authors allege, will have a false view of the history that preceded the technology of mechanical representation.

En otro tiempo solo se retrataban los reyes para presidir las sesiones de los concejos.[...] Pero ahora *todos se reproducen* [...]: el rey y el pechero, el viejo pergamino y la nueva vitela; el general que *gana* victoria y el que es *ganado* [...] el escritor, el magistrado, el tendero; todos, en fin, se retratan porque no falte a la posteridad cuando quiera escribir la historia de nuestra edad la *vera efigies* de esos gloriosos obreros de la moderna civilizaci3n. (1)

The desire to represent oneself is born of a modern sense for the historicity of culture and for one’s future place in history. Spanish *costumbrismo* seeks to establish such an archive even when it wishes to correct the “backwardness” of the idiosyncratic. *Costumbrismo*, then, is a thoroughly modern procedure in that it serves the impulse to memorialize the

disappearing present conceived as a future past. In this way, it is a bulwark against the loss of *lo pintoresco* in the present to a homogeneous (i.e. fully modern) future. The difference between the *costumbrista* writer and the foreign travel writer in Spain is not so much the object of their interest (*lo pintoresco*), but their attitude toward it. For the travel writer, as we saw in the case of Sarmiento in the first chapter, what is *digno de pincel* is what is truly Spanish. What is modern in Spain is foreign to it. But seen from the outside, as in the case of Sarmiento, what is characteristic of Spanish society is also pleasurably premodern and therefore unthreatening in a world construed as a hierarchy of the modern. Hence Fernán Caballero's feeling that "los extranjeros se burlan de nosotros." For the *costumbrista* writer the premodern idiosyncrasies of *la España tradicional* produce both pleasure and anxiety. Again, to take an example from the prologue to *Los españoles pintados por sí mismos*, we can see that the modern practice of self-representation is born of an ethical concern for the preservation of the local as a bulwark against the sense of inferiority brought about by the wholesale adaptation of a foreign modernity:

Ningún otro pueblo ciertamente merecía tanto el ser pintado como el español, porque que ningún otro es tan numeroso y variado en sus tipos, ni tan original. ¿Dónde hallaréis un torero? ¿dónde un gitano como el español? ¿un contrabandista como el andaluz? ¿una manola como la madrileña? En ninguna parte; y si hubiésemos tardado algo más en pintarnos, ni en España mismo, porque la sociedad entera se está rejuveneciendo y la moda francesa nos ha ido desnudando pieza por pieza para vestirnos al instable (sic) capricho de ese pueblo, que así arroja un rey una mañana al canal de la Mancha como se quita una camisa y la echa a la ropa sucia.

Yo no digo que en esto haga bien ni mal el pueblo español y la sociedad entera. Si lo hace, sus razones tendrá para ello. Lo que digo es que vamos perdiendo todas las facciones de aquella fisonomía especial que nos distinguía de los demás pueblos de la tierra, y que dentro de poco será preciso exclamar con el poeta:

«No busques en Roma a Roma ¡oh! caminante.»

La España tradicional, la España de nuestros abuelos, tendrán entonces que venir á buscarla nuestros nietos y los extranjeros en este libro, en que están *Los Españoles pintados por sí mismos* (1)

In this geographical imaginary, France is the “object” of the absolutely modern. There is no mention here of the quaint customs of the French peasantry but only the ultramodern sense of the “moda francesa” that is quickly imposing itself on Spanish lifeways. At the same time, however, the *costumbrista* writer shares a modern curiosity for *lo pintoresco*, thereby marking a spatiotemporal distance from the object of representation. In other words, the writer cannot be a *torero* or a *manola madrileña* but rather a Spaniard under the sway of “la moda francesa.” Therefore, for these and other *costumbrista* writers, “la España tradicional” is somehow magically displaced from the world of the writer. In this case, it is displaced, despite its actual contemporaneity with the writing, onto the past or “la España de nuestros abuelos”, thus preserving the necessary distance between the modern observer and the picturesque object of observation. This displacement is also codified in spatial terms so that movement through cultural spaces is also movement through cultural time. In this way, the urban spaces such as Madrid and Barcelona represented “modern” space within the national imaginary to be contrasted with the “exotic” or “traditional” spaces such as Andalucía and Galicia or León. At the same time, the urban space itself opened a codifiable series of scenes of “Madrid moderno” (museums, cafés, theatres, Puerta del Sol) and “Madrid antigua” (churches, monuments, seigniorial mansions). To take an example of this spacialization of the modern and the traditional from Gustavo Adolfo Bécquer’s *costumbrista* writing in *La Ilustración de Madrid* —a text to which I will return in some detail below— we can see in the description of the Plaza Mayor de Madrid the exemplar of “la España tradicional” in contrast to the modern Puerta del Sol:

Teatro de grandes acontecimientos políticos, de fiestas y ceremonias públicas, la Plaza Mayor de Madrid tiene una larga é interesante historia demasiado conocida, para que nosotros nos detengamos a trazar de nuevo sus páginas. El pincel y el buril nos han ofrecido también en diversas épocas los rasgos de su particular fisonomía, ya se levantara en su ámbito el cadalso para la ejecución de un

poderoso valido, ya coronaran sus arcadas las damas y galanes, espectadores de una fiesta real, ú ocupara los estrados y graderías el imponente tribunal de la Inquisición, en alguno de sus famosos autos de fé. El siglo XIX, que no se encontraba bien moviéndose dentro del círculo severo de arcos y edificios de altas torres, con chapiteles de pizarra oscura, trasunto fiel de la triste época á que se debe la última reedificación de esta plaza, creó la Puerta del Sol, en principio estrecha é irregular, pero llena de movimiento y vida, que forman contraste con el abandono en que desde este punto quedó aquel histórico recinto. (148)

The national space —whether urban or rural— could be indexed not only along a modern/traditional axis but also in terms of class, gender, religious and regional projections. Furthermore, the *usos y costumbres* (religious processions, traditional agricultural practices, rural and urban practices of all sorts) that served as the basis of this literary practice were always spacially designated.

The nostalgia evoked in the impending loss of “la España tradicional” can coexist with a light (or even acrid) humor as long as the community of readers is stable and the object of representation retains its ethics of introjection (i.e. identification with the readerly “we”). But as we saw in the case of Fernán Caballero, the sense of splitting in the potentially international community of readers engenders a certain amount of paranoia and defensiveness on the part of the *costumbrista* writer. She wishes on the one hand for “European” readers to have an accurate portrait of Spaniards, but immediately worries that such a portrait might be laughed at just the same. She is less nervous in the case of the local (Spanish) communities of readers —despite their acknowledged differences in attitude regarding the solution to the problem of modernization in Spain— and she is less worried because a common concern for the nation and its well-being can be asserted as the ethical basis of that community. This ethical bond is not shared with “foreign” readers but rather, it is shared *against* them insofar as they can be imagined as having been trained either to disdain Spanish “backwardness” or to enjoy its picturesque qualities. Their disapproval must be disarmed by underscoring their outsider status. At

the same time, the *errores comunes* must be corrected from within by those capable of brokering a locally idiosyncratic form of modernity, namely the local modern writer.

By virtue of its insider/outsider positionality, *costumbrismo* structures attitudes towards modernity by throwing its spatiotemporal grid over the confusions of everyday practice. In this way it also structures the attitudes of its readership which is invited to share its perspective. Whether in the ironical reformism of a Larra esconced in his *rincones excusados* of the café to eavesdrop on his fellow citizens, or the lighthearted and elitist humor of the *cuadros pintorescos* in *Los españoles pintados por sí mismos*, the *costumbrista* writer adopts —and urges the reader to adopt— the insider/outsider perspective of the native observer. Along with this positionality comes an ethical disposition to the spacio-temporal coordinates that the writer's perspective enacts. What emerges in the *costumbrista* text is a subtle mix of pleasure (whether ironical or sentimental), with concern (whether reformist or nostalgic), for a society suffering the growing pains and indignities of modernity. It is also with *costumbrismo* that the figure of the professional writer begins to emerge in Spain. In the transition between the slow decline of Absolutist rule under Fernando VII and the 1836 revolution, Larra, Mesonero Romanos and Estébañez Calderón began to produce a mature form of *costumbrista* writing as part of their journalistic repertoire. The end of the rigid censorship of the absolutist period and the steady return of exiled liberals from abroad meant the press that emerged in period before and after 1836 was increasingly professional and professionalized. Among the journalists of this period, María Cruz Seoane points out,

Larra es el prototipo del periodista independiente, fiel a sí mismo. No se adscribió a ningún partido porque ninguno podía conformarle [...] Con justificado orgullo se incluye tácitamente dentro de la variedad que ofrecía la profesión periodística entre los «hombres que no conocen miedo ni precio; hombres que no admiten ni admitirán nunca destinos del gobierno, ni promesas de partido; hombres, en fin, que tienen tanto orgullo, fundado o no, para escribir otra cosa que lo que se dice.» (Seoane 159)

The combination of the professionalization of the press and the emerging discourse of the independent writer is visible in the point of view adopted in *costumbrista* writing.

There is some debate about whether Larra was in fact a *costumbrista*. Juan Bautista Montes Bodajandi, for example, does not consider Larra a *costumbrista* like the contributors to the *Los españoles pintados por sí mismos* such as Mesonero Romanos and Estébanez Calderón on account of the difference in the political function of literature. Larra's reformism sets him apart from them because "A Larra no le interesa el cuadro de costumbres como simple descripción de las mismas, sino como método de análisis, de disección, de profundización en los vicios que impiden el progreso social. Larra considera la sociedad como un problema y no como un modelo que reflejar en sus escritos" (24). The importance of *costumbrismo* here, however, is less about the particular political commitments expressed in *costumbrista* texts and more about how it articulates its relation to the object of representation. In Larra we see the first glimmers of the emergence in Spanish letters of the autonomy of the "pure observer" that would be the bedrock in the later century for the discourse of autonomous art. As Pierre Bourdieu explains in relation to this phenomenon in Flaubert's France,

Writing abolishes the determinations, constraints and limits which are constitutive of social experience: to exist socially means to occupy a determined position in the social structure and to bear the marks of it, especially in the form of verbal automatisms or mental mechanisms; it also means to depend on, to hold to and to be held by, in short, *to belong to* groups and be enclosed in networks of relations which have objectivity, opacity, and permanency, and which show themselves in the form of obligations, debts, duties -- in short controls and constraints. As with Berkeleyan idealism, the idealism of the social world supposes both the overview and absolute viewpoint of the sovereign spectator, freed from dependence and from work through which the resistance of the physical and the social world makes itself felt, and thus capable, as Flaubert says, 'of placing oneself in one bound above humanity and having nothing in common with it other than a relation of the eye'. Eternity and ubiquity, these are the divine attributes with which the pure observer endows himself. (27)

Larra, of course, is not *yet* able to adopt the “divine” positionality of the “pure observer” since he and the writers of his generation are still struggling against such mundane concerns as political censorship and social *errores comunes*. For Larra, art is an instrument to intervene in a closed political system. It is an *available form of authority* whose power is increasing with a rapidly expanding readership. But his gesture toward the independence of the writer from other forms of social, political or economic power, with all of their duties and obligations (“hombres que no conocen miedo ni precio”) points the way to the emergence of the modern intellectual who will be able to declare fully the dignity of art from the indignities of its subordination to the field of power. *Costumbrismo*, by the very nature of the positionality of the writer to the society, cannot be an “autonomous” form of art. The costumbrista adopts an insider/outsider point of view with respect to the object of observation and by doing so contracts the “duties and obligations” of the socially embedded writer and bears the marks of the “psychodrama” of progress. In short, *costumbrismo*’s narrative stance enacts the ideological resolution of the contradictory desire for modernity and concern (love) for the idiosyncratic enabled by the *national fantasy*.

LA ILUSTRACIÓN DE MADRID AND THE ETHICS OF REPRESENTATION

Some striking examples of this spacialization of the relation of the “modern” to the “traditional” appeared in the series of drawings and articles published by the Bécquer brothers (Gustavo and Valeriano) in *La Ilustración de Madrid* during the years 1870-1871. Together, Gustavo and Valeriano had received a government stipend from the Ministerio de Fomento in the years before 1868 to travel around the country archiving the traditional customs of the countryside. Valeriano sketched the *cuadro* and Gustavo wrote an accompanying text. A few years later, after their famous escape from the hubub of

modern Madrid to the “romantic” quietude of Toledo,⁵⁵ the brothers returned to Madrid and participated in the founding of *La Ilustración de Madrid*. This new publication, according to María Dolores Cabra Loredo, was unique in Madrid of the time because its “sentido de lo español traspasaba las fronteras de lo folklórico para desarrollar un tipo de periodismo en el que la otra imagen de España, la desconocida, la olvidada, comenzara a renacer del espíritu de los propios españoles”(19). If Cabra Loredo is correct about the uniqueness of *La Ilustración de Madrid* in terms of its attitude to the “unknown and forgotten” Spain, what is neither unique nor new to Gustavo’s writing nor Valeriano’s drawing is the ethical burden of managing the problem posed by modernity in Spain. If the disposition that the Bécquer brothers brought to the *cuadro de costumbres* is a new (neoromantic) disposition, they shared with Larra, Fernán Caballero, Mesonero Romanos and other *costumbrista* writers both an ethical concern for the object of representation — whether ironized or sentimentalized— that returns obsessively to the problem of modernity in Spain. Like other *costumbristas*, this ethical dimension is spacialized in order to underscore the distance of the observer from the observed so that what the writer/artist shares with the reader/viewer is a common displacement from the object. But this distance is filled in, as it were, with an ethical and aesthetic *interest* in the object because that object pertains to the *national community* and must therefore be integrated into the process of projection and introjection characteristic of fantasies of modernity. Perhaps we could here propose the concept that *costumbrista* writers stage *national fantasies* in order to transfer the problem of the authority inherent to modernity onto an endless series of objects whose troublesome aspects can be split off from their idealized forms and in this way introjected into the national “we.”

⁵⁵ For an overview about the importance of the year the Bécquer brothers spent in Toledo in 1868-1869, see Rubio Jiménez.

For example, Gustavo Bécquer begins the article “Tipo toledano: El pordiosero” explaining that “El estudio de las costumbres populares de un país ofrece siempre grande interés a las personas ilustradas” (37). This interest, he suggests springs from two sources, one aesthetic and one historical: “Ya se las mire bajo el punto de vista del arte, buscando en ellas lo mucho que tienen de pintoresco, ya se las considere como datos preciosos para reconstruir el pasado” (37). For Bécquer, to be capable of recognizing the aesthetic pleasure or the historical value of “costumbres populares” is proper to “personas ilustradas” and his purpose in undertaking this project is to serve as an example for others to emulate:

Reuniendo en las columnas de *La Ilustración de Madrid* cuanto nos sea posible allegar á referente á monumentos, tipos, trages y costumbres de nuestras provincias, creemos hacer algo de lo mucho que en este camino podría hacerse por nuestros artistas y escritores contemporáneos. (37)

Like the author of the prologue to *Los españoles pintados por sí mismos*, Bécquer’s interest is motivated by a historical duty to capture “los tipos, los usos, los trages y hasta las ideas de esas masas, que siguen de lejos y lentamente el movimiento de la civilización.” (37) There is a certain urgency to the project since the objects of artistic and historical interest are quickly disappearing:

Pero si siempre es de gran interés este género de estudio, nunca lo será tanto como en los momentos actuales, en que espectadores de una radical transformación, sólo así podremos recoger la última palabra de un modo de ser social que desaparece, del que sólo quedan hoy rastros en los más apartados rincones de nuestras provincias y del que apenas restará mañana un recuerdo confuso. (37).

Several important things become clear in Bécquer’s *costumbrista* project that can either by similarity or contrast be read back onto the other *costumbrista* writers we have considered so far. First, the question of the community of readers to which this writing is addressed is not explicitly open to outsiders as it was in the case of Fernán Caballero. Rather, there is a cosmopolitan impulse in his appreciation of the value of the “popular”

or the “historical,” since the “personas ilustradas” of Spain have analogues in other places who are likewise interested in their own “costumbres populares.” Secondly, Bécquer is not only an observer of picturesque “usos y trages” but also of the radical transformations brought about by the modernizing projects of the state and the increasing modernizing influence of the bourgeoisie. Bécquer leaves these projects to the politicians and philosophers. For Bécquer, unlike for Larra or Fernán Caballero, the role of the artist is not to instill a desire for reform and progress, but rather to shape his readers’ attitude to the detritus of that process:

La irresistible corriente de las nuevas ideas nos empuja hácia la unidad en todo; los caprichosos ángulos de las antiguas ciudades vienen al suelo sacrificados á la línea recta, aspiración constante de la modernas poblaciones; los característicos trages de ciertas provincias comienzan á parecer un disfraz fuera del oscuro rincón de la aldea; los usos tradicionales, las fiestas propias de cada localidad, se nos antojan ridículas. (37)

For Bécquer, the incomprehension and ridicule that Fernán Caballero projected onto a foreign community of readers has been internalized. Like the other *costumbristas*, Bécquer sees Spanish modernity as problematic, but at the same time his interest in the remaining vestiges of *la España tradicional* is not a stance against modernity. Rather, modernity for him has been introjected into the national community as something which, although laudable in its own right, is unavoidable. While others will take care of the modernizations, it falls to the artist to aestheticize it as a loss:

No nos falta la fe en el porvenir: Cuando juzgamos, bajo el punto de vista del filósofo ó del hombre político, las profundas alteraciones que todo lo transforman y cambian á nuestro alrededor, esperamos que en un término más ó menos distante algo se levantará sobre tantas ruinas: pero séanos permitido guardar la memoria de un mundo que desaparece y que tan alto hablaba al espíritu del artista y del poeta: séanos permitido sacar de entre los escombros algunos de sus más preciosos fragmentos, para conservarlos como dato para la historia, como una curiosidad ó una reliquia. (37)

As a kind of cultural archaeologist of the present, Bécquer sets out to lovingly piece together the remaining shards of vanishing lifeways. Bécquer is not necessarily in thrall to those lifeways in themselves, but rather to their capacity to inspire representational fantasies, and he uses the case of the *pordiosero* to make his case:

Merced á los esfuerzos de la beneficencia oficial y á los reglamentos de policía urbana, las poblaciones importantes de nuestro país se han visto libres de la nube de pordioseros que en tiempos no muy remotos llenaban las calles. El mendigo, cuya cabeza típica y pintorescos harapos inspiró á más de un artista fantásticas siluetas, se ha transformado al contacto de la civilización en el vulgar acogido de San Bernardino, con su uniforme de bayeta oscura y su sombrero de hule. Al imponerles la chapa y la guitarra á los que aún permanecen, merced á no sabemos qué privilegio, á las puertas de las iglesias, los han despojado de la originalidad y multitud de atavios, lesiones, actitudes y arengas en que desplegaban su inagotable fantasía. (38)

There is in the “inagotable fantasía” of the *pordiosero* a kind of communion with the artist in whom he inspires “fantásticas siluetas,” and in the cleaned up and straightened modern streets Bécquer feels a palpable nostalgia for this disappearing Spain. Even if the *pordiosero* is in reality disgusting, through the “inagotable fantasía” of the artist who reproduces him —not as he “really” is, but as a composite of “cien modelos”— he can be recuperated as something beautiful:

Aplaudimos á la Administración que hace esfuerzos por remediar este daño, poniéndonos en lo posible al nivel de los países de mayor cultura: pero, no obstante, nos gusta recoger las impresiones que guarda el artista de estos tipos tradicionales, y que hoy sólo en algunas provincias pueden estudiarse con toda su pintoresca originalidad. Tiene el arte no sabemos que secreto en cuanto que todo lo que toca lo embellece. Entre cien modelos repugnantes y groseros, sabe, tomando un detalle de cada uno, formar un tipo que sin ser falso, resulta hermoso. Mirando a través de este prisma, no hay asunto que no interese, ni figura que deje de ser simpática. (38)

Here the role of the artist is supplemental to the modernizing project of the State, for not only does the *costumbrista*, in Bécquer’s conception at least, create an archive of the “we” lost to modernization, but also serves to retrain the affective relationship to those lost objects:

La multitud pasa indiferente al lado de aquella escena: el artista se detiene herido ante el contraste de tanta miseria junta con tanto esplendor; repara en la armonía de las líneas y en los efectos del color, se siente impresionado como ante un cuadro que pertenece á otra época diferente, y ve una revelación de otro siglo y de otra manera de ser social en aquella tradición viva que entra á hablar á su alma por el conducto de los ojos. (38)

If the artist knows how to ferret the beauty out of so much misery, the reader is in turn schooled in a new way of appreciating the “tradición viva” that speaks to the soul by way of the eyes. Although a gulf of moral distance separates “personas ilustradas” from the vanishing lifeways of “la España tradicional” the *costumbrista* —through an aesthetics of sublime contrasts and nostalgic sympathy— to combine an ethics of interest to the national “tradición viva” with a more mundane interest in the project of “poniéndonos en lo posible al nivel de los países de mayor cultura.”

The *costumbrista* writer who arranges the *cuadros* in a series of spacialized social types into a museum or archive of an ethically conceived “we” is a kind of travel writer. But the inside/outside stance of the costumbrista is fundamentally different from the explorer or the exotic tourist. This is because the pathways of the *costumbrista* traveler are circumscribed by the borders of the national “we”. The Bécquer brothers traveled around urban and rural Spain collecting and later exhibiting in *La Ilustración de Madrid* the “tradición viva” that they had accumulated in their travels. But it is not enough to simply consume the products of their travels, Bécquer insists, but rather, he imagines his own travels as an example for others to emulate in his “interés” in the vanishing rural lifeways.

In another article published in *La Ilustración de Madrid* (“Las Segadoras: Estudio de costumbres aragonesas”) Bécquer takes up the topic of travel in order to urge urban Spaniards to do a little *costumbrista* traveling of their own. The topic is where to go for summer vacation. The traditional vacation trip to the “costas y los pueblos de la

Península” has begun to give way in the 1870s to international travel. The “esclavos de la moda” rather than taking a tranquil vacation in the rural countryside, travel to wherever it is now fashionable to vacation:

Adoradores de un ídolo, corren á rendirle culto á donde se trasladan sus sacerdotes. Esclavos de la moda y las exigencias sociales, cambian de decoración; pero va á los puntos en que se reune el mundo elegante á continuar representando la misma escena. (158)

Bécquer contrasts this fashionable form of travel with its hubub and social anxieties to the tranquility of the traditional trip to the countryside or the sea to recover from the “perpetua agitación” of the city. This traditional form of tourism has some distinct advantages over the habits of the “mundo elegante.” First, it has material and intellectual benefits for both urban and rural Spain: “La circulación de las gentes trae como consecuencia natural la circulación de dinero y lo que es más importante la de las ideas. Cambiar de horizonte, cambiar de método de vida y de atmósfera, es provechoso á la salud y á la inteligencia” (158). By contrast to those “esclavos de la moda,” those who choose traditional rural vacations learn to appreciate rural lifeways —just as urban people in other countries appreciate their rural areas— and in the process recover “la energía del cuerpo y del alma”:

Otros por el contrario, y éstos son los que verdaderamente justifican la conveniencia de una costumbre desde mucho tiempo adoptada en otros países y hoy ya bastante general en el nuestro, buscan en lugares apartados el reposo que ha de devolverles la energía del cuerpo y del alma, enriquecen su inteligencia con el conocimiento íntimo de los hábitos y necesidades de los pueblos agrícolas, rompen la monotonía que también resulta del eterno trasfago de las ciudades, con la contemplación de escenas y paisajes completamente nuevos, y en la serenidad que las rodea, en lo extraño de los tipos, en la sencillez de las costumbres, encuentran una emoción aun los mismo la buscan inútilmente dentro del círculo de su tempestuosa vida. (158)

Bécquer’s exhortation thematizes a geographical imaginary that underscores the moral contrast between city life (“su tempestuosa vida”) and country life (“la sencillez de sus

costumbres”). But at the same time, Bécquer’s pitch for the country vacation proposes an ethical community that acquires “conocimiento íntimo de los hábitos y *necesidades* de los pueblos agrícolas.” Here Bécquer proposes to modify the structures of feeling between the “valuing city” and its hinterlands. If the moral contrast between country life-ways and city life-ways is properly appreciated through direct contact, the city dweller may find “una emoción” that he only thought achievable in the “círculo de su tempestuosa vida.” That feeling, one suspects, is the satisfaction of discovering an undivided, unproblematic “we” that at once embraces modernity and tradition in an ethical community. For Bécquer, it is a question of looking with “interés” just as for Fernán Caballero it means to “apreciar, amar y dar a conocer nuestra nacionalidad” and for Martí it meant to “empezar a probar el amor.”

IMPERIAL TRAVEL WRITING

If *costumbrista* literature depends on movement through space to codify that space in a series of vignettes along an axis of “tradition” and “modernity,” it does so within a prescribed national space and therefore purports to present a more nuanced picture of “nuestra nacionalidad” than did those “ojos extranjeros” who produced in Europe the image of “la España romántica” that so troubled Spanish intellectuals. This difference between *costumbrista* Spain and the Spain of Alexandre Dumas or Victor Hugo is that the latter is *imperial* travel literature (rather than *national* travel literature) and does not construct the double stance of *costumbrismo*, rather it self-consciously emphasizes the *moral* contrasts that mark the relation between “us” and “them,” without the *ethical* imperative to imagine oneself and the object of representation as a “we” despite stark differences in social mores. To put this another way, *costumbrismo* represents its object through the lens of a *national* fantasy, while exoticist travel writing indulges an *imperial* fantasy.

Travel literature assumes two principal forms: the pilgrimage and the voyage. As we saw in chapter 1, the pilgrimage is driven by what Octavio Paz called a “voluntad de participación en una plenitud histórica.” The aim of the pilgrimage —religious or secular— is to connect (geographically through travel) one’s accidental birthplace to the organizing centers of authority, and to bridge the gap between them in order to transform one’s birthplace from a wilderness to an extension of the shrine of all-encompassing authority. Of course, for the sincere religious pilgrim, those centers are the locations most proximate to the divine. For the secular pilgrim, those places enshrine human authority (however conceived). This is why the pilgrim, even if he resents the journey or even the destination, needs to create the *analogy* between the centers of authority and his own birthplace. That is, he need to construct in his birthplace another version of Jerusalem.

The imperial voyage —whether the exploration, the pleasure trip, the commercial venture, the scientific expedition or fieldwork— has as its principal aim bringing something back home from “out there.” This could be any number of things but for the imperial travel writer the most important “thing” to bring back is a reconfirmation of the gulf that lies between “us” and “them.” That is, by contrast to the pilgrim, the imperial traveler does not look for analogies but rather contrasts, and the starker the better. Before turning to a novel that is a hybrid form of a *costumbrista* text and a literary pilgrimage, let me first return to *La Ilustración de Madrid* for a straight-forward example of imperial travel writing from Spain of the 1870s. Of course, it is no surprise that the text concerns Morocco, since as we saw in chapter 3, the African campaign of 1859-60 had a profound effect on the Spanish imperial imaginary, and fueled powerful imperial fantasies throughout the later decades of the nineteenth century in Spain.

In this text, simply titled “Marruecos” and written in a three-part essay by Antonio de San Martín, the author sets out first to correct some literary *errores comunes*,

namely, that the orientalist fantasies that Europeans have by the 1870s become accustomed to indulging about North Africa are not true. The *odaliscas* and *almes* of *A Thousand and One Nights* or from the paintings of Ingrés, Fortuny, Gerôme or Bouchard are “bellas ilusiones”:

Al hablar de este singular país, creen muchos que en él reina el lujo y la poesía de los célebres cuentos de las *Mil y una noches*. El europeo que visita cualquiera de las ciudades de Marruecos, entra en ella con el pensamiento lleno de aventuras amorosas; eunucos y esclavos negros, enteramente adictos á los caprichos de sus señoras, y de serrallos cuyas puertas pueden abrir fácilmente el oro y la audacia. Desgraciadamente estas bellas ilusiones no tardan en desvanecerse por completo ante la realidad. Ni hay serrallos perfumados; ni fuentes bulliciosas y artísticas; ni Alhambras en miniatura; ni complacientes esclavos dispuestos á introducir furtivamente al amante aventurero en cómodos y encatadores retretes. (165)

Once again, the pleasure of travel writing depends on the intimate identification between the narrator and the reader against the narrated. That is, if the reader is going to enjoy for him or herself the “wealth of Egypt” contained in the travel narrative, *not* being an Egyptian is a prerequisite for that enjoyment. As I have already noted above, Díaz Larios explains that Spanish intellectuals were sensitive because *imperial* travel writing produced a moral contrast between “lo *normal* —espacio doméstico compartido con el lector” and “lo *anormal* —el espacio exterior y ajeno” which in turn is represented to the reader as “lo *incivilizado, atrasado y ridículo*” (110, emphasis in the original). Furthermore, travel writing for Díaz Larios conceals a narrative sleight of hand that requires the unconscious complicity of the readers in order to create the illusion that the readers “reciben las confidencias de alguien próximo.” The narrative trick works in the following manner: first the narrator in the guise of an ‘hombre de bien’ declares his intention to be objective and truthful. But this is an

estrategia manipuladora de la credulidad del lector, quien así queda en disposición de admitir el subjetivismo de los comentarios, las generalizaciones excesivas, la tendencia a *tipificar* a los individuos, a identificarse con los prejuicios y a asentir, en fin, a la repetición de tópicos que circulan sobre el país visitado, presentados

por el autor como agudas observaciones originales...Para que esta práctica sea eficaz, es necesario que el narratario se haga cómplice del narrador y acepte su juego, renunciando también a la utilidad prometida en aras de la diversión; dicho de otro modo, que la imagen del extranjero propuesta por el viajero se corresponda con las *idées reçues* de sus lectores, aunque sean “errores comunes.” (110, emphasis in the original)

If, as an “hombre de bien” Antonio de San Martín presents himself as too scrupulous to directly indulge our readerly fantasies of erotic conquests and heroic grandeur, he does indeed offer us (his “European” reader) something of value: the melancholy truth about Morocco:

Tánger, lo mismo que las demas ciudades de la costa de Berbería, es una población que visitan bastantes europeos, sin que esto contribuya á modificar las costumbres de los naturales del país. En Tánger aún hace muy pocos años que se clavaban en las puertas que dan al campo los mutilados miembros y cabezas de rebeldes y delincuentes, y sólo los repetidos ruegos de los ministros plenipotenciarios y cónsules generales que allí residen, han podido relegar tan bárbaro y repugnante espectáculo á las ciudades del interior. (165)

But having dispensed with our readerly *errores comunes* by giving us the truth about the “barbarous and repugnant spectacle” of Moroccan customs, the author returns to the “repetición de tópicos que circulan sobre el país visitado”: the market, the winding streets, the mosque, religious fanaticism, the violent cruelty (of the men), and the sensuality of the women. Each of these well-trodden topics allow Antonio de San Martín to mark off with the starkest lines possible the moral distance from his “Europeans” and Moroccans. But this is not all, for despite his claim to expose the “bellas ilusiones” to the harsh light of the truth, San Martín sets about indulging the imperial (orientalist) fantasies of erotic conquest and heroic grandeur that his readers have come to suspect. Of course these fantasies are mitigated by a more mature attention to the “reality principle,” but they are stock fantasies nonetheless:

Las moras, efecto quizá del clima en que viven ó de la continua clausura en que las tiene sus padres y esposos, se muestran muy aficionadas á los cristianos. Ellas saben que entre nosotros la mujer es reina y no esclava. Ellas saben apreciar las

deferencias que guardamos con el sexo bello, y sólo el temor al castigo puede contenerlas en ciertos límites. Sin embargo, en los baños públicos á que son sumamente aficionados (sic), y en donde como se puede suponer no entran los hombres, suelen fraguarse algunas intrigas. El moro que espía á una de sus mujeres, sigue sus pasos al salir del baño, engañado con un traje enteramente igual al que llevaba su esposa. la sigue; pero no tarda en convencerse que aquella mujer no es la suya. Entretanto la infiel ha desaparecido, y sólo Dios sabe á qué cita culpable ó á qué escondido lugar fué quizá á faltar á sus deberes. (168)

Of course, the erotic narrative is not only a stock narrative, but it is entirely abstract and speculative. This to some degree obeys the logic of the *costumbrista* representational strategy to typify. That is, this is something that tends to happen in the public baths (“suelen fraguarse algunas intrigas”) and like Bécquer’s *pordiosero* is merely a composite story. But why the schematic nature of the story and what are the pleasures involved? As we noted above, San Martín presents himself first as a sober “hombre de bien” by denying the verisimilitude of fully elaborated fantasies of (Romantic) European orientalism. When he returns to the topic of erotic intrigue and heroic grandeur, we are allowed to fantasize the connection between the general propensity of “la mora” to desire “Christian” men and the schematic story of the cuckolded *celoso*. In other words, “we” can fit ourselves symbolically into the figure of the mysterious and furtive lover with whom the *mora* has arranged a tryst. But beyond the shallow satisfactions of an erotic fantasy, there are deeper ways in which this text means to bring back something of use from North Africa. That something is a fully elaborated *imperial fantasy*.

It is significant that San Martín only construes a “Spanish we” in relation to certain topics (the fall of Tetuán to Spain in April of 1860, for example). For the most part, he is content to include himself (and his readers) among a “European we” with which he clearly evokes the European *concierto de las naciones* —as in the passage quoted above about the effect of Europeans (“los ministros plenipotenciarios y cónsules generales que allí residen”) on Moroccan customs. This brings to mind Núñez de Arce’s

memorable phrase related to the African Campaign: “Para *entrar dignamente en Europa*, en el sentido diplomático de esta frase, éranos de todo punto indispensable pasar por África.” To put this another way, to have a Spanish writer sending dispatches from Africa as one among many “Europeans” reminds the reader of Spain’s imagined place in the *concierto de las naciones*. With this in mind, San Martín’s description of the consequences of the African campaign can be linked to a “Spanish we” directly:

Nuestro victorioso ejército ocupó á Tetuán haciendo en esta ciudad, una de las más querida (sic) de los moros, algunas mejoras, tales como limpiar las calles, rotularlas y poner faroles en las esquinas; más apenas los innovadores evacuaron la plaza, las calles volvieron á estar llenas de inmundicias, los rótulos desaparecieron, y los faroles fueron rotos á pedradas. (174)

This glorious episode in the history of a resurgent colonial militarism brings a pleasant memory to present circumstances. But a cloud immediately covers the bright sky of this fantasy of grandeur in the very mention of the abandonment of Tetuán by Spanish troops. That is, the reason Spanish troops evacuated Tetuán after having taken it by force was because General O’Donnell had given secret assurances not to seek territorial aggrandizement to the English, whose occupation of Gibraltar made them (and the French in Algeria) the imperial powers with whom any Spanish incursions into North Africa had to be negotiated. Not only does the English presence in Gibraltar disturb any Spaniard en route to Tangiers, but it even haunts the glorious memory of the conquest of Tetuán.

To compensate for this disruption of the pleasure of an imperial memory San Martín singles out the English in Tangiers for a small but significant symbolic revenge. While describing the “cuadros pintorescos” in the streets of Tangiers (the market, a wedding, the colorful clothing, etc.), San Martín laments the presence of European tourists since their clothing seems to ruin the visual pleasure of the scene:

Entre tanta variedad de trages y colores, destacan, de una manera bien pobre ciertamente, nuestros pobres vestidos y algunos horribles sombreros de copa alta, con que se presentan sobre todo los ingleses procedentes de la vecina roca que se llama Gibraltar.” (166)

So, added to the colorful pleasures of a description of the picturesque streets of Tangiers, San Martín, includes a small symbolic revenge for the traumatic presence of the English in Gibraltar.

All three forms of travel writing that I am here considering relate in different ways to the “psychodrama” of progress and the “geographic imaginary” that codifies the globe in spatial hierarchies. If imperial travel writing seeks through its representational procedures to enhance the hierarchies of the “geographical imaginary” because the imperial traveler travels from some superordinate location in the grid of modernity to a subordinate location, the imperial travel writer does so by drawing as starkly as possible the contrast between a “we” (a moral community of readers) and a “they” (the object of description) while simultaneously blurring the lines between the readerly “we” and other superordinate locations. This is why San Martín is content to simply call himself an “europeo” and only splits that identity when strategically necessary. The kind of imagining that makes this structuring possible is what I have been calling *imperial fantasy*.

The *costumbrista* traveler, as mentioned above, travels only within the geographic confines of the nation. The goal of the *costumbrista* writer is to buffer the traumatic effects of modernity on national culture. By imagining an *ethical* community of readers, the *costumbrista* proposes to bridge the moral gap between “las dos Españas” that modernity has produced in the national identity.

And finally, the *pilgrim* travels from the periphery to the center, or in an important variation, to other analogous peripheries and centers. The secular pilgrim, who

travels through the space of the “geographic imaginary” of modernity, does so to restructure that imaginary by establishing a new relation to the authority that structures it. That is, the pilgrim faces the “psychodrama of progress” by pulling back the Wizard’s curtain, as it were, and restructuring the meaning of the spatial hierarchies of the geographic imaginary. The pilgrim’s gesture is profoundly *ethical* rather than moral but unlike the ethics of *costumbrismo*, the pilgrim sees an ethics of solidarity among analogous peripheries and analogous centers that leads to universalist gestures.

UN VIAJE DE NOVIOS: A COSTUMBRISTA PILGRIMAGE.

Emilia Pardo Bazán had a special penchant for travel literature. Not only did she write a number of “libros de viaje” but she had a particular fascination with travel literature.⁵⁶ Besides the novel *Un viaje de novios* Emilia Pardo Bazán wrote travel books and collections of literary chronicles such as *Mi romería* (1888), *Al pie de la torre Eiffel* (collected chronicles from the Universal Exposition in Paris written for *La España Moderna* 1889), *Por la España pintoresca* (*costumbrista* chronicles collected in 1895) and *Por la Europa católica* (1902). In her own travel writing we can detect at least two important itineraries. In the first she travels the well established pilgrimages to the centers of modernity (Paris, Brussels, Vichy, Rome, etc.) and in the second, which takes her in search of *lo pintoresco* proper to *costumbrista* writing, follows itineraries through the provincial regions within Spain. Much of Pardo Bazán’s travel writing was journalistic in nature and was published in the form of literary chronicles sent to Madrid and Barcelona from these remote locations.

But in her second novel *Viaje de novios* (1881) —which Pardo Bazán considered “de índole más semejante a la de la moderna novela llamada de costumbres” (“Prefacio” 3:573)— Pardo Bazán combined these itineraries by sending provincial newlyweds

⁵⁶ See Freire López, “Los libros de viajes de Emilia Pardo Bazán” p. 204.

traveling from León to such cosmopolitan places as Vichy and Paris. As she states in the preface, the impetus for her novel was a trip she herself took to the mineral baths at Vichy and then to Paris. But her impulse to write a travel narrative engendered an anxiety that she satisfied with a fictional account of her own trip:

En Septiembre del pasado año 1880, me ordenó la ciencia médica beber las aguas de Vichy en sus mismos manantiales, y habiendo de atravesar, para tal objeto, toda España y toda Francia, pensé escribir en un cuaderno los sucesos de mi viaje, con ánimo de publicarlo después. Mas acudió al punto a mi mente el mucho tedio y enfado que suelen causarme las híbridas obrillas viatorias, las «Impresiones» y «Diarios» donde el autor nos refiere sus éxtasis ante alguna catedral o punto de vista, y a renglón seguido cuenta si acá dio una peseta de propina al mozo, y si acullá cenó ensalada, con otros datos no menos dignos de pasar a la historia y grabarse en mármoles y bronces. Movida de esta consideración, resolvime a novelar en vez de referir, haciendo que los países por mí recorridos fuesen escenario del drama. (3:571)

Given the circumstances of its production, it might not be overly bold to take Freud's assertion and suggest that Pardo Bazán's decision to "novelar en vez de referir" obeys to some degree the "psychological" inclination to "split up [her] ego, by self-observation, into many part egos, and, in consequence, to personify the conflicting currents of [her] own mental life in several heroes" ("Creative Writers" 441). The drama of *Un viaje de novios* might correspond to Emilia Pardo Bazán's psychological experience of travel through "toda España y toda Francia." It turns out, however, that her novel has very little to do with travel in Spain and quite a lot to do with travel in France. But Spain remains present, as it were, in the three main characters of this travel romance who are Spanish travelers and whose exotic location heightens their social identities and occasions the drama.

The marriage to which the title of the novel refers is ill-fated not just because it combines an innocent provincial (Lucía González) with a cynical, corrupt and vain bureaucrat (Aurelio Miranda) but more importantly because the incompatibilities of the

couple are brought into stark relief under the bright light of modern circumstances. The triangulating factor in this (almost) tragic romance is the fully modern and urbane traveler (Ignacio Artegui) who has shed his Carlist roots in favor of a Schopenhauerian pessimism and with whom Lucía falls in love but ultimately rejects out of naive and traditionalist loyalty to her psychopathically jealous and (almost) murderously abusive husband. This “foundational fiction” —as Doris Sommer has called nationalist romances of this type— is curious if only for the fact that the romance takes place in fully modern spaces (the train, the post office, the tourist hotel, the hospital, Paris,) but outside the borders of the country that it allegorizes. In the novel, France is a seamlessly modern place and each of the characters marks a positionality with respect to that modernity.

Of the three main characters Artegui is the most like the author. He is rich, cosmopolitan and a lay intellectual who is at ease in the sophisticated world of Vichy, Biarritz and Paris. But despite his ability to cope with the modern circumstances of travel —something with which his eventual rival Miranda fumbles repeatedly— Artegui suffers from the *mal du siècle* that makes him despair of happiness in modern life.

Eran todas sus actitudes y ademanes como de hombre rendido y exánime. Algo había descompuesto y roto en aquel noble mecanismo, algún resorte de esos que al saltar interrumpen las funciones de la vida íntima. Hasta en su vestir percibíase la languidez y desaliento que tan a las claras revelaba la fisonomía. No era negligencia, era indiferencia y caimiento de ánimo lo que manifestaba aquel traje obscuro de mezclilla, aquella cadena de oro, impropia para un viaje, aquella corbata atada sin esmero y al caer, aquellos guantes nuevos, de fina piel de Suecia, de color delicado, que no iban a durar limpios ni diez minutos. Faltábale al viajero la elegancia primorosa e inteligente que cuida de los detalles, que hace ciencia del tocador; veíase en él al hombre que es superior a la propia elegancia porque no la ignora, pero la desdeña: grado de cultura por donde se ingresa en una esfera más alta que el buen tono, que al fin y al cabo es categoría social, y quien se eleva por cima del buen tono, exímese también de categorías. (*OC* 1:103)

Miranda, on the other hand, is a bungler. Lucía and Artegui have been thrown together in their train voyage to France because Miranda left his wallet at the restaurant

in a stop along the way and while Lucía slept in the compartment, he ran out to recover it and missed the train without her knowing. Miranda's turpitude occasions his fortuitous substitution in the train compartment by "un viajero" (Artegui), who quietly slips in so as not to wake the peacefully sleeping Lucía, who is both unaware of Artegui's presence and Miranda's absence. As the dying light fades and the windows frost over with the breath of the travelers, Artegui has long hours to contemplate his mysterious traveling companion. Artegui is at first intrigued by her simple beauty and increasingly unsettled by her ability to sleep so soundly:

cediendo a involuntario sentimiento, que a él mismo le parecía ridículo, a medida que transcurrían las horas perezosas de la noche, iba impacientándole más y más, hasta casi sacarle de quicio, la regalada placidez de aquel sueño insolente, y deseaba, a pesar suyo, que la viajera se despertara, siquiera fuese tan sólo por oír algo que orientase su curiosidad. Quizá con tanta impaciencia andaba mezclada buena parte de envidia. ¡Qué apetecible y deleitoso sueño; qué calma bienhechora! Era el suelto descanso de la mocedad, de la doncellez cándida, de la conciencia serena, del temperamento rico y feliz, de la salud. Lejos de descomponerse, de adquirir ese hundimiento cadavérico, esa contracción de las comisuras labiales, esa especie de trastorno general que deja asomar al rostro, no cuidadoso ya de ajustar sus músculos a una expresión artificiosa, los roedores cuidados de la vigilia, brillaba en las facciones de Lucía la paz, que tanto cautiva y enamora en el semblante de los niños dormidos. (*OC* 1:99)

Under these highly charged conditions (unaccompanied young woman, at night, sleeping car, frosted window panes) Artegui (and the reader) eroticizes her beauty: "se entreveía, a trechos de la revuelta falda, orlada de menudo volante a pliegues, algo del encaje de las enaguas" (*OC* 1:99). At the same time that he notices the edge of her undergarments, he fantasizes the threat to which her solitary yet peaceful sleep exposes her: "se asombraba de tan confiado sueño, de aquella criatura que descansaba tranquila, sola, expuesta a un galanteo brutal, a todo género de desagradables lances" (*OC* 1:99). Artegui gallantly resists this (unconscious) erotic fantasy, which is projected onto some

nameless adversary, and takes from his own suitcase a “chal escocés, peludo, de finísima lana, que delicadamente extendió sobre los pies y muslos de la dormida.” (OC 1:99)

The romance between the naive Lucía and the sentimental Artegui is, of course, doomed by Miranda’s return to claim his newlywed wife. Miranda is both a foil for the noble but tortured Artegui, and the allegorical stumbling block to the flowering of affection between the modern (but rootless) Artegui and the innocent (and very rooted) Lucía. Miranda is a bureaucrat, though now middle-aged, and, with few professional prospects before him has cynically married the well-to-do but simple daughter of a provincial shop owner who became wealthy providing provincial delicacies to urbanized provincials. Aboard the train (before losing his wallet) Miranda muses on his new and very young wife’s good looks and finds himself doubly fortunate:

Es guapa de veras esta chica -pensaba el hombre maduro y experto-. [...] Ese diablo de Colmenar⁵⁷ parece que adivina todas las cosas... otro me hubiera dado los millones con alguna virgen y mártir de cuarenta años... Pero esto es miel sobre hojuelas, como suele decirse. (OC 1:96)

Miranda’s calculating cynicism—which in the allegorical overtones of the plot stands in for the bureaucratic state of the Restoration—is visible in his studied effort to dress in a modern fashion. Artegui, who by contrast *is* modern, dresses *beyond* the categories of taste and fashion. And Lucía, who is innocent of the “philosophy” of style, intuits the insouciant dignity of “el viajero” Artegui.

Miranda vestía la librea del buen gusto, y por eso, antes de reparar en Miranda, se fijaban las gentes en su ropa, al paso que lo que en Artegui atraía la atención, era Artegui mismo. Ni la irregularidad del vestir encubría, antes bien, patentizaba, la distinción de la persona: cuantas prendas componían su traje eran ricas en su género; inglés el paño, holanda la tela de la camisa, de primera el calzado y guantes. Todo esto lo notó Lucía, más con el instinto que con el entendimiento, porque, inexperta y bisoña, no había llegado aún a dominar la filosofía del traje, en que tan maestras son las mujeres. (OC 103)

⁵⁷ Colmenar is the corrupt politician who arranges Miranda’s introduction to Lucía’s father that leads to the marriage.

The accidents of travel make possible the romance between Lucía and Artegui that in Spain itself would have been impossible where the commitments of social life would never have permitted Artegui's unrestrained and eroticized gaze nor Lucía's frank intimacy. This triptych of Spanish society (i.e. the "traditional" Lucía, the "quasi-modernized" Miranda, and the "cosmopolitan" Artegui) reveals allegorically that the romantic reconciliation of the naive *España tradicional* and the sentimental *España cosmopolita* is blocked by the cynical and jealous bourgeois state.

As we noted above, her novel betrays an anxiety in Pardo Bazán's own sense for the problem of Spanish modernity. Pilar Faus has noted that at the heart of Pardo Bazán's intellectual project is the "superación de los antagonismos" that trouble Spanish society's relation to modernity: "Aquella postura intelectual y humana, que ella reiteradamente califica de ecléctica, se va a convertir en su médula vital. Ella siente, y desea transmitirla a sus compatriotas, que Tradición y Progreso, Catolicismo y Liberalismo, Casticismo y Europeísmo no tienen por qué ser incompatibles" (32). These "antagonismos" are overcome in her novel by the nascent love between the naive Lucía and the sentimental Artegui and frustrated by the middling Miranda. In the preface to the novel Emilia Pardo Bazán expresses her distaste for "las híbridas obrillas viatorias, las «Impresiones» y «Diarios»." As the novel dramatizes, with the rise of mass transit and tourist infrastructure, travel has increasingly become a middle class phenomenon in Spain and had begun to produce a "hybrid" form of travel writing that was at once in thrall to the authority of the tourist destination and concerned with penny pinching. In her first travel chronicle sent from Universal Exposition in 1889, Pardo Bazán satirized this type of Spanish tourist:

El viajero que más abunda en la coronada villa [Madrid] es el que calcula económicamente la salida veraniega, y resuelve pasar en París quince días, sin conocer palabra del idioma, ni jota de las costumbres [...] Así, desde que pasa la frontera y se ve entre desconocidos y extranjería, todo le sorprende, todo le escama, todo le amontona, todo le subleva. La cortesía francesa le parece baja adulación; la útil ley, irritante traba; el abuso que con él comete un hostelero ó un fondista, se lo achaca a la nación en conjunto. Ve que por un vaso de agua (con azúcar y azahar) le cobran un franco, y supone que en París la vida es imposible, y que el agua del Sena cuesta más que el vino de Arganda. Le empuja el gentío, y reniega de las Exposiciones, diciendo que son un caos, un desbarajuste y un infierno. (40)

The partially modern *madrileño* inspires laughter in the cosmopolitan Pardo Bazán because he is too ambitious to stay home and not sophisticated enough to travel well: “¡Ah y qué disimuladamente voy á reirme cuando encuentre por aquellas calles y aquellas instalaciones de la Exposición á mis vecinos matritenses, que no verán la hora de volver á catar su linfa de Lozoya y su puchero castizo!” (44). The threat that occasions this nervous laughter is punished in the novel in the figure of Miranda who after beating Lucía savagely in a fit of rage abandons her and scurries back to Madrid. But the affection of the cosmopolitan Artegui for the traditional Lucía also has its roots in Pardo Bazán’s 1880 trip to France.

She describes in the “Apuntes biográficos” that serve as the prologue to her 1886 novel *Los pazos de Ulloa* an episode during her stay in Paris after having left the thermal baths of Vichy in which she was invited to attend the literary salon of the then octogenarian Victor Hugo. She was invited by Hugo to sit by his side whereupon he began to ask her polite questions. At the sound of the poet’s voice, the room went silent to hear the exchange. Pardo Bazán for her part, “trataba de ampararme tras un gran ramillete de heliotropos que en la mano tenía, para llevar lo embarazoso del interrogatorio y el respeto que me embargaba ante el viejo representante del pasado” (*OC* 3:720). Pardo Bazán’s defensive strategies of the flowers and the dismissive tag (“viejo representante del pasado”) were born of the perceived condescension in Hugo’s interest

in Spain, and by extension in Pardo Bazán herself. With the entire room of “los postreros cortesanos de la majestad caída, neófitos tardíos y rezagados del romanticismo” (719) listening to their conversation,

llegó un momento en que Víctor Hugo, después de declarar que miraba a España como una segunda patria, lamentó su atraso, y añadió que no podía ser de otro modo, puesto que el tribunal de la Inquisición había achicarrado sin piedad escritores y sabios. (720)

Hugo, who as a youth had lived in Spain with his parents as part of the officialdom of Joseph Bonaparte’s court, had returned as a traveler to Spain in 1843 and whose own writing often concerned Spain (e.g. *Hernani*, *Ruy Blas*, *Torquemada*) certainly felt authorized to speak about Spanish cultural history. If the comment seemed innocent enough to Hugo and the members of his *salon*, Pardo Bazán’s response made it clear that she neither shared his point of view nor appreciated his willingness to condescend to her:

Con todos los miramientos que dicta la educación para contradecir, y más a Víctor Hugo, le respondí que precisamente nuestras épocas de esplendor literario eran las inquisitoriales, y que ni la Inquisición se entrometía en asuntos de letras, ni había tostado a sabio o escritor alguno, sino a judaizantes, brujas e iluminados. No se dio por convencido, y yo, arrastrada por mi inveterado apasionamiento en defender a España de acusaciones gratuitas, me deslicé a armar polémica con el anciano. (720)

At the end of the polemic in which Pardo Bazán turned the subject of the debate to the excesses of French intolerant violence, she finished by explaining that “en España, nos preciábamos de estimar a las Musas, como lo probaba mi presencia en su casa” (720). We get a sense for the acrimony of the debate by Hugo’s muttered response: “Voilà, bien l’espagnole.” Whereupon, she says, Hugo “empezó a echar incienso a España, país, según decía, el más romancesco de Europa, y a preguntarme por los poetas y escritores contemporáneos, de los cuales no sabía media palabra” (720). She finishes the episode with a coup de grace:

La noche pasó en un soplo, y los discípulos parecían descontentados, y se movían y hablaban, porque en aquel salón del trono [de Hugo] —¡verdadera inquisición poética!— sólo un incidente casual, como la venida de un extranjero, podía infundir la animación de la controversia y romper el hielo de un respeto casi hierático. A las doce me despedí de Víctor Hugo para siempre. (720)

More is at stake here than the truth about the causes of Spain's "atraso." The content of the debate, as I suggested above, was deeply important to Emilia Pardo Bazán and her commitments to *la España tradicional* are central to her literary project. But her symbolic revenge on the elderly Hugo in her retelling seems out of proportion to the sleight taken at his comment. To understand this sour encounter, one might ask why Pardo Bazán desired to meet him ("quise conocer a Víctor Hugo, último y grandioso resto de la generación romántica") if not to receive from the last great Romantic some show of interest in her own efforts in the literary field. At play here is a dialectic of recognition in which Pardo Bazán fears that as an outsider, a foreigner, a youth, a woman and a Spaniard, she will not be accorded the proper respect (hence the ambivalence of the phrase "el respeto que me embargaba") and she feels herself to be under the judgmental gaze of the entire gathering. When her fears are confirmed by Victor Hugo's condescension regarding the "atraso" of Spanish society, Pardo Bazán hastens to "defender a España de acusaciones gratuitas" and in the re-telling exacts a complex symbolic revenge on "el viejo." If Hugo is the "grandioso" he is only so as the last dying member of a dead literary generation. Hugo, we could say, is under the sway of the comforting habits of an imperial fantasy about "Romantic" Spain. Pardo Bazán, by contrast, feels the effects of that imperial *regard* as an affront to her dignity.

This does not, however, mean that Victor Hugo was speaking offhandedly but rather that he expressed in his comments to Emilia Pardo Bazán his habitual regard for Spain to which his own biography, the literary tradition of the *leyenda negra*, and the habits of an imperial geographic imaginary predisposed him. That Hugo "miraba a

España como una segunda patria” had biographical roots, as I noted above. But it expressed quite succinctly the nature of the imperial *regard* —which Pardo Bazán here translates as *miraba*— and which vacillates between an expression of interested consideration and a predisposed way of seeing. Victor Hugo had certainly turned his interested gaze toward Spain repeatedly and his comments about the Inquisition were not off the cuff. Rather, they were the product of studious consideration. He began researching his Inquisition drama “Torquemada” as early as 1853 and wrote the play in 1869 after his return from exile. However, the work was not published until May of 1882, a year and a half after his encounter with Pardo Bazán. The problem, as far as Pardo Bazán was concerned, was not simply that Hugo’s *regard* did not include her (as a cosmopolitan and modern Spaniard) but that it implied a representational predisposition that she by the nature of her geographical identity could not and did not wish to share. It meant, in short, sharing the point of view of a community of readers that precluded her. In the polemic itself her defensive strategy was twofold. The first move was to undermine the truth-claim of Hugo’s representation of the consequences of the Inquisition: “nuestras épocas de esplendor literario eran las inquisitoriales, y que ni la Inquisición se entrometía en asuntos de letras, ni había tostado a sabio o escritor alguno.” The second strategy was to turn the judgmental gaze back toward the gazer, inviting an economy of recognition and reflection (i.e. changing the point of view). When a woman in the salon sarcastically asked her if she had studied history with the Dominicans, Pardo Bazán turned the object of the gaze away from Spain’s Inquisitorial *leyenda negra* to France’s own storied tradition of ideological brutality. Pardo Bazán replied that “en Michelet, Thiers y otros historiadores, franceses había leído las dragonadas, la Saint-Barthelemy, el Terror y demás episodios de la historia Francesa, al lado de los cuales eran tortas y pan pintado las terribles de la Inquisición” (720).

But Pardo Bazán's symbolic revenge for the indignities suffered in Hugo's salon were not realized there but rather in the retelling. Furthermore, this symbolic revenge was not limited to her Parisian antagonists but also implicated a host of literary adversaries in Madrid. In this way, the staging of this polemic in the pages of her "Apuntes biográficos" published in 1886 underscores the importance of an implicit community of readers in narrative. The retelling was not for Hugo (who was by 1886 no longer alive), but rather for the reading public of Madrid in the aftermath of the literary polemic elicited by Pardo Bazán's *La cuestión palpitante* and as an authorizing gesture for her new novel (*Los pazos de Ulloa*) to which it served as a prologue. But Hugo's authority is vulnerable for being *passé* which Pardo Bazán exploits to comic effect in the retelling by caricaturizing his "court" and underscoring his decrepitude. This episode is embedded in her explanation of her own introduction of the literary procedures of French Naturalism into Spain, and the Hugo incident serves as an appropriate foil, especially since he is the supreme model for many of her literary adversaries back in Spain. One obvious target of this symbolic revenge was Gaspar Núñez de Arce who was one of the first to publicly criticize Pardo Bazán's *La cuestión palpitante* as an attack on poetry. In Núñez de Arce's not only is the literary authority of Hugo and Lamartine fundamental to his defense of "el ideal" but he had sustained Hugo's very argument regarding the nefarious effects of the Inquisition on Spanish cultural life upon assuming a chair in the Spanish Royal Academy in May of 1876.

The second aspect is a cultural authority that is geographically inflected. Pardo Bazán is particularly sensitive to Hugo's sentimental condescension not only because it evokes a tradition of exoticizing Spain as "Romantic" but also because it is an affront to her desire to be recognized as a fellow citizen of the European system of literature. His condescension and her feeling of defensiveness are related to the kind of traveler she was

when she went to Paris in 1880. She was a pilgrim traveling to the center of the world literary system, and the fact that she sought Victor Hugo out is a confirmation that she was there to establish a link between herself (personally and as a representative of an ethical community in “Spain”), and the literary authority of the “grandiose” Hugo.

That the encounter went sour was partially the effect of her anxiety over whether she, a *cosmopolitan* and a *Spaniard*, could be recognized by Hugo’s authority and his condescension only confirmed her suspicions that her dignity was indeed in question. But her symbolic revenge, as I suggested above, was not completed except through the literary retelling of the story in 1886 where she could with new forms of authority dismiss the authority that had in turn failed to recognize her. That is, in 1886, Pardo Bazán had become the primary extension of the modern representational practice of Naturalism/Realism in Spain and had, in fact, been recognized in France for her efforts by the leaders of the movement. Zola congratulated her for *La cuestión palpitante* which was translated into French in 1886, and she had become a close friend of the Goncourt brothers. Hugo and his literary movement were dead. In this symbolic encounter we see a secular pilgrim at work to restructure the “geographic imaginary” that Hugo so casually referenced (“España, país, según decía, el más romancesco de Europa”) by an appeal to new solidarities among *analogous* allies against the “exaggerations” of Idealism.

But I am tempted to take this argument a step further and suggest that this episode was in fact the traumatic kernel at the heart of her *costumbrista* novela de viajes. That is, Pardo Bazán’s novel is a hybrid form because for her, the pilgrim in Paris, the problem of modernity in Spain had to be staged in the scene of its creation. The problem of the reconciliation of *la España tradicional* and *la España moderna* had to be settled in Paris because the true nature of the problem of modernity in Spain was only visible when seen from the outside, as it were, and *systematically*. Her novel is *costumbrista* in that it

proposes the restructuring of feelings between the truly modern intellectual toward the innocent *España tradicional* against the cynical and calculating false modernity of the bourgeois State. This state is in thrall to the *moda francesa*, just as Miranda dresses in an acceptably modern way, and in his case, we might say the “clothes make the man” (“antes de reparar en Miranda, se fijaban las gentes en su ropa”.) Artegui, by contrast, has everything but the one thing he wants. To have Lucía he offers to run away with her and accept Miranda’s unborn child as her own:

Escúchame un instante —insistió él deteniéndola—. Sólo un instante. Tengo fortuna sobrada; mi viaje según cree todo el mundo se verificará esta noche. Estamos en un país libre, iremos a otro más libre aún. En los Estados Unidos nadie le pregunta a nadie de dónde viene, ni adónde va, ni quién es, ni qué hace. Nos vamos juntos. La vida juntos, ¿oyes?, la vida. (OC 1:182)

But, in the end, Artegui’s offer to take Lucía away with him to the United States to live in anonymity is rejected allegorically as the abandonment of the ethical relation one bears to one’s birthplace to which Lucía returns disgraced and alone. But as Hostos reminded us in the prologue to his *Bayoán*, the pilgrim cannot live in the present, and cannot seek the “inútil felicidad de los felices”. Rather s/he must continue “con paso firme” toward the rectification of the “geographic imaginary” that robs her (and her homeland) of her dignity.

In her aesthetic adaptation of Naturalism to Spain, which she began to theorize in the prologue to *Un viaje de novios* and developed in the essays of *La cuestión palpitante*, Pardo Bazán does not make Artegui’s mistake by simply slavishly translating Naturalist procedures into Spanish. Rather she regards Naturalism *systematically* —that is, universally— in order to reconcile in her theory of Realism her commitments to modernity and her commitments to tradition:

¡Oh, y cuán sano, verdadero y hermoso es nuestro realismo nacional, tradición gloriosísima del arte hispano! ¡Nuestro realismo, el que ríe y llora en *La Celestina* y el *Quijote*, en los cuadros de Velázquez y Goya, en la vena cómico-dramática de

Tirso y Ramón de la Cruz! ¡Realismo indirecto, inconsciente, y por eso mismo acabado y lleno de inspiración; no desdeñoso del idealismo, y gracias a ello, legítima y profundamente humano, ya que como el hombre, reúne en sí materia y espíritu, tierra y cielo! (*OC* 3:572-3)

In the nineteenth century Spain's literary elite faced the problem of their subordinate status in the hierarchies of space which the processes of imperial modernity threw over the entire globe. If imperialism enforced the rule of the colonial difference between metropolitan and colonial populations in order, as Partha Chatterjee suggests, to "preserve the alienness of the ruling group," Walter D. Mignolo's notion of "imperial difference" shows that a similar regime of controls and restraints, a similar system of writing and reading, and similar relations of disdain and fascination were at work in inter-imperial relations. That is, Spanish intellectuals occupied a location in the interpretive grid of modernity that was analogous to the location occupied by Filipino intellectuals who struggled to erase the structures of difference.

For Spanish intellectuals, I have suggested in this chapter, travel literature was, like Achilles's spear, both the offending instrument and the means to the cure. If "ojos extranjeros" could be imagined as maliciously savouring the sordid or "romantic" details of Spain's "atraso," Spanish writing, and travel writing in particular offered itself as a corrective not only to the false impressions that those "ojos extranjeros" might have of Spain, but also to realign the structures of feeling of the domestic community of readers toward the national self-image. Each mode of travel writing offered a different set of solutions to the problem of Spain's uneven modernity but each in its own way resisted the subordination of Spain to the "imperial difference" that structured its relations to Eurocolonial modernity.

Chapter 5: *La cuestión (palpitante) de Filipinas: Emilia Pardo Bazán and the Pleasures of Imperial Fantasy*

In March of 1891 Emilia Pardo Bazán published an enthusiastic book review of *Filipinas: esbozos y pinceladas* by Quioquiap, the pen name of Philippines-based colonial journalist Pablo Feced. As I suggested in Chapter 3, Feced's *Filipinas* was a literary tract with some very pragmatic, if polemical, suggestions for solving the *cuestión de Filipinas*. If his series of vignettes of life in the Philippines contained the *costumbrista* concern for the picturesque, his was not a nostalgic lament for the disappearing traditional lifeways under the impulse of a homogeneous modernity, but rather a modernizing rant against the barriers to the colonial modernization of the Philippines through settler colonialism and commercial exploitation. Emilia Pardo Bazán begins the review ("La España remota") by disclaiming any authority to speak on the pragmatic or political consequences of the book and instead proposes to consider *Filipinas* "únicamente como libro amenísimo de viajes, prescindiendo de su espíritu é importancia filipinológica." (78, emphasis in the original) The articles that make up Feced's *Filipinas* had previously appeared in the Peninsula in the pages of *El Liberal* and in Manila in the *Diario de Manila*, and Emilia Pardo Bazán herself had been, by her own admission, their most assiduous reader.

The principal aim of this chapter is to account for what it was in Quioquiap's *Filipinas* that so captivated the celebrated and polemical author of *Los pazos de Ulloa* and *La cuestión palpitante* that she not only read his book with pleasure but also took the trouble to recommend it to the readers of her *Nuevo Teatro Crítico*? I also hope to suggest why her review so vexed those who defended the cause of Filipino political and cultural assimilation and why their response seemed so out of proportion to her modest

admiration for a virtually unknown traveler to *la España remota*. Pardo Bazán's review is, to borrow an imperial metaphor, a kind of Gordian knot into which are tangled the multiple strands of modernity in late imperial Spain. But unlike Pardo Bazán, who with an impetuous stroke severed the *cuestión de Filipinas* asunder ("ya no tengo por qué seguir dándole vueltas"), I will opt for the decidedly more humble task of picking through the snags.

To appreciate the stakes involved in Quiquiap's book, Pardo Bazán's review and the response by the proponents of Filipino assimilation, it will be necessary to follow a few of the coarser fibers in the problematic modernity of the late Spanish empire. The first strand that I will attempt to separate out is the discourse of psychology with its tropes of pathology and cure. I follow psychologizing tendencies in the texts themselves. Along the way I propose a diagnosis of my own (imperial fantasy) for the peculiar set of symptoms expressed in Spain in relation to expanding Eurocolonialism of the late century as they are projected onto the "colonial" Philippines. Secondly, I keep a finger on the uneven processes of modernization both in Spain and in the Philippines that contributed to the rise of this particular confrontation in the pages of *El Liberal*, *El Nuevo Teatro Crítico* and *La Solidaridad* (among other contemporary publications). The literary system in Spain of the 1880s and 1890s was undergoing a rapid integration into the cosmopolitan literary circuits of the European (global) literary system and Emilia Pardo Bazán played no small role in that integration. I track the effects of the participation of Filipino intellectuals (both as readers and writers) in the Spanish literary system in order to suggest that the projections and introjections of the imperial fantasy that depended on the "otherness" of the Philippines were disrupted by the emergence of a Filipino literary system both in the Philippines and abroad. And finally, I try to tease out the importance of travel literature as a stage on which the psychodrama of modernity is played out.

Travel writing (with its distinct phases of writing *allá* and reading *aquí*) passes through and doubles back on the workings of the field of power in late imperial/colonial Spain and with a number of decisive tugs at its loose ends, the imperial fantasy that seemed to hold the Spanish cultural system together threatened to come undone. Each element in this psychodrama (*Filipinas*, *El Nuevo Teatro Crítico*, and *La Solidaridad*) was the expression of a complex and interconnected project to bring a desired modernity into being by overcoming the sting of a wounded dignity born of the contradictions of the modernizing process itself.

Emilia Pardo Bazán's literary enthusiasm for Pablo Feced's collection of travel vignettes on life in the Spanish Philippines may have seemed at once an innocent pleasure and a mere footnote in her projected history of modernized Spanish letters, but for "la gente que se ocupa en asuntos de Filipinas," her authorizing imprimatur resonated far beyond the literary merits of Feced's *Filipinas*. Of course, it included her explicit endorsement of the book's denigrating racism. But more than that, it signaled a tacit but powerful rejection of the literary and political project of cultural and political assimilation that Filipinos advocated most stridently in the pages of *La Solidaridad*. In her brief article, Emilia Pardo Bazán does not mention either the responses to her review of *Filipinas* emanating from *La Solidaridad* nor the polemic that Filipino writers like José Rizal, Marcelo del Pilar, Graciano López Jaena and Eduardo de Lete had sustained with colonialist writers like Pablo Feced, Wenceslao Retana, and Vicente Barrantes in peninsular publications. But for all of her silence on the participation of Filipinos in the debate, Emilia Pardo Bazán cannot quite conjure away the threat posed by an emerging contact zone not only in the metropole and the colony, but also in such cosmopolitan locations as Paris, London, Berlin and Hong Kong.

LA CUESTIÓN DE FILIPINAS IN THE PENINSULAR PRESS

Feced's articles represented a surge in journalistic activity in the Peninsula that surrounded the preparations and aftermath of the 1887 *Exposición de Filipinas* organized by then Overseas Minister Víctor Balaguer, and celebrated in Madrid's Retiro park.⁵⁸ In Spain of the last two decades of the nineteenth century, the Philippines had suddenly begun to receive an increasing share of the national attention. To borrow a phrase from the columns of the conservative newspaper *La Epoca* from late 1890, "Los asuntos de Filipinas [estaban] de moda" (cited in Blumentritt, "Los asuntos" 303). Pardo Bazán shared this sense of the importance of "los asuntos de Filipinas" but suggested at the beginning of her review of Feced's book that to speak of them required not only competence but also robust patriotism:

Me convendría, para hablar de este libro [*Filipinas*] y de estos asuntos que tanto nos interesan, ó que tanto debieran interesarnos por lo menos, la competencia del señor Barrantes, que, además de consumado filipinólogo es un escritor muy castizo, muy gustoso de leer, preciso y claro al expresar las ideas, y animado por un patriotismo que, si pudiese errar en los medios (y esto no me toca resolverlo á mí), no erraría jamás en el sentimiento, noble entre los más nobles, de querer todo bien y toda ventaja para la madre común. ("La España remota" 75).

Beneath the seemingly serene surface of her endorsement of the "competence" of Vicente Barrantes to speak of "asuntos de Filipinas" in fact raged an acrimonious literary polemic around the politics of the Spanish colonial administration in the Philippines. At issue, as I pointed out in the last chapter, was the question of the political status of the Philippines in the larger imperial political system. On one side were the proponents of the legal and cultural assimilation of the Archipelago to the Peninsula through legal reform, parliamentary representation and the Hispanization of the largely non-Spanish-speaking inhabitants of the Philippines. Against this assimilationist reformism were the apologists

⁵⁸ For a recent description of the personal role of Víctor Balaguer and an overview of the 1887 *Exposición de Filipinas*, see Sánchez Gómez, *Un imperio en la vitrina*.

for the “Special Laws” that since the constitution of 1837 had made the overseas provinces legally different from peninsular provinces. Vicente Barrantes was an apologist for the latter position against the assimilation of the Philippines, and in endorsing Barrantes’s “competencia,” Pardo Bazán was taking sides in this debate at the outset of her review. Vicente Barrantes Moreno (Badajoz, 1829-1898) was a writer, journalist, playwright, bibliographer, folklorist and poet and was a member of both the Spanish Royal Academy and the Royal Academy of History. He was named by the first Cánovas government as a functionary to the Philippines and there rose to the position of Director General of Administration. After retiring from the colonial administration, Barrantes returned to Spain where he was elected to two terms as Senator for Cáceres. During the decade between returning to the Peninsula and his death, Barrantes published his *Teatro tagalo* (1889) in which he argued that Filipinos were incapable of creative thought. He also collaborated regularly in the cultural review *La España Moderna*, the influential cultural review founded by Lázaro Galdiano in intimate collaboration with Pardo Bazán. It was in the pages of this publication that Barrantes sustained a bitter polemic with Ferdinand Blumentritt and criticized José Rizal’s novel *Noli me tângere*.

Pardo Bazán refers explicitly to this polemic further on in her review to make clear that she preferred Barrantes’s colonialist approach to the *cuestión de Filipinas* over the assimilationist ideas of Ferdinand Blumentritt. The latter was born in Prague but spent his professional life in Leitmeritz as an educator and scholar. He was a member of many European learned societies and made his name as an orientalist with special expertise in the languages and cultures of the Malay region of Southeast Asia. His interests in the history of colonialism were not limited to Southeast Asia but his correspondence and friendship with Filipino intellectuals such as José Rizal, Trinidad Pardo de Tavera and Isabelo de los Reyes deeply affected his views of Spanish colonial policies in the

Archipelago. A devout Catholic and fluent in Spanish, Blumentritt became an indefatigable defender of the political rights of Filipinos, basing his views on an assimilationist interpretation of the historical legacy of Spanish missionary colonialism combined with a humanist conviction of the scientific desirability and historical inevitability of the modernization of the Philippines. Blumentritt forcefully engaged both Barrantes and Pablo Feced in the pages of the Filipino bi-weekly *La Solidaridad*.

These polemics that surrounded *la cuestión de Filipinas*, like all of those other *cuestiones* that occupied the Spanish intelligentsia of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (i.e. *la cuestión social, religiosa, femenina*, or, as I will have occasion to discuss below, Pardo Bazán's own *La cuestión palpitante*) orbited obsessively around the problem of modernity and Spain's place in it. As suggested in Chapter 3, a combination of factors had led to a state in which Philippine affairs were fashionable in the Peninsula. In 1885 a war with Germany was narrowly avoided over competing claims to the Carolina Islands. This diplomatic row led to rowdy popular demonstrations of patriotism in the streets of Madrid and to the sudden surge in the peninsular press of the importance of Spanish colonial possessions in the Pacific. This conflict coincided with the 1885 Berlin conference in which the international rules for colonial trade and expansionism in Africa were agreed to by the major imperial powers. Although a minor player in the Berlin conference, Spain was able to obtain international sanction of its claim over Fernando Poo and Equatorial Guinea as part of the arrangement that led to the "scramble for Africa." Just two years later, Overseas Minister Víctor Balaguer organized a colonial exposition which opened in Madrid's Retiro park in the summer of 1887 to great public and official fanfare, to display the cultural and commercial potential of Spain's Pacific possessions (Philippines, Marianas, and Carolina Islands). At the Philippine exposition, the public display of *igorrotos* (animists from the uplands of the

island of Luzon); *moros* (muslims from the southern islands of the archipelago); *indios* (lowland christian Filipinos); native Carolinos and Chamorros from Guam overshadowed in the popular imagination the more mundane displays of hemp cordage, tobacco, tropical flora and Filipino arts and crafts.⁵⁹

The purpose of the exposition was officially twofold. First it was to raise awareness in the metropole of the economic and strategic importance of the empire's Pacific possessions. And secondly, it was to put on display the relative potential of the inhabitants of those islands to assimilate the benefits of Spanish civilization. If the reaction of the metropolitan public to the colonial exposition was complex and contradictory, the exposition did succeed in its purpose to place a modernizing vision of Spanish imperialism on view in the empire's capital city and through the periphernalia of the exposition, such as the construction of the Crystal Palace, Madrid succeeded in emulating the "new" colonialism of its northern neighbors.

But if the geopolitical importance of a reinvigorated Spanish colonialism in the Pacific had made the Philippines suddenly visible and strategically important to Spanish international relations, another development within the imperial system had begun to make its presence felt in the Peninsula. According to the article in *La Epoca*, the reason "los asuntos de Filipinas [estaban] de moda" was that articles regarding the political affairs of the Archipelago that were regularly appearing in the mainstream press of the Peninsula were not due to "propio impulso de su Redacción," but rather because they were being "suggested" by "una media docena de mestizos [... que] capitanea desde Bohemia un extranjero" (cited in Blumentritt "Los asuntos" 303). The "foreigner" to which the article refers was Ferdinand Blumentritt and the newspaper that served as the base of operations for this "media docena de mestizos" was *La Solidaridad*.

⁵⁹ See Sánchez Gómez, *El imperio en la vitrina*.

La Solidaridad was a fortnightly newspaper that was first published in Barcelona on February 15, 1889, but by November of 1889 the newspaper had moved to Madrid where it remained in continuous publication until 1895. *La Solidaridad* was secretly funded through donations collected through a clandestine organization of Filipino Freemasons known as “La Propaganda,” but the writers who collaborated in its pages were not all associated with this organization nor did they all receive stipends. The collaborators in *La Solidaridad* included most (but not all, of course) of the important Filipino writers and intellectuals of the period (Graciano López Jaena, Mariano Ponce, Marcelo del Pilar, José Rizal, Antonio Luna, Pedro Paterno, Eduardo de Lete, José Panganiban, Isabelo de los Reyes, and Dominador Gómez). Ferdinand Blumentritt was its most regular and most polemical non-Filipino collaborator. In regular columns, Blumentritt attacked the writing of Pablo Feced, Wenceslao Retana and Vicente Barrantes where he accused them of causing “filibusterismo” (separatist agitation) through their advocacy of a rigid colonial intransigence.

The charge leveled in *La Epoca* that *La Solidaridad* was “captained” by Blumentritt was far from the truth; quite the opposite was true since Blumentritt’s views of colonial politics shifted dramatically under the influence of Rizal and other Filipino contacts. But because Blumentritt was a recognized *filipinólogo* and a foreigner, he felt licensed to say directly what Filipino writers said with much more circumspection about the need for reforms and the nefarious effects of an intransigent colonial policy. But the fact that the charge was leveled in this manner reveals both the seriousness with which *La Solidaridad* was taken by its ideological enemies and the degree to which the Philippine question had become imbricated with geopolitical concerns.

It is hard to gauge precisely the direct impact of *La Solidaridad* on the colonial administration in the Philippines but it clearly stoked separatist fears and official

repression in the archipelago, for the collaborators themselves saw the mounting political repression in the colony as retaliation for their literary campaign in its pages. By late 1890, political events in the Philippines had taken an ugly turn and the specter of separatist “filibusterismo” haunted the colonial officialdom in the Philippines. Governor General Valeriano Weyler had personally overseen the military depopulation of José Rizal’s hometown of Calamba over a legal dispute between the indigenous tenants and the Dominican order whose estate included the town itself. The military intervention against the inhabitants of Calamba was based on a dispute over the rising “canon” (tenant rents) that the farmers of the town had to pay to the Dominican order, and was part of a larger campaign of political repression in the Archipelago in response to the increasing political visibility of Filipino reformist activism both in the Philippines and, perhaps equally importantly, in the Peninsula. The visibility and impact of Filipino political writing, whose first major literary salvo was José Rizal’s 1887 novel *Noli me tángere*, was enhanced by the 1885 conflict with Bismarck’s Germany over the Spanish claims to the Carolina Islands and the 1887 Exposición de Filipinas in Madrid.

But if the debates surrounding the *cuestión de Filipinas* were acrimonious, the impact of Filipino writers on peninsular intellectuals has been underestimated in Filipino cultural history and ignored in the literary history of the Peninsula. The circulation figures for *La Solidaridad* are hard to determine for a number of reasons but the circulation of the newspaper was certainly limited in the Peninsula. Yet the impact of its mere existence in the cultural life of the Peninsula had profound consequences that far outstripped the modesty of its material presence. José Rizal’s *Noli me tángere* whose distribution was extremely limited, despite a 2,000-copy print run, provides a related example of the inordinate influence that Filipino writing had on metropolitan fears about the impending loss of the imperial periphery. The circulation of Rizal’s novel was limited

both in the Peninsula and in the Philippines due largely to an ad hoc method of distribution and official and semi-official efforts to suppress it. But despite its limited availability, it was widely commented upon and was even mentioned in both the parliament and the senate as evidence of a separationist threat in the Philippines even before the book was materially available in the Peninsula.⁶⁰ The very fact that Vicente Barrantes felt it necessary to criticize Rizal's novel in *La España Moderna* is further evidence of the novel's unsettling effect on the metropolitan intelligentsia. In fact, Barrantes's polemic with Blumentritt revolved initially around the latter's defense of Rizal's novel in a pamphlet that he distributed widely among peninsular intellectuals. Adding to the official paranoia surrounding the substance of the novel's critique of Hispanic colonialism in the Philippines was the germanophobia elicited by the conflict over the Carolinas and the persistent rumors that Chancellor Bismarck harbored annexationist designs on the Philippines. For Rizal had printed the novel at his own expense in Berlin and had undertaken its distribution personally by sending it in small parcels to friends in Barcelona, Madrid, Hong Kong, Manila and elsewhere. The novel was not immediately banned in the Philippines and for that reason a number of copies were introduced there without difficulty. But if the novel elicited a sluggish official response in the Philippines, Rizal's ideological enemies set about propagating an unofficial condemnation of the book through the publication of polemical tracts against Rizal and his novel. These tracts though aimed at heading off popular interest in the novel served only to heighten the mystique of the *Noli* and the pamphlets, written by two Augustinian friars, alleged not only that the novel was heretical but that it was part of a larger geopolitical strategy on the part of the "German" Rizal to foment rebellion in the islands.

⁶⁰ See Retana, *Vida* p. 131.

If these claims were clumsily made in the Philippines, they were more sophisticatedly echoed in the metropole by Vicente Barrantes, who while praising Rizal's literary talents as the exception to the rule among Filipinos, attributed those exceptional talents to the fact that Rizal had been educated in Germany (which, in fact he had not):

los escasos hijos de Filipinas que dentro o fuera de ellas han publicado libros, no tocan puntos de arte, ni mucho menos de crítica antropológica, excepto el autor de la novela que acabamos de citar [José Rizal], cuya educación alemana ha llenado su espíritu de recóndita hostilidad a España y los españoles, que sólo aparece un tanto modificada por el conocimiento del país a que pertenece, donde presiente que sus ideales no caben ni aun metidos a mazo.

What is striking about Barrantes faint praise of Rizal's literary talents is that they were necessary at all for a person of Barrantes's social and literary status. For what Barrantes's *Teatro tagalo* lays bare is how tenuously the unity of an imperial community of readers was hanging together under the influence of the work of these "few sons of the Philippines" who had begun to publish in the metropole and beyond. If Barrantes's *Teatro* was explicitly aimed at metropolitan readers and its purpose was to convince them that Filipinos were incapable of art, the true target of his polemic does not emerge until the final chapter of the book where he takes up the subject of Rizal's novel.

Barrantes presents his *Teatro* as a "scientific" enquiry into the history of Filipino theater (Barrantes calls his *Teatro* "una tesis estética-antropológica"), yet its polemical tone betrays the urgency with which Barrantes worked to block the integration of the Filipino literary system not only into the larger imperial cultural order but also into circuits of the world literary system which Spanish intellectuals themselves aspired to enter. In short, Rizal's novel threatened not only the political order in the Philippines by offering an alternative re-presentation of the meaning of imperial relations to readers there, but it also threatened to change the meaning of Spanish imperialism in the metropole and in competing imperial systems. While Barrantes's *Teatro* was an attack on

Rizal's *Noli*, it was for Rizal an opportunity to be seized upon with gusto. Rizal took up Barrantes's *Teatro tagalo* (published first as a series of articles in Barcelona's *Ilustración Artística* and later collected in book form) in an article in *La Solidaridad* in which Rizal scurrilously pretended to defend (in vain) Barrantes's arguments from his Filipino detractors only to systematically reduce them to so much rubbish. And again Rizal responded to Barrantes's review of his *Noli* (published first in *La España Moderna* and later as the final chapter of the book) by mocking Barrantes's naive view of literary realism which underwrote his claim that Rizal was a harsher critic of Filipino lifeways than either Barrantes himself or Pablo Feced would dare to be.

Barrantes's *Teatro tagalo* is, then, evidence of the impact of the steady integration of the colonial and metropolitan literary systems in the hands of Filipino intellectuals whose very presence in Spain, Europe, Asia and the Philippines restructured the meaning of geocultural relations between the metropole and its most "colonial" possession by rendering visible alternative networks of authority that circumvented official channels of power. But perhaps the surest sign that Filipino writing such as Rizal's novel and Filipino newspapers such as *La Solidaridad* were having an impact on Philippine affairs was the appearance in Madrid in January of 1891 of the newspaper *La política de España en Filipinas*. This newspaper was reportedly financed by Friar interests in the Philippines and was produced entirely by the Feced brothers (Pablo and José) and Wenceslao Retana in order to combat the influence of *La Solidaridad* in the Peninsula as well as in the Philippines.

PARDO BAZÁN AND "LOS ASUNTOS QUE TANTO NOS INTERESAN"

But if the effect of *La Solidaridad* was directly perceptible in Barrantes's articles in *La España Moderna*, in the columns of *La Política de España en Filipinas*, or in comments like the one quoted from *La Epoca*, it was only indirectly perceptible in the

thought and writing of the literary elite to which Emilia Pardo Bazán belonged. My purpose here is to measure that impact on the thought of Emilia Pardo Bazán as an exemplary member of that literary elite. For even more telling than the direct polemical evidence of the Filipino literary impact on peninsular thinking regarding the Philippines, Pardo Bazán's enthusiastic review of Feced's *Filipinas* demonstrates that the presence of literary Filipinos was getting under the skin of the intelligentsia in revealing ways. And as suggested above, Pardo Bazán, despite coy protestations to the contrary, takes sides in the overt polemics then taking place in the Spanish press between writers like Pablo Feced, Vicente Barrantes and Wenceslao Retana on one side, and José Rizal, Eduardo de Lete, Graciano López Jaena and Ferdinand Blumentritt on the other. She mentions Vicente Barrantes as a model *filipinólogo* at the beginning of her review of Pablo Feced's book not only because Barrantes was at the time one of the only active peninsular "experts" on the Philippines, but also by virtue of her professional association with him in the pages of Lázaro Galdiano's *La España Moderna*. It was in the pages of that review that Barrantes wrote the regular column "La sección Española Ultramarina" and it was there that he had condescendingly criticized José Rizal's *Noli me tângere*. In her review she also mentions Ferdinand Blumentritt as Barrantes's counterpart in debates over colonial policy in the Philippines. But what is revealing in her review is the absence of Filipino writers like José Rizal or the mention of *La Solidaridad* in which Blumentritt's articles were published.

Emilia Pardo Bazán's enthusiasm was certainly a powerful compliment to a virtually unknown writer like Pablo Feced and a serious blow to his critics. For if Pardo Bazán was not a *filipinóloga* she certainly had the credentials to comment on the literary pleasure to be found in Feced's book of sketches for an urbane metropolitan reader. And

after insisting on considering the book “únicamente como amenísimo libro de viajes” she declares, “tocante a amenidad, *Quioquiap* puede poner tienda” (78).

Her review elicited a heated response from the pages of the Filipino newspaper *La Solidaridad* then being published in Madrid. The first article was published by Eduardo de Lete on May 15, 1891 under the aggressive title “Paranoia persecutoria (A la señora Pardo Bazán; caso psicopático)” and was followed in July by an equally aggressive response from Ferdinand Blumentritt in August 15, 1891 under Pardo Bazán’s title “La España remota.” In addition, Pardo Bazán also received other correspondence directly including a pamphlet and a letter from Blumentritt as well as at least one letter from Manila which she mentions in the “Crónica literaria” and “Índice de libros recibidos,” both published in *Nuevo Teatro Crítico* 1:6 (June 1891).

Responding to these and other attacks, Pardo Bazán again took up the subject of Quioquiap’s book two months later in a note published in the June 1891 edition of her *Nuevo Teatro Crítico*, this time to bow out of the political polemic occasioned by her own article and to wryly scold her interlocutors. Again, by first disclaiming any specific authority on the subject (“no soy filipinóloga”), she advised her readers that she would not respond to the letters and pamphlets she had received in response to the article because their authors, she suggested, had misunderstood the intent of the review and the purpose of the *Nuevo Teatro Crítico* itself. She explained that she could not “abrir en el *Teatro* palenque a discusiones que, en el fondo, son ajenas a la verdadera índole de la publicación” (84). The “verdadera índole” of the *Nuevo Teatro Crítico* was to provide an outlet for a distinctly *modern* form of literary criticism. The *Teatro*, like its contemporary *La España Moderna*, was committed to a project of national *renovación*. But unlike *La España Moderna*, in which Emilia Pardo Bazán was an active collaborator, the *Nuevo Teatro Crítico* was not a collaborative effort. Rather, it was singlehandedly written and

financed by Pardo Bazán herself and therefore was the organ of her personal judgement and taste in literary matters.

Why, then, was Pardo Bazán so enthusiastic about Pablo Feced's travel writing about the Philippines? And, furthermore, what was the relation of her enthusiasm for his book to the more general modernizing impulse of her *Teatro*? To answer these questions is to address the role of empire in the regenerationist program of Spanish intellectual nationalists during the period of the Restoration. In particular, it means to point to the way in which fantasies about imperial regeneration assuaged more fundamental anxieties about the subordinate status of Spain in the geopolitical and geocultural hierarchies of modernity.

Pablo Feced's book seemed to fit Pardo Bazán's prescription for assuaging the anxieties produced by the "decadencia" of the Spanish literary system because it indulged a fantasy of Spanish participation in the project of Eurocolonialism. That is, Feced's *Filipinas* was more than just a traveler's journal of a trip to the Philippines. Rather, it was a political and cultural tract advocating Spanish settler colonialism and a paternalistic form of direct colonial rule modeled on the one then being institutionalized "scientifically" by the Dutch in the East Indies and by the English with the Raj. Consequently, his view of "reality" in the Philippines and of Filipinos was constructed to shore up this modernizing program. As mentioned in a previous chapter, it is a mistake to see the colonialist project outlined in Feced's book as politically or culturally reactionary. It was not. If Feced and his intellectual cohort were in league with the interests of the Religious Orders, it was a marriage of convenience to combat in the short term the assimilationist threat posed by modernizing Filipinos like Rizal. Curiously, however, Emilia Pardo Bazán never mentions Feced's modernizing colonial plan for the

Philippines. Rather, she fixates on the reactionary, and paternal role of the Friars in a fundamental misreading of the purpose of his book.

In other words, the pleasures that she derived from his book were perhaps limited to its literary charms as an “amenísimo libro de viajes” and truly were divorced from any practical concern for the actual practice of colonialism in the Philippines. Indeed, Feced’s book represented a form of imperial travel writing that was relatively rare for Spanish writers of the Restoration but which was a booming industry in the imperial capitals of northern Europe. Furthermore, travel writing and exploration literature were immensely popular throughout the European (i.e. global) literary system. Feced’s book, in Pardo Bazán’s reading, promised to put Spain on the imperial map at a time, at least in the realm of culture, when that map was quickly being colored with the imperial colors of other nations and its “distant lands” were being described by legions of imperial travelers. And while Feced intended to allay the impending eclipse of Spain’s imperial status with hope for an imperial renewal along modern lines, Pardo Bazán took pleasure in the decidedly anti-modern view of life in the Philippines as the best hope of Spain’s imperial survival. Like Pardo Bazán’s regenerationist project for Spanish letters, Feced’s book prescribed a remedy for the “decadence” of Spanish imperial policies and prognosticated a bright imperial future for Spain in the Philippines yet for Pardo Bazán, the value of Feced’s *Filipinas* rested on its ability to facilitate a complex imperial fantasy.

If to the literary project of the *Nuevo Teatro Crítico*, the political and “scientific” dimensions of Quiroga’s book were professedly of little interest —indeed, her expressed political views on the colonial *cuestión de Filipinas* were not identical to those defended by Feced— these aspects were critical to the increasingly contentious colonial question in the colony and in the metropole. Pardo Bazán insisted that the value of Feced’s *Filipinas* was its ability to afford literary pleasure to a particular metropolitan

community of readers and that her role as literary critic was to guide her readers in the informed pursuit of literary pleasure. But the acrimonious response to her review made it clear that the community of readers was altogether more diverse than the one that Pardo Bazán imagined was reading her *Teatro* and also that all of her readers did not find the aesthetic commodities for sale in Quiroquiap's colonialist *tienda* to their liking.

Emilia Pardo Bazán rather disingenuously registered her surprise at the stir caused by her brief review in the debates surrounding the *cuestión de Filipinas*:

Por cierto que me asombra la importancia que atribuye la gente que se ocupa en asuntos de Filipinas a mi breve y desautorizada nota sobre el libro de Quiroquiap. No parece sino que penden de ella los destinos del Archipiélago. ("Crónica literaria" 85)

The disingenuousness of this statement deserves attention for this declaration of surprise is not only a form of false modesty, but is also practically a stock phrase in Emilia Pardo Bazán's polemical arsenal. For example, in her description of the polemic surrounding the publication of *La cuestión palpitante* she declares "Siempre me sorprenderá el extraordinario dinamismo de aquel librejo [...] Al ver que unos artículos ligeros, batalladores e improvisados han dado origen a tantas polémicas, provocando tantas adhesiones entusiastas, tanta contradicción, tanto alboroto, y son traducidos y analizados seriamente por la prensa extranjera, [...] y los veo tan insignificantes como son, explico la fortuna del libro por su oportunidad" (*OC* 3:721). Or, later in her collected chronicles of her trip to the 1889 Paris Exposition in *Al pie de la Torre Eiffel*, she makes a similar declaration of falsely modest surprise at the stir caused by the criticism of the Spanish military ("mi desautorizada pluma") (see *Al pie* 18). The poignant irony of these professions of false modesty was provided by her constant recourse to her own gender and the fact that women's voices were indeed not authorized to intervene in such weighty matters as military reform, colonial policy, or literary history. But as her candidacy to the

Spanish Royal Academy demonstrated, Pardo Bazán did, in fact, authorize herself to pioneer a feminist intervention in the institutions of cultural and political power. When that candidacy failed, she turned to the only instrument available to her...a “desautorizada pluma.”

Pardo Bazán was indeed aware of the polemical history of Feced’s articles that had been published in *El Liberal*. In her review she refers to some of the participants in this polemic (Vicente Barrantes and Ferdinand Blumentritt) while leaving out any mention of Filipino writers in Spain such as those who were publishing the newspaper *La Solidaridad*. Similarly, if, as she says in the review, she was an “assiduous” reader of Feced’s articles in *El Liberal*, she must have read the rejoinder to Feced’s most virulent article («Ellos y nosotros»). This energetic response was written by the Filipino polemicist Graciano López Jaena and published under the title “Los indios de Filipinas” (see López Jaena 138-40) just days afterwards in the same *El Liberal*. “Ellos y nosotros” was not the first of Feced’s articles published in *El Liberal*, but it was the first to provoke a response from the Filipino community of Madrid on account of its ferocious tone and denigratory arguments. It was, interestingly, the only one of Feced’s articles from *El Liberal* that was not included in the book *Filipinas: esbozos y pinceladas*. Luis Ángel Sánchez Gomez suggests that this is on account of its virulence, and while this is probably correct, its propositions are repeated (in less concise form) throughout the book, and in book form, *Filipinas: esbozos y pinceladas* is unapologetic about the denigratory arguments laid out in “Ellos y nosotros”⁶¹

Pardo Bazán’s failure to mention any of the Filipino intellectuals then active in the Peninsula should not to be chalked up to ignorance of their writing on her part, for Blumentritt’s side of his polemic with Barrantes, which Pardo Bazán mentions in the

⁶¹ See Sánchez Gómez, “«Ellos y nosotros»” 310. See also Schumacher, *Propaganda* p. 62-64.

review, was sustained in the pages of *La Solidaridad*. Rather, it is a suppressed element, whether consciously or not is hard to tell, in order to shore up a discursive authority threatened from within by the intervention of Filipino intellectuals and threatened from without by “foreign” authorities like Blumentritt.

For the fact that Emilia Pardo Bazán mentions the Barrantes-Blumentritt polemic is evidence that she was not only aware of the existence of *La Solidaridad* but that she was quite possibly a regular reader (most likely by way of Barrantes). This is all the more likely since Emilia Pardo Bazán and Vicente Barrantes were close associates through their mutual involvement in the cultural review *La España Moderna* and had personal connections to its founder and publisher Lázaro Galdiano.⁶² Pardo Bazán had helped Lázaro Galdiano found the periodical in 1889 and remained an influential, if largely invisible, participant in its management well into the decade of the 1890s. Barrantes was also a dedicated contributor to *La España Moderna* and, from late 1889 until his death in 1898, published nearly everything he wrote in this publication. This fact is confirmed in a letter written by Galdiano in October of 1898 where he requested that Gómez de Baquero, a regular contributor to the review, that he include a memorial to Barrantes and Adolfo de Castro, both of whom had recently died. He said of them, “desde que fundé *La España Moderna* han sido de los más asiduos colaboradores de ella y casi no han escrito más que lo que yo he publicado” (Cited in Davies 85). It was in the pages of this cultural review that Barrantes published a condescending critique of José Rizal’s novel *Noli me tângere* in January of 1890 to which Rizal responded in *La Solidaridad* in February of the same year. One year previously, Rizal had responded in the same pages to Barrantes’s

⁶² Emilia Pardo Bazán’s intimate relationship with Lázaro Galdiano has been widely commented because of its importance not only to the foundation of the influential *La España Moderna* but also for its implications in her more celebrated, if more subdued and durable, affair with Galdós. For her connection to Galdiano and *La España Moderna* see Davies and Asún.

book *El teatro tagalo*, which had been published as articles in *La Ilustración Artística* of Barcelona and collected in book form that same year.

Why does Emilia Pardo Bazán suppress the presence of Filipino intellectuals while explicitly naming Blumentritt in this debate over colonial policy? At issue in this debate was not only the practical matter of how to proceed in the governance of the islands, but, more fundamentally, the very nature of difference at the heart of the colonial question. Could Filipinos be assimilated into “European” lifeways or not? This question resonated strongly with analogous questions concerning the capacity of women, workers, the poor and even Spaniards collectively to assimilate “European” lifeways. Surely in part, at least, her suppression of Filipinos was an example of what Hostos called the “guerra de silencio” with which the metropolitan literary elite responded to writing from the periphery. But this answer begs the more basic question of her motives for this silence. The answer lies, it seems, in the peculiar way in which discourses of race, gender and sexuality dovetailed neatly not only with the discourses of the “new” imperialism of the late nineteenth century, but also, paradoxically, with the unreconstructed traditionalism that persisted in the peninsular view of the nineteenth-century Philippines. In other words, Filipino demands for cultural and political assimilation worked against the very matrices of difference that were increasingly structuring imperial modernity. At the same time, it might be argued, Blumentritt as a polemical outsider in this debate about the internal workings of the Spanish empire only served to reconfirm Spain’s participation in the concert of imperial nations then working out the practical matters of inter-imperial relations. Feced’s book enabled an imperial fantasy that assuaged a contradictory and complex matrix of anxieties in Emilia Pardo Bazán and it was precisely this fantasy that she was recommending unreservedly to her metropolitan community of readers.

FAILURE OF SOLIDARITY

As noted above, Emilia Pardo Bazán's surprise at the tenor of the pro-Filipino response to her article was certainly disingenuous and condescending. But at the same time, it reveals her particular location in the matrix of authority as a woman, literary critic and Spaniard. The irony of her positionality is that like Filipino intellectuals writing in the Peninsula to procure political rights and social dignity, Pardo Bazán is also struggling to obtain rights and dignity for women and at the same time working in the cultural field to recover a betrayed national dignity. That is, Pardo Bazán's campaign in her *Nuevo Teatro Crítico* is in many ways analogous to the campaign carried on in the pages of *La Solidaridad*. In the case of Filipino writers like Rizal, Lete, and del Pilar, writing was virtually the only avenue to influence in a political system that was closed to their direct participation. Likewise, Pardo Bazán also depended principally on writing to break down the barriers to feminine participation in the institutions of power and her elision of Filipino efforts to procure their own dignity is evidence of her inability to perceive the obstacles to her own dignity as a woman, a writer and a Spaniard as *systematically* akin to those faced by Filipinos in late Hispanic imperialism.

In this failure to imagine relations of solidarity with Filipinos like Rizal, Pardo Bazán was not alone. For example, in his response to her review, Blumentritt used the scandalous nature of a short story included in the same issue of *Nuevo Teatro Crítico* to put her in her place as a woman. The story, ("No lo invento") narrates the shocking case of a *sepulturero* who because he is rejected by the women of his town, he systematically avenges the insult by violating the cadavers of all of the women he buries in the town. Blumentritt begins the article in which he denounces Pardo Bazán's favorable review of Feced's *Filipinas* by feigning shock that a woman could have written such a story:

Tengo á mi vista un folleto, el número 3 del *Nuevo Teatro Crítico*, de Emilia Pardo Bazán.... El primer artículo contiene la relación de una monstruosidad terrible y salvaje, indigna de ser sacada á la luz de la publicidad por la pluma de una mujer, porque, según nuestro concepto, la mujer no debe manchar ni siquiera su pluma en el fango de la obscenidad bestial. (Blumentritt, “La España remota” 479-80)

Like Pardo Bazán, Blumentritt fails to understand the motives (however complex and contradictory) behind the inclusion of such a story in the *Nuevo Teatro* and prefers the self-satisfying path of condescension and scandal. Much like Victor Hugo’s casual remark about the “atraso” of Spain, Blumentritt’s comment depends on the very structures of subordination against which Pardo Bazán was struggling. Susan Kirkpatrick has noted the importance of Pardo Bazán’s efforts in bringing to the fore feminist concerns in the initial moments of national soul-searching that characterized the last decades of the nineteenth century in Spain:

Los problemas que inquietaban entonces a los intelectuales españoles preocupados por la modernización del país se centraban en las divisiones de clase, que se habían vuelto más visibles por el protagonismo de los movimientos anarquistas y socialistas en la política nacional, las crecientes diferencias entre la España urbana y la España rural provocadas por la desigual industrialización y los incipientes conflictos entre los nacionalismos periféricos y el Estado central. El elemento que Pardo Bazán incorporó al debate fue la idea de que la brecha entre los géneros podía suponer un obstáculo al progreso y un factor relevante en el accidentado ingreso de España en la modernidad. (7-8)

Here, Kirkpatrick places Pardo Bazán’s feminism alongside other projects of social and political dignity. At the heart of each of these *cuestiones sociales*, Kirkpatrick argues, was the larger problem of the “accidentado ingreso de España en la modernidad.” And those who struggled for the assimilation of these various “pariahs” (the urban poor, the rural poor, Galicians, Catalans, women, Filipinos) into the structures of social and political power, did so by appealing to a commonly held desire for modernity. But what these individual struggles often lacked was a broadly conceived strategy of solidarity with other similar struggles for political dignity. This is certainly the case with Pardo

Bazán, who while struggling publicly for the political enfranchisement of Spanish women, could not imagine the cause of Filipino rights as analogously meritorious.

In the “Presentación” to the *Nuevo Teatro Crítico* that we cited above, Pardo Bazán ironizes the political system that excludes her and all women and declares her intention to intervene in politics in her own “innocent” way:

Tratándose de política sí que soy la propia inocencia, y tengo una simplicidad de doceañista. Como que llega mi candor al extremo de figurarme que política es el arte de gobernar á los pueblos para su mayor bienestar y gloria; y como derivación de esa teoría infantil, sostengo que el interés de la patria es muy superior al de los partidos; [...] Sospecho que mi cándida manera de ver estos asuntos se origina de ser yo un individuo de la casta de los parias, á quienes no alcanza ni la unción del sufragio *universal*, y que incapacitados para hacer las leyes (aunque forzados á sufrirlas), [...] Mi condición de mujer, tan desfavorable en el sentido social, me presta una sola ventaja: ver desde afuera tal linaje de *política*, y apreciar cumplidamente su vanidad y mezquinidad, sin que para expresarla me cohiban los miramientos del compañerismo ni las precauciones del *hoy por ti...* etcétera. Realmente, la anómala situación de la mujer respecto á derechos políticos, nos permite (del mal al menos) pensar y sentir con absoluta independencia, [...] Para mí, la óptica del problema político es radicalmente distinta que para los políticos militantes: ellos ven el advenimiento ó la caída de *los suyos*; yo veo á España... que patria, dígase la verdad, aún no nos han prohibido tenerla á las mujeres. (16-18)

This statement makes clear the centrality of writing in Pardo Bazán’s intention to circumvent the legal obstacles to her political enfranchisement by means of the “sección de política” of her *Nuevo Teatro Crítico*. If writing had become a “fourth power” in Spain of the Restoration, that power was available to her for her own purposes. But her political statement also reveals as curious mix of wry ironic humor and sanctimonious superpatriotism that is at the heart of her strategy to break through the barriers to her full enfranchisement. Yet, Pardo Bazán’s feminism does not sensitize her to those other “pariahs” publishing *La Solidaridad* and dedicated to the procurement of political rights for Filipinos. In the same issue of the *Nuevo Teatro Crítico* in which she published the review of Pablo Feced’s book, Pardo Bazán revisited the controversy surrounding her

own failed candidacy for admission into the Spanish Royal Academy. Although there was no explicit obstacle to the entry of women in the bylaws of the Academy (Gertrudis Gómez de Avellaneda was very nearly admitted) a recrudescing chauvinism mixed with the equally contentious failed candidacy of Galdós conspired to block her admission.

In the article titled “La cuestión académica” Pardo Bazán admits strategical mistakes in her candidacy (although she claimed entry on feminist principles, she was easily charged with personal ambitions) and she declares her candidacy officially dead. She does not, however, give up the feminist principle of the right of women to enter the Academy and suggests that the case of the Concepción Arenal should be pursued with all haste for entry into the Royal Academy of Moral and Political Sciences. In a statement that could have been lifted right out of *La Solidaridad* Pardo Bazán explains that her candidacy,

Como cuestión puramente personal, no merece la tinta que se gaste en dilucidarla. Mas como cuestión objetiva y de principios, vale cuanto vale toda reivindicación del derecho, toda afirmación de la igualdad y la justicia, toda protesta contra las exclusiones irritantes, que, sentenciadas ya en la conciencia, lo estarán en el orden de los hechos, tarde o temprano, opóngase quien se oponga. (“La cuestión académica 63).

Her inability to make the connection between the *cuestión académica femenina* and the *cuestión de Filipinas* is a product of the powerful effects of the imperial fantasy through which all things related to the Philippines were filtered in metropolitan imaginings of the sudden importance of its possessions in the Pacific.

As I noted above, Pardo Bazán repeatedly confesses her lack of expertise in the science of *filipinología*. Rather than a hindrance to her authority to write about Feced’s book, her very claim to separate out the literary pleasures from the nitty-gritty of representational truth is the gesture that authorizes her to speak. In fact, she points out that the “scientific” truth about the Philippines has representational problems of its own.

She outlines the arduous requirements that must be fulfilled in order to speak with authority about distant lands such as the Philippines:

Al tratar de lejanas tierras, parece que cabría establecer como axioma que se requiere, para desertar de lo que en ellas ocurre, una larga residencia, familiaridad con sus habitantes, conocimiento minucioso del idioma, costumbres, clima, carácter, productos naturales y régimen administrativo. Con esto, y además un entendimiento claro, una pluma hábil y una voluntad bien encaminada por el amor de la patria, diríase que ya rebosaba cuanto conviene para opinar con acierto y pesar decisivamente en toda cuestión que á ese país haga referencia. (“La España remota” 76)

This prescription for representational truth-telling, it seems, would disqualify all from speaking with authority. Even Pardo Bazán’s exemplar *filipinólogo* Vicente Barrantes, as we will have occasion to point out in another section of this study, lacked such important requirements as “conocimiento minucioso del idioma.” The Austrian Blumentritt had neither traveled to the Philippines nor were his professions of love for Spain taken seriously by his adversaries who took his criticisms of Spanish colonial policies in the aftermath of the diplomatic conflict over the Carolinas as either pro-Bismarckian machinations or as “nativist” perversions. But, Pardo Bazán points out, even when such “qualified” *filipinólogos* such as Barrantes and Blumentritt wrote about the Philippines, distortion seemed to be the one element their representations shared:

No obstante, sucede que dos personas van á ese país, lo estudian, lo examinan, lo recorren de igual modo, y al tomar la pluma para escribir acerca de él, en vez de estar de acuerdo, sacan de los mismos datos conclusiones diametralmente opuestas. Y es que los entendimientos casi nunca son espejos planos, sino convexos ó cóncavos, por el estilo de los que se exhiben en las barracas de la feria, y los datos reales adquieren cierta deformación, en el sentido de la superficie reflectora. Así se explican las ardientes polémicas y viva contraposición entre los filipinólogos, los diversos sentimientos y pareceres de Barrantes y Blumentritt, por ejemplo. (76-7)

Pardo Bazán seems here to despair of any direct access to the “datos reales” because the “diversos sentimientos y pareceres” make of *filipinología* a kind of colonial sideshow in which partisan interest warps the “reality” of the Philippines beyond

recognition. By effectively suspending the “scientific” aspects of Feced’s book, Pardo Bazán authorizes herself to concentrate on its literary pleasures.

THE PLEASURES OF TRAVEL READING

But if “diversos sentimientos y pareceres” that are at the heart of the Barrantes-Blumentritt polemic taint any claim to “scientific” knowledge about the Philippines, why does Feced’s book, whatever its “scientific” merits, yield such pleasures? That is, what is the link between literary pleasure (including her authority to speak of it) and her expressions of patriotic devotion? Her demurral does not stop her from offering her own “naive” solution to the colonial question in the Philippines. For, despite her disavowal of any scientific authority to resolve the differences of opinion between Barrantes and Blumentritt (“No es mi incumbencia decidir entre ellos”), Pardo Bazán does side with Barrantes against Blumentritt, but does so with the same patriotism and “innocence” that we saw expressed in the “Presentación.” But aside from her recourse to a radicalized form of patriotism—which is an integral part of her list of requirements to be able to speak with authority about “lejanas tierras”—the retention of the “magnificent colonial patrimony” is linked to the traumatic national memory of the Napoleonic invasion.

No es mi incumbencia decidir entre ellos, si bien deseosa de que España conserve lo que le resta de su magnífico patrimonio colonial, me inclino bastante á las que Blumentritt llama *instituciones frailerias*; por que me consta que Dominicos y Franciscanos mantienen muy encendido en sus corazones aquel fuego patriótico de que dieron tan gallarda muestra cuando los franceses nos invadieron á los principios del siglo. (“La España remota” 77)

The connection of the retention of the colonies to the defense of national sovereignty underscores the absolute nature of the patriotism evoked here and recalls the superpatriotism in Núñez de Arce’s descriptions of the African campaign of 1859-1860 that prompted Castelar on the heels of the triumph of the Revolution to say to a disappointed Hostos: “que primero soy español y después republicano.” What did it mean

to be “español” in this formulation if not the heir to a colonial legacy that in 1808 was threatened with annihilation and survived in the nineteenth century in reduced form? The connection between the retention of the Philippines and the Napoleonic war is an indirect but important one because it makes the link between the loss of the American colonies and the threat of the loss of the nation itself that subtended the importance of the colonies to national imaginings. Empire, then, was an integral part of Spanish nationalism in the nineteenth century and while a reanimated imperialist spirit emerged with a consolidated bourgeois intelligentsia in Spain, this new imperialism drew its strength simultaneously from a new appreciation for Spanish imperial expansion in the 15th and 16th centuries, and a new faith in the promise of national regeneration through the modernization and expansion of its 19th century empire. The operative phrase of the time with regard to retention was “la integridad nacional en Cuba,” “la integridad nacional en Filipinas,” etc. As Castelar’s phrase suggests, to be “español” required the colonial supplement. *La cuestión colonial* was the unifying element that held together a nation that was threatened with the centrifugal forces of Carlist and Cantonalist, socialist and anarchist agitation. And as if to ward off this threat, Pardo Bazán proposes to solve the problem of the emergence of modernity in the Philippines by sending more Friars: “Si los frailes en Filipinas son, como creo, utilísimos para nuestra patria, vayan allí en cantidad, y que se les proteja, y que no se les escatime ni el dinero ni la sanción oficial. Así lo aconseja la sana política.” (78).

Pardo Bazán’s insistent evasion of “scientific” knowledge about the Philippines in favor of mere literary pleasure may sound strange coming from a writer whose literary reputation was made largely as the adapter and defender of the aesthetics of literary Realism and Naturalism in Spain. If this were a travel book about Madrid or Galicia, could Pardo Bazán be so unconcerned with the practical details and find pleasure in the

picturesque anecdotes? In the case of this book about the distant Philippines, however, an intimate pact arises between the narrator and the reader in which both share the illusion of an identical point of view. Or rather, the reader sees by proxy what is otherwise an enigma. In Pardo Bazán's reading of Feced's *Filipinas*, this pact is experienced as a calming of her excited imagination (*fantasía*). That is, Feced's book was especially pleasurable because it soothed Pardo Bazán's anxieties about the meaning of the Philippines in the imperial imaginary:

su mérito especial y propio consiste en esa impregnación de la atmósfera de un país (don que posee en tan alto grado el célebre Pedro Loti, y en que la imaginación lúcida y fresca toma mucha parte); en evocar de ese país una imagen pintoresca y viva, que podemos concretar, y que nos calma, en cierto modo, la excitación de la fantasía cuando aspiramos a representarnos comarcas que nunca vieron los ojos. Después de leer a Quiroga, el enigma que encierra Filipinas, como todo país encierra el suyo, parece aclararse. ("La España remota" 79-80)

According to Díaz Irujo, travel writing conceals a narrative sleight of hand that requires the unconscious complicity of the readers in order to create the illusion that the readers "reciben las confidencias de alguien próximo" (110). This intimacy is of a moral order and it structures a shared way of seeing in which the "domestic" lifeways of narrator and readers are posited as "normal" and contrasted starkly with the "abnormal" lifeways (often portrayed as backward, uncivilized, degraded, etc.) of the denizens of the place being described. This intimacy is not only self-congratulatory, but it reaffirms the "we" constructed morally in the narrative through the negative image of "foreign" lifeways. While the travel writer produces this narrative sleight of hand, the reader must be complicit in the construction of this intimate "we":

Para que esta práctica sea eficaz, es necesario que el narrador se haga cómplice del lector y acepte su juego, renunciando también a la utilidad prometida en aras de la diversión; dicho de otro modo, que la imagen del extranjero propuesta por el viajero se corresponda con las *idées reçues* de sus lectores, aunque sean "errores comunes." (110)

In the case of Pardo Bazán's reading of Feced's travel narrative, she has explicitly sacrificed the "utilidad prometida" on the altar of pleasure: "Dicho todo esto, que es cuanto puedo decir sobre el caso, ya me será lícito considerar la obra de *Quioquiap* únicamente como libro amenísimo de viajes, prescindiendo de sus espíritu é importancia *filipinológica*. Y tocante a amenidad, *Quioquiap* puede poner tienda" ("La españa remota" 78). But again, what form does this pleasure take? It turns out that Feced is not, in Pardo Bazán's estimation, as good a literary stylist or as knowledgeable as Barrantes: "Su pericia de escritor no llega á la de Barrantes, y en saber tampoco puede compararse al docto autor del *Teatro tagalo*" (79). Yet, Pardo Bazán reveals the outlines of the intimacy that wells up in the intercourse of reading and she does so in the language and the narrative trajectory of a passionate yet chaste seduction:

Cuando los capítulos de *Filipinas* veían la luz en un importantísimo periódico diario, no tuvieron lectora más asidua que yo. Unas veces la risa, provocada por donosas observaciones; otras el estímulo de curiosidad con que miramos el exótico abanico de laca ó el minúsculo relieve de la caja de sándalo; de tiempo en tiempo la melancolía producida por la contemplación de un imperio colonial casi perdido, por el recuerdo de que un tiempo pudimos blasonar nuestro escudo con los dos hemisferios de globo.... todo esto y mucho más, porque la sugestión del un libro es complicadísima, me producían los artículos del desconocido *Quioquiap*, que desconocido sigue para mí, pues nunca quise averiguar su estado y condición, por no desflorar la impresión de entretenimiento que me regalaba. (78-9)

The layers of feeling in this passage reveal the complex overdeterminations that structure imperial fantasies. In this particular fantasy, the humdrum of mechanized modernity (the newspaper), the vaguely erotic fascination of the implements of oriental femininity (the fan and sandalwood box), and the nostalgia for the virile days of global imperial dominion are all esconced in the sexualized language of a virginal *impresión de entretenimiento*. What threaten to "deflower" this delicious spell are the tawdry details of everyday life that might reveal the ugly face behind the enchanting illusion offered as a gift to her by the unknown *Quioquiap*. This illusion must be protected at all cost. But

what must be protected is not the content of the illusion, for as we saw in her repeated disinterest in the scientific details of the book, Pardo Bazán is not concerned with the pragmatic details of reality in the Philippines or with debating the factuality of this or that. Rather, what must be protected is the *meaning* of the Philippines in the construction of the imperial “we.” In other words, Feced’s book occasions complex imperial fantasies in Pardo Bazán yet, those fantasies are not simple fictional escapism into an exotic landscape in order to avoid the ugly realities of the everyday. Rather, they are *complex rearticulations* of who “we” are and what “our” place in the world is. Imperial fantasies are not simply the desire for an alternative reality, but rather psychic stagings in which contradictory demands, both internal and external, are dramatized with the materials that are both immediately present in the given circumstances or can be called into play in memory and restaged. While it may not be possible to tease out all of the complexities of the fantasy occasioned by Feced’s text, it may be possible to follow a few of the more obvious strands in this knotty affair.

Some of the most obvious cords that make up this jumble of feelings that I am calling Pardo Bazán’s imperial fantasy can be identified thematically, yet to extricate them totally from the general tangle of associated ideas, desires, anxieties and pleasures would leave us with little more than a handful of useless fibers while the imperial puzzle would remain inscrutable. Coursing through this knotted fantasy is first a curious interface between the very personal act of reading and the social act of collective imagination. That is, one of the building blocks of imperial fantasy is the construction of a collective “we” which is here not only constructed in the “pact” between the narrator (Feced) and the reader (Pardo Bazán) but replicated in the review between the reviewer (Pardo Bazán) and her readers whose identity she interpellates as part of the collective “we” she imagines sharing with Feced. This “we” is, of course, a national identity but

with an imperial supplement. “We” not only know the “importantísimo diario” to which she refers (*El Liberal*) but “we” also know the nostalgia that “we” feel for a time “cuando pudimos blasonar nuestro escudo con los dos hemisferios del globo.” What is more, “we” know the pleasures of travel writing with its indulgence in the sensual *chinoiserie* and this is the kind of pleasure that Feced’s *Filipinas* offers its readers. That is, we are trained consumers of imperial travel writing and we know how to enjoy the “wealth of Egypt” through the collective fantasies offered in such texts.

But for all of the pleasures, this imperial fantasy contains some anxieties that must be forestalled for the fantasy to hold. As mentioned above, Feced must remain “unknown” so as not to “desflorar” the immaculacy of the “impresión de entretenimiento.” Allowing the mundane “reality” of Feced’s biographical information to intrude in the immaculate image of the narrator produced in the intimacy of reading would, it seems ruin everything. Similarly, Pardo Bazán’s disinterest in the scientific value of the book speaks to her desire to indulge a fantasy that is relatively free of troubling questions of truth or reality. Furthermore, the curious sexuality of this image points to a deeper anxiety in Pardo Bazán around sexuality and literature. That is, “reality” assumes a masculine sexual function that threatens to ruin the immaculate feelings that have welled up in the reader in this elaborate of this imperial fantasy and, as I will suggest below, Pardo Bazán assigns a similar gender structure to her own aesthetics of realism.

IMPERIAL FANTASY AND COLONIAL “REALISM”

My purpose in connecting Emilia Pardo Bazán’s review of Feced’s book to her views on the modernization of literature in Spain as they are outlined in *La cuestión palpitante* and other writings is not to demonstrate how her appreciation for Feced’s rendering of the colonial Philippines was of a piece with her “realist” aesthetic doctrines. On the contrary, I wish to suggest that the pleasure she derives from Feced’s book, and

from exoticist travel writing in general, marks a perceptible deviation from her realist aesthetics. But what is more important here is that, despite her professions to the contrary, the particular pleasures to be had from Feced's book derive from its ability to assuage her very real-world anxieties. To accomplish this, the colonial space must be rendered as exceptional not only in scientific terms, but in aesthetic terms as well. In this effort to describe Emilia Pardo Bazán's imperial fantasies as they relate to the Philippines, I also do not wish to single her out as exceptional. Rather, her review is a convenient example of the importance of the colony in the political imaginary of late imperial Spain and a poignant case study of what David Harvey has called the "psychodrama of progress" as it relates the "geographic imagination" that is at the heart of modern modes of representation.

The concept of fantasy as a mental faculty long predates psychoanalytic theory and has long been linked to the practice of literature and art. But the emergence of psychology generally and psychoanalysis in particular in the nineteenth century marked an attempt to apply the rigorous methodologies of observational science to the mysteries of the soul that had before been the complex domain of art, theology and philosophy. In the last half of the nineteenth century, novelists began —first in the "realist" mode and later in "naturalism"— to adapt the procedures of observational science to the art of the novel. In fact, for Pardo Bazán what is distinctively *modern* about literary procedures like Naturalism and Realism is the irruption into literary representation of the *psychological*. In the concluding chapter of *La cuestión palpitante* she asserts that,

de todos los territorios que pueden explorar el novelista realista y reflexivo, el más rico, el más variado e interesante es sin duda el psicológico, y la influencia innegable del cuerpo en el alma y viceversa, le brinda magnífico tesoro de observaciones y experimentos. (299)

As Pardo Bazán points out, it was Zola who most explicitly theorized the link between literary representation and the procedures of experimental psychology. However, quoting Zola's essay *Le Roman expérimental* (1879) Pardo Bazán rejects the radical determinism at the heart of his concept of experimental literature, which she says amounts to little more than the vulgar fatalism of Epictetus or the determinism of Luther dressed up in modern scientific garb. To counter this deterministic model of the human psyche and the literary methodology to represent it (Naturalism), Pardo Bazán turns to Catholic theology. In the Catholic dogma of the Fall and a free human will, she finds a model of the human psyche that shapes her "fomula más amplia" for realist aesthetics:

Sólo la caída de una naturaleza originariamente pura y libre puede dar la clave de esta mezcla de nobles aspiraciones y bajos instintos, de necesidades intelectuales y apetitos sensuales, de este *combate* que todos los moralistas, todos los psicólogos, todos los artistas se han complacido en sorprender, analizar y retratar. (144)

Zola's Naturalism, Pardo Bazán contends, goes to one representational extreme in attempting to see the human will as simply determined by physiological processes. Idealism goes to the other extreme by abandoning the limitations of reality to structure its narratives around sentimentalized types. Pardo Bazán's Realism takes a middle path by denying neither the meanness of human passions nor the flights of the will: "En el Realismo cabe todo, menos las exageraciones y desvaríos de dos escuelas extremas, y por precisa consecuencia, exclusivistas." (151) One of the extremes to which Zola's determinist aesthetics lead, Pardo Bazán contends, is that he finds it necessary to deny the value of lyric poetry. "Para la estética realista" by contrast, "vale tanto el poeta lírico más *subjetivo* e interior como el novelista más *objetivo*. Uno y otro dan forma artística a elementos reales." (152, original emphasis). That is, what Zola's determinism seems to stamp out, for Pardo Bazán, is what Zola himself famously called the "temperament" of the artist:

si el arte moderno exige reflexión, madurez, y cultura, el arte de todas las edades reclama principalmente la personalidad artística, lo que Zola, con frase vaga en demasía, llama el *temperamento*. Quien careciere de esa quisicosa, no pise los umbrales del templo de la belleza, porque será expulsado. (*Cuestión* 150)

But behind the apparent truth claims of Pardo Bazán's rejection of Zola's determinist Naturalism is also a vigorous defense of what Pardo Bazán considers to be a long tradition of Spanish literary realism that goes back at least as far as Cervantes. In other words, Pardo Bazán not only defends her "realist" aesthetic principles on the basis of her commitments to the Catholic dogma of free will against the "Lutheran" determinism of Zola's Naturalist "experimental literature," but she does so to revindicate the Spanish "national" literary tradition against two important threats to her literary dignity. First she inoculates herself from the charge of "afrancesamiento" by denying the primacy of French Naturalism in her aesthetic principles. And second, she puts herself on an equal footing with French cultural prestige by simultaneously "discovering" a modern literary procedure in a "traditional" national culture.

Pardo Bazán's Realist aesthetics are of particular interest because they closely parallel Freud and, later, Klein's model for fantasy. It may be possible, in fact, to trace Freud's theories of the interaction of "phantasying" the "pleasure principle" and the "reality principle" to late nineteenth century aesthetic debates. Whatever the case, literary creations for Freud bear a distinct resemblance to the psychological function of "phantasying." In his 1907 study "Creative Writing and Day-Dreaming" Freud lays out a psychological origins of artistic production. In particular, Freud searches for the "secret" to the creative writer's choice of subject matter and "how [the writer] manages to make such an impression on us with it and to arouse in us emotions of which, perhaps, we had not even thought ourselves capable." (436) To satisfy his (and our) curiosity, Freud turns, not surprisingly, to a connection with childhood. Creative writing, he suggests, bears a

relation of continuity to play in childhood and “phantasying” in adulthood. Both children at play and adults in their “phantasying” draw on the external circumstances of their lives in order to stage a wish fulfillment. In the case of the child, the wish is to be grown up and the materials of play are provided by the adult world around him or her. But the adult, Freud argues, must hide the fact that he phantasies and “he cherishes his phantasies as his most intimate possessions, and as a rule he would rather confess his misdeeds than tell anyone his phantasies.” (Freud 438). This shame associated with fantasies for Freud is linked, of course, to his repressive hypothesis and to his sense that fantasies stage in one way or another repressed wishes that in the adult who “knows that he is not to go on playing or phantasying any longer, but to act in the real world.” (438) Fantasies, Freud argues, usually fulfill two types of wishes that are no longer appropriate in the “real world” of the adult: they are usually fantasies of personal grandeur or erotic fantasies, or some combination of the two. Because these behaviors are repressed by the adult ego, their indulgence in fantasy carries with it outward shame and inward pleasure.

This repressive structure leads Freud to hypothesize the connection between fantasy and creative writing, and for Freud, the particular value of this connection lies in the fact that beside the pathologically unwell, only creative writers express their fantasies publicly. In this way, literature provides for Freud a rich source of interpretable data for understanding fantasy and his theories are strikingly similar to Pardo Bazán’s account of the historical passage of the European novel from the aesthetics of Romanticism to those of Realism. First, Freud takes as his example of the creative writer, “not the writers most highly esteemed by the critics, but the less pretentious authors of novels, romances and short stories, who nevertheless have the widest and most eager circle of readers of both sexes.” (440) We can gather from Freud’s description of this “type” of creative writer that s/he is the author of serial fictions in which “if, at the end of one chapter of my story,

I leave the hero unconscious and bleeding from severe wounds, I am sure to find him at the beginning of the next being carefully nursed and on the way to recovery.” (441) The organizing principle of these narratives is the confident invincibility of the hero who in this respect mirrors “His Majesty the Ego, the hero alike of every day-dream and of every story.” (441) In this respect, the hero-centered novel is akin to the fantasy of personal grandeur and the fact that “all the women in the novel invariably fall in love with the hero” provides the erotic variant on the wish-fulfilling fantasy. If in the romantic novel the outlines of the “egocentric” day-dream are most apparent, this model allows Freud to suggest that even more sophisticated forms of creative writing (“the ‘psychological’ novel” for example) express mediated relations to the general outlines of the pot-boiler:

We are perfectly aware that very many imaginative writings are far removed from the model of the naïve day-dream; and yet I cannot suppress the suspicion that even the most extreme derivations from that model could be linked with it through an uninterrupted series of transitional cases. It has struck me that in many of what are known as ‘psychological’ novels only one person —once again the hero— is described from within. The author sits inside his mind, as it were, and looks at the other characters from outside. (441)

One gets the impression that Freud’s idea of an “uninterrupted series of transitional cases” that separate the “naïve” pot-boiler from the “psychological” novel is a crude form of literary history that traces a trajectory from the “childish” satisfactions of the Romantic plot to the grown-up “real world” of the psychological novel. Or, as Emilia Pardo Bazán puts it, rejecting the heroic exaggerations of Hugo and Lamartine: “¡Cuán preferible es retratar un ser humano, de carne y hueso, a fantasear maniqués!” (156) Although Pardo Bazán’s Realist aesthetic, under the grown-up influence of the ‘reality principle,’ spurns the exaggerations of Idealist fantasies, it retains through its insistence on the “personalidad artística” (el *temperamento*) a connection to the interior processes of the ‘pleasure principle’ that for Freud structure the workings of fantasy. In fact, for Freud, the aesthetic mediations of “psychological” novels and other vanguard literary

procedures amount to little more than an aesthetic “fore-pleasure” which is offered to the reader as an incentive “so as to make possible the release of still greater pleasure arising from deeper psychical sources.” (443) That greater pleasure, Freud argues, is the true key to unlocking the secret pleasure of reading. It is not simply that the reader takes pleasure in the content of the fictional fantasy but also arises from the fact that reading another’s fantasy releases us from the guilt of fantasizing itself:

In my opinion, all the aesthetic pleasure which a creative writer affords us has the character of a fore-pleasure of this kind, and our actual enjoyment of an imaginative work proceeds from a liberation of tensions in our minds. It may even be that not a little of this effect is due to the writer’s enabling us thenceforward to enjoy our own day-dreams without any self-reproach or shame. (443)

Freud’s essay on Creative writing and Phantasy was written in 1907, well before he developed his theory of the drives in *Beyond the Pleasure Principle*. Consequently, his account of fantasy as fundamentally a mechanism of wish-fulfillment was open to further elaboration in light of his later writing on the existence of a ‘death-drive’ in addition to an ‘erotic’ drive. For Melanie Klein’s object theory, fantasy is not merely a mechanism for idle wish-fulfillment but rather is the primary buffer in which the psyche unconsciously constructs its relations both to “external” reality and to the “internal” reality of the instinctual drives. Rather than wish-fulfillment, fantasy, for Klein, is a defense mechanism with which the ego protects itself from the pressures exerted by external privations and internal demands. Hanah Segal in her introduction to Klein’s theory explained this relationship:

Since phantasy aims at fulfilling instinctual drives, irrespective of external reality, gratification derived from phantasy can be regarded as a defence against the external reality of deprivation. It is, however, more than that: it is also a defence against *internal* reality. The individual, producing a phantasy of wish-fulfillment, is not only avoiding frustration and the recognition of an unpleasant external reality, he is also, which is even more important, defending himself against the reality of his own hunger and anger —his internal reality. Phantasies, moreover, may be used as defences against other phantasies. Typical of these are the manic

phantasies, whose main purpose is to ward off underlying depressive phantasies.
(Segal 16)

These defense mechanisms, which include in Klein's theory introjection, projection, repression, and splitting, are experienced as fantasies in which the "objects" of the external world meaningfully interact with the instinctual drives. And unlike Freud's model of fantasy, for Klein (and Hanna Segal), fantasy does not develop as a consequence of the workings of the 'reality principle' on the formation of conscious thinking, but rather is a kind of primitive 'thinking.' That is,

The reality principle, we know, is but the pleasure principle modified by reality testing. Thinking could be viewed as a modification of unconscious phantasy, a modification brought about by reality testing. The richness, depth and accuracy of a person's thinking will depend on the quality and malleability of his unconscious phantasy life and his capacity to subject it to reality testing. (Segal 23)

In Klein's elaboration of Freud's theory of fantasy we can find a homologue to Pardo Bazán's "mezcla de nobles aspiraciones y bajos instintos, de necesidades intelectuales y apetitos sensuales, de este *combate* que todos los moralistas, todos los psicólogos, todos los artistas se han complacido en sorprender, analizar y retratar." But what is even more important about the connection between the psychoanalytic concept of fantasy and Pardo Bazán's realist aesthetics is that both of them employ a developmental model from naive "childish" fantasies to mature "realist" thought without severing the one from the other. It is along this continuum of progress —whether psychically or aesthetically that we can find echoes of the "psychodrama" of progress that structured the geographic imaginary of modernity in the nineteenth century and shaped to a certain degree Pardo Bazán's readerly enjoyment of Pablo Feced's travel narrative about the Philippines.

But if Pardo Bazán insists on considering Feced's book "únicamente como amenísimo libro de viajes," how did her aesthetic principles change in the case of

imperial travel literature. That is, what is the “imperial” component of our concept of “imperial fantasy”? To answer these questions I will return to Pardo Bazán’s theories of Realist aesthetics outlined in her *La cuestión palpitante* (1882) since there, the legacy of imperialism makes a symptomatic appearance and reveals the importance of the historicized continuum between the “naive” fantasies of romantic idealism and the “mature” thought of Realism.

At the beginning of the second chapter—the section of the book where she begins in earnest to theorize the meaning of *Naturalismo* and *Realismo*—Pardo Bazán alerts us to the fact that neither term can be found in the Dictionary of the Spanish Royal Academy. This absence, it seems, is symptomatic not only of the lack of any established agreement on their meaning in the field of literature, but also highlights the fact that in Spain, these terms bear within them no cultural memory. But what is in the dictionary, Pardo Bazán wryly points out, are a lot of words of dubious utility that bear out the historical construction of the Spanish language in contact with its empire:

Por supuesto que el Diccionario de la Lengua Castellana (que tiene el don de omitir las palabras más usuales y corrientes del lenguaje intelectual, y traer en cambio otras como *of*, *chincate*, *songuita*, etc., que sólo habiendo nacido hace seis siglos, o en Filipinas, o en Cuba, tendríamos ocasión de emplear), carece de los vocablos *Naturalismo* y *Realismo*. (*Cuestión* 141)

That the Dictionary enshrines linguistic atavisms (“habiendo nacido hace seis siglos”) and odd-ball words from the margins of the empire, while excluding “las palabras más usuales y corrientes del lenguaje intelectual” is for Pardo Bazán symptomatic of the state of Spanish letters. But what it reveals in Pardo Bazán’s ironic comment is a sense that the imperial periphery could not be one and same with the “lenguaje intelectual,” that is lamentably missing from the Dictionary. The quaintness of such oddities as *chincate* or *songuita* is offered as a superficial joke to make a serious point. But, it turns out, that the imperial periphery is not only excluded from participation in the “lenguaje intelectual”

but the aesthetic procedures that pertain to it are decidedly more primitive than those espoused in Pardo Bazán's theory of aesthetic Realism.

For example, in the historic progression from the naive representational practices of Idealism to Realism, for Pardo Bazán, modern (Realist) novels distinguished themselves from the representational procedures of *Idealismo* in the abandonment of the aesthetic strategy of *lo pintoresco*. Her example for this transformation is the literary career of Benito Pérez Galdós, who although he started as an "idealist" in his *Episodios nacionales* and his *novelas de tesis* such as *Doña Perfecta* or *La familia de León Roch*, "Galdós retrocedió para huir de ese callejón sin salida, y en *El amigo Manso* y en *La desheredada* comprendió que la novela hoy, más que enseñar o condenar estos o aquellos ideales políticos, ha de tomar nota de la verdad ambiente y realizar con libertad y desembarazo la hermosura." (293). Galdós's passage from Idealism to Realism/Naturalism meant abandoning the picturesque fantasies and stock types of Idealist aesthetics for "la tierra que pisamos":

[Galdós] se halló siempre dispuesto a pasarse al Naturalismo con armas y bagajes; pero sus inclinaciones estéticas eran idealistas, y sólo en sus últimas obras ha adoptado el método de la novela moderna y ahondando más y más en el corazón humano, y roto de una vez con lo pintoresco y con los personajes representativos para abrazarse a la tierra que pisamos. (*Cuestión 292*)

But when it comes to fiction set in the past or in (now) colonial spaces such as Flaubert's *Salammbo*, the connection to the "tierra que pisamos" becomes decidedly more tenuous. That is, while on the one hand, Pardo Bazán declares that "*Salambona* es en su género un estudio tan realista como *Madama Bovary*," at the same time she makes it clear that the claims of a scientifically rigorous reproduction of the past is not necessarily conducive to the producing the desired literary effect:

Prescindamos de la infatigable erudición que desplegó Flaubert para pintar la ciudad africana, de su viaje a las costas cartaginesas, de su esmero en revolver autores griegos y latinos; también lo hace Ebers, y mejor y más sólidamente; pero

por eso no son menos soporíferas sus novelas. Lo que importa en obras como *Salambona*, no es que los pormenores científicos sean incuestionablemente exactos, sino que la reconstrucción de la época, costumbres, personajes, sociedad y naturaleza no parezca artificiosa y que el autor, permaneciendo sabio, se muestre artista; que en todo haya vida y unidad, y que ese mundo exhumado de entre el polvo de los siglos se nos figure real, aunque extraño y distinto del nuestro; que no produzca la misma impresión de verdad que causa el jeroglífico al descifrarlo un egiptólogo, o el fósil al completarlo un eminente naturalista, y que si no podemos decir con certeza absoluta «así era Cartago», pensamos al menos que Cartago *pudo* ser así. (*Cuestión* 217)

Besides the clear suspension of the Realist charge to describe “la tierra que pisamos,” the literary “reconstrucción de la época” requires a *costumbrista* sleight of hand so that the “costumbres, personajes, sociedad y naturaleza no parezca artificiosa y que el autor, permaneciendo sabio, se muestre artista.” It doesn’t matter if the Carthage of the novel is rigorously true to life but rather “que ese mundo exhumado de entre el polvo de los siglos se *nos* figure real, *aunque extraño y distinto del nuestro.*” The point here is not that Pardo Bazán abandons her Realist principles when it came to historical fictions or colonial travel narratives. Rather, that such writing required a less rigorous adherence to the “mature” representational practices of literary Realism and allowed a decidedly heavier emphasis on the work of a more naïve form of representational fantasies. Furthermore, what is revealed in this passage is not only that that re-presented past *seem* real, but that it seem real to *us* eventhough it is *strange* and *different* from *our* world. In other words, what Pardo Bazán criticized in Galdós’s early fiction —his propensity to reproduce *lo pintoresco* and *personajes representativos*— in Flaubert is not only pardonable but a positive virtue in his reconstruction of the period and customs of a long vanished Carthage. To put this another way, because Carthage is not “tierra que pisamos,” the rules of aesthetic realism are much more flexible than when a novel attempts to re-present contemporary reality. That is, it is a question of the distance between the place represented —whether displaced in time or space (or both)— and the

place in which *we* read. In this *we* Pardo Bazán clearly evokes a morally unified (European) community of readers for whom the fantasy of a revived Carthage could seem real.

A similar flexibility is detectable in Pardo Bazán's enthusiasm for the French travel writer Pierre Loti (Julien Viaud) who as a French naval officer participated in colonial campaigns in Japan, Tonkin and Senegal, and traveled to Tahiti, Turkey and Egypt. His travel narratives were immensely popular and his neo-Romantic eroticization of exotic (colonial) spaces was very influential in turn of the century travel writing. In an article dedicated to Loti in her *Nuevo Teatro Crítico*, Pardo Bazán suggested that Loti's Japan need not be objectively true to life, but rather reflect the interior reality of his *temperamento*:

Además, no falta quien interpreta mal esa parte subjetiva, esas páginas en que el escritor ve «a través de su temperamento» la comarca. El Japón de Pedro Loti, por ejemplo; aquellas musmés semejantes a muñecas de marfil; aquellos niños en caricatura; aquel colorido extraño; aquel mundo de laca y porcelana..., no se encuentran, claro está, ni en el Baedeker, ni siquiera en Eliseo Reclus. Son un Japón que pertenece a Loti: tan suyo como de Teniers los clásicos Fumadores, y de Goya las endiabladas imágenes de los Caprichos. No todo que va al Japón puede verlo por los ojos de Loti. (OC 3:1400)

Japan, it seems, can be possessed capriciously by the eyes of Loti and presented as a collection of *japonerías* (“aquellas *musmés* semejantes a muñecas de marfil; aquellos niños en caricatura; aquel colorido extraño; aquel mundo de laca y porcelana”) to a curious reader. What makes this possession possible and desirable, however, is the condition of distance from the community of readers to whom the text offers its rare pleasures: *aquellas musmés*, *aquellos niños*, *aquel colorido*, *aquel mundo*. In the far off regions of Japan, the elements that make up its society can be “muñecas de marfil” or “niños en caricatura” because *we* can't know any different. In fact, *aquel mundo* must seem a figment of the excited fantasy of the author to a reader to whom everything in it

seems far off and strange. So, one component of imperial fantasy that I have tried to show in the previous examples is the observable aesthetic regression from the “adult” procedures of literary realism practiced in Europe, with its focus on psychological representational procedures, toward more naïve forms of representational fantasy when the representation concerns distant lands.

But imperial fantasy is much more than aesthetic procedures, for those are merely observable expressions of the logic of its mechanisms. If Freud identified fantasy as a wish-fulfillment, imperial fantasy certainly satisfies this basic requirement by making the imperial periphery into a landscape in which fantasies of grandeur and erotic fantasies are given full rein. But Melanie Klein’s theory of fantasy as a psychic defense mechanism—even in its manifestation as wish-fulfillment— against the psychic threats presented by both the *external* and *internal* realities allows us to perceive imperial fantasy as a more complex economy that manages —through the mechanisms of projection and introjection, repression and splitting— the complex stimuli of external conditions and internal impulses. That is, Klein’s object theory allows us to speculate that geographical “objects” such as “España,” “Francia,” or “Filipinas,” or complex historical concepts such as “Modernity,” “Realism,” or “Art” are, in the narrative scripting of imperial fantasy, subject to the defensive strategies of introjection, projection, repression and splitting in order to manage through defensive wish-fulfillment, the complex and contradictory emotions that any of these “objects” presents to the collective imperial psyche. By “collective imperial psyche” I am referring to nothing more than that unproblematic “we” to which Pardo Bazán refers in the texts above and to whom Flaubert’s *Salambo* or Pierre Loti’s texts can seem to unproblematically address. This “we” is the imperial subject which is both an individual psyche and a collective identity

whose personality is the product of the interaction of both complex external (historical) and complex internal (psychological) processes.

To take a simple example as a way of proceeding toward a complex of associated ideas, let me suggest that one of the primordial “objects” in the structuring of Pardo Bazán’s imperial fantasy is “España”. In Kleinian object theory, the introjection of primordial object of “the mother” precedes first as partial objects—which allow for contradictory feelings of love and aggression to “split” the external object into separate introjected objects (“the ideal and the persecutory breasts”)—and then whole objects (“the mother”). This occurs not only through a complex process of reality testing but also as projections of internal drives (aggression, eros) interact in a fantasy of that object and internal emotional realities. This is in turn available for the further strategies of splitting and repression that allow the psyche to accommodate the contradictions of internal drives and external stimuli in a manageable unconscious fantasy of “reality” that tends increasingly toward conscious thought. But in this progression from the unbridled workings of fantasy toward the conscious processes of thought, Hanna Segal explains that “the earlier the introjection, the more fantastic are the objects introjected and the more distorted by what has been projected into them” (20). If, then, we take “España” as a primordial object onto which the collective psyche constructs its fantasies, much as the “mother” is the primordial object of the individual psyche in the Kleinian theory, we can see that the psychic object “España” (“la madre común”) is subjected to the “more distorted” processes of introjection first as partial objects such as one’s home town (“la patria chica”), and later as a whole object (“la patria grande”). Internal feelings of aggression and love are projected onto a split “España”—and here one thinks of the durability of the notion of “las dos Españas” in which contradictory feelings about the nation could be projected onto competing “Españas” conceived as separate internalized

objects. But, of course, the complex introjection of the “nation” object into the collective psyche is neither static nor singular, for into that same collective psyche (Pardo Bazán’s readerly “we”) are introjected other psychic objects that are also subjected to the complex mechanisms of fantasy projections, splitting and repressions. Furthermore, as Hanna Segal points out, not all “objects” express the same relation to the “ego”:

With some objects, the ego identifies —introjective identification. They become assimilated into the ego and they contribute to its growth and characteristics. Others remain as separate internal objects and the ego maintains a relationship with them (the super-ego being such an object). The internal objects are also felt to be in relationship with one another; for instance, the internal persecutors are experienced as attacking the ideal object as well as the ego. Thus, a complex world is built up. The structure of the personality is largely determined by the more permanent of the phantasies which the ego has about itself and the objects that it contains. (Segal 20)

This “complex world” of the collective imperial psyche includes objects with which it identifies in complex ways (“España,” “La Iglesia,” “Europa,” “Filipinas,” “letras patrias”) and objects which remain separate from but related to the ego and the other objects it contains (“Francia,” “Naturalismo,” “Africa,” “modernity”). Like the primordial objects such as “España,” objects introjected into the psyche later are also subject to the mechanisms of fantasy but, one presumes, at a level more tempered by the processes of the “reality principle.” If this is so, we might suspect that with the sudden appearance of the Pacific colonies into the metropolitan consciousness (especially after 1885), Spanish collective perceptions of the “meaning” of those colonies would be quite down-to-earth. But, of course, exactly the opposite was true as was apparent in rowdy popular manifestations and in the superpatriotism that these events elicited in Spain’s intellectual circles.

LA INTEGRIDAD NACIONAL EN...

A step toward understanding the emotional power of imperial feelings of the late nineteenth century in Spain is to recall another important element in Freud's sense for the structure of fantasy: time. Freud explained that fantasies have a tripartite temporal structure. That is, the content of fantasies is not stereotypical or invariable, but rather "they fit themselves in to the subjects's shifting impressions of life, change with every change in his situation, and receive from every fresh active impression what might be called a 'date-mark.'" ("Creative Writers" 439) This 'date-mark' links the fantasy not only to present circumstances, but also to a past memory and a projected future:

Mental work is linked to some current impression, some provoking occasion in the present which has been able to arouse one of the subject's major wishes. From there it harks back to a memory of an earlier experience (usually an infantile one) in which this wish was fulfilled; and it now creates a situation relating to the future which represents a fulfillment of the wish. What it thus creates is a day-dream or phantasy, which carries about it traces of its origin from the occasion which provoked it and from the memory. Thus past, present and future are strung together, as it were, on the thread of the wish that runs through them. (439)

Taking the temporal structure of fantasy outlined by Freud and connecting it to the relations between mental objects proposed by Klein, we can get a sense for the intensity of imperial fantasies about the Philippines in the last decades of the nineteenth century. This intensity with which the present circumstances (German territorial claims on the Carolinas, the *Exposición Filipina*, and the presence of a "media docena de mestizos" writing in the Peninsula) were linked to the powerful "childhood" fantasies about the nature of the primordial psychic object ("España"), and all of the ways that these new circumstances could be arrayed in the collective fantasy are forestalled as threats in a pleasant future. That is, because mental objects like "Filipinas" or "Cuba" were contradictorily related to the primordial (and idealized) "España" as "la madre común" the threat of their loss was felt not only as an attack (from whatever quarter) on the

collective “we,” but on the idealized “España” itself. This is why in the late nineteenth century, the notion of “la integridad nacional en Cuba...Filipinas...Puerto Rico” was, despite its patent contradictions, such a deeply felt necessity in the metropole.

José Martí made the connection between the emotional power of the fantasy of “la integridad del territorio” and the geographic and historical absurdities of such a notion in his 1873 open letter to the new Spanish Republic when he argued ironically:

Y se habla de integridad del territorio. –El Océano Atlántico destruye este ridículo argumento. A los que así abusan del patriotismo del pueblo, a los que así le arrastran y le engañan, manos enemigas pudieran señalarle un punto inglés, manos severas la Florida, manos necias la vasta Lusitania. (24)

The importance of Martí’s counter-argument to the metropolitan desire to preserve the “integridad del territorio” is not simply that he contradicts it but the manner in which he does so. Martí is not content with saying that the Atlantic Ocean divides Spain from Cuba but he points to the deeply felt power of the notion itself and to those who use the power of that feeling for their own purposes. In other words, the “ridículo argumento” of “la integridad del territorio” is not a rational argument but an emotional manipulation that cannot be simply countered with common-sensical indications such as the geographical reality of the interposition of the Atlantic Ocean. Rather, it must be countered by enhancing the paranoia that engendered the fantasy of “la integridad nacional en Cuba” in the first place by pointing to a series of traumatic losses of territory more “integral” to the *patria*: Gibraltar (“un punto inglés”); Florida (sacrificed in 1763 to the English in a swap to recover Havana and Manila both captured by the English in the Seven Years’ War, Florida was recovered and then incrementally ceded to the United States in the 1820s without a fight); and Portugal (“la vasta Lusitania”).

If the paranoid fears about the loss of “la integridad nacional” structured how metropolitan Spaniards felt toward the imperial periphery, anti-imperial writers like

Martí, Hostos and Rizal exploited those fears in order to renegotiate relations of power with the metropole. Feced's text, on the other hand strenuously worked to calm those fears and offer an optimistic vision of the imperial future by radicalizing the nature of the relationship with scientific discourses of European superiority. This vision of the meaning of the Philippines, it seems was just what Pardo Bazán needed to feel better about a place that was increasingly producing imperial anxieties:

su mérito especial y propio consiste en esa impregnación de la atmósfera de un país (don que posee en tan alto grado el célebre Pedro Loti, y en que *la imaginación lúcida y fresca toma mucha parte*); en evocar de ese país *una imagen pintoresca y viva*, que podemos concretar, y *que nos calma*, en cierto modo, la *exitación de la fantasía* cuando *aspiramos a representarnos comarcas que nunca vieron los ojos*. Después de leer a *Quiquiap*, el *enigma que encierra Filipinas*, como todo país encierra el suyo, *parece aclararse*. ("La España remota" 79-80 my emphasis)

In this passage the paradox that inheres in the expression "la integridad nacional en Filipinas" reveals to a certain degree its geographically inflected psychology. For the pleasure mechanisms to work, Filipinas must be "other" ("ese país" "comarcas que nunca vieron los ojos") to the readerly "we" ("que *podemos* concretar, y que *nos calma*" etc.). But this otherness makes a claim on the readerly imagination in the form of a preexisting *enigma* that demands resolution; namely how is "ese país" simultaneously "other" and "we"? In answering this question this passage vacillates between a cosmopolitan analogy and an imperial claim; on the one hand the "enigma" of the Philippines is no different than the enigma that surrounds any "foreign" place ("como todo país encierra el suyo"). But on the other hand, all "distant lands" do not excite the imagination in the same way. In the first lines of the review, Pardo Bazán points out that Philippine affairs are "asuntos que tanto nos interesan, ó que tanto debieran interesarnos por lo menos." (75). What is the source of this "interés" if not the need to safeguard the fantasies that connect "Filipinas" to primordial object relations associated with "España"

that layer fantasies of grandeur on top of erotic fantasies in an intricate network of associated ideas and feelings?

Her evocation of Pierre Loti in this passage is a kind of node on which the diverse facets of Pardo Bazán's wish-fulfilling fantasy of the "reality" of the Philippines assumes the shape of a complex defense mechanism to ward off both inward and outward threats to the idealized object "España." First, it points to the special "interest" that the colonial Philippines represented to the metropolitan "we" implied in Pardo Bazán's text. In other words, it points out the importance of the cosmopolitan gesture, meaning that the Philippines is not (or should not be) just any "distant land" for a metropolitan Spanish reader. Rather it is *our* distant land. The interest that such a reader might have in such exotic places as Tahiti, Tonkin or Senegal, are not the same as Loti (or a French metropolitan reader) would have. Rather, the interest that a Spanish metropolitan reader has (or should have) in the Philippines is *analogous* to that of the French (or English, Dutch, German, etc) toward their own particular "distant lands." To have in Feced a Spanish Pierre Loti means to join the "concert of (colonizing) nations."

But Pierre Loti's evocation in this passage points to another important source of metropolitan "interest" (i.e. anxiety) regarding the Philippines that is also related to the question of "integridad nacional en Filipinas." Inhering in the word "integridad" is a complex jumble of associated ideas and concerns. I have just suggested that the colonial exceptionalism —its "otherness"— is supplemental to the national "we" and thereby secures its "wholeness" by virtue of its difference and sameness. If the Philippines exists as a "colony" then "we" must exist as a "nation" that has colonized it. In this sense the "Spanish" Philippines makes Spain a whole like "French" Algeria or "British" India do their respective metropolises. In other words, in the last decades of the nineteenth century, the remaining colonies were integral to the national "we," and their impending loss

elicited powerful fantasies of defending the homeland. It is for this reason that the memory of the Napoleonic invasion and the successful defense of the homeland was constantly evoked in the literature of the Restoration and plays a prominent role in Pardo Bazán's enthusiasm for Feced's description of the Philippines.

But "integridad nacional en Filipinas" carries with it the etymological implications of being *(un)touched*, and with this a complex of sexual overtones and moral anxieties regarding national honor and probity. The "integridad" (i.e. virginity) of the nation is, of course linked ideationally to that other metaphor for national honor that took Spain to war in Africa in 1859 and was repeatedly evoked in the Cuban and Joloan campaigns and most recently, (in 1885) had been the rallying call to defend the Spanish claim to the Carolina Islands under the guns of a German warship: "el pabellón inmaculado." Here again, the presence of Pierre Loti —the traveling seducer par excellence— evokes precisely the threat of other colonial seducers roaming the High Seas in search of easy conquests. In this context we might take the title of José Rizal's first novel *Noli me tângere* ("Touch me not"), which taken from the Gospel of John and spoken by Jesus to Mary Madalene after his resurrection, might be taken as a complex gloss on "la integridad nacional en Filipinas" in all of its fantasies of wholeness, purity and immaculacy, as well as its paranoid sensitivities.

A final connection to Pierre Loti and the "integridad nacional en Filipinas" presents itself. Loti's travel narratives are stories of impossible colonial love in which the languid pleasures of love in the tropics (Tahiti) or the Orient (China, Istanbul) are at odds with the traveler's modern (i.e. commercial or military) duties. But the spell of the colonial idyll ruins the modern man who only spends his time pining for his forsaken love. Loti then, here recalls the problem of colonial erotics and its uncertain consequences for the identity of the national "we". Loti's erotic tales thematize the

problem of “going native,” miscegenation, *aplatanamiento*, etc. that threatened the “integridad nacional en Filipinas” not only politically with the emergence of a mestizo class of uncertain political affiliations, but also with a tergiversation of the *paternal* authority of the colonial order. To eroticize the colonial is to turn away, as Loti does repeatedly, from the “virile” symbolic order of modernity and progress in order to adopt a simpering cultural neurosis. As Emilia Pardo Bazán is at pains to point out in an article dedicated to Loti in the *Nuevo Teatro Crítico* in July of 1892, Loti’s version of colonial travel literature is part of a distinctively feminine turn in French literature.

En mi sentir, la literatura francesa novísima se está afeminando de un modo evidente. Ha vuelto al lirismo, a la *morbidezza*, al toque fino, a las neurosis suaves, empapadas en lágrimas; a las menudencias y cominerías del sentimiento y de la forma, al país de abanico, a Watteau y a Lancret. (“Ojeada” 1061)

For Pardo Bazán this new lyricism was deeply troubling for it represented a turning away from the progressive impulse of post-Romantic realism on which she had based her own literary principles which she had set out in *La cuestión palpitante*. That is, it troubled her basic conviction that modern literature was evolutive in nature and it was her observation that what passed now in the most fashionable literary circles as “modern” seemed somehow aesthetically and sentimentally regressive:

A mí la cosa me da mucho en qué pensar, por ciertas contradicciones que suscita en mi sentido estético. [...] Mas sin duda que en literatura mi instinto femenino se repliega y esconde, puesto que esta nueva escuela transpirenaica, visiblemente inspirada en las tradiciones de la pintura y de la indumentaria Luis XV, no acaba de satisfacerme, ni me parece progreso y evolución, sino retroceso y aminoración del período literario que siguió al Romanticismo. (1061)

Laden with contradictions and ironic anxieties, what is remarkable about this passage is its very earnestness. The usually playful Pardo Bazán confesses her anxiety about the contradiction that this aesthetic gender confusion has caused her.

In this passage, the contradictory meaning of “Pierre Loti” for Pardo Bazán’s realist aesthetic principles helps us relate the function of imperial fantasies to the

“calming” of the anxieties produced by the psychodrama of progress. To put this directly, when Pardo Bazán compares Pablo Feced’s representational practices to those of Pierre Loti, this connection at the conscious level is a clear compliment. Pierre Loti is at the time the most important stylist of travel fiction in Europe and she means to flatter, one supposes, the unknown Feced. Yet, as the above passage demonstrates, her enthusiasm for Loti’s aesthetic principles is mixed with misgivings about its relation to her own commitments to aesthetic realism as a more “mature” (i.e. “masculine”) way of representing the world than that of Romanticism. In short, Loti’s “feminine” aesthetics are *regressive* (“no acaba de satisfacerme, ni me parece progreso y evolución, sino retroceso y aminoración del período literario que siguió al Romanticismo”) and therefore cause in Pardo Bazán anxieties about what “modern” literature is.

Curiously, this anxiety is expressed in a repressive reversal in which the feeling elicited by —significantly perhaps— “la cosa” gives her much to think about, since it elicits certain contradictions in her “sentido estético.” That is, her “personalidad artística” (her *temperamento*) is perturbed by the “feminization” of art in the vanguard aesthetics of Loti. If she had set out the procedures of realism along a combination, a *combate* between reflexive thought and “personalidad artística” (“si el arte moderno exige reflexión, madurez, y cultura, el arte de todas las edades reclama principalmente la personalidad artística, lo que Zola, con frase vaga en demasía, llama el *temperamento*. Quien careciere de esa quisicosa, no pise los umbrales del templo de la belleza, porque será expulsado.”) here Loti’s feminine “personalidad artística” elicits in her a masculine anxiety: “en literatura mi instinto femenino se repliega y esconde.”

Pardo Bazán assuages her own anxieties of this new literary sexuality specifically as it relates to Loti’s colonial conquests. If Loti’s literary orientations are a bit cockeyed, as Pardo Bazán reassures us, he straightens things out in the end:

Loti va a cada país buscando una mujer, no por capricho de libertinaje, sino por curiosidad analítica, pues si indudablemente las latitudes modifican la forma de los cuerpos, las facciones del rostro, el color de pelo, de los ojos y de la tez, aún establecen mayores diferencias en el sentir y el pensar, y eso es lo que enciende la curiosidad de Loti y subyuga su fantasía. ¿Qué hay de verdad en sus relaciones amoroso-trashumantes? A luengas tierras, luengas mentiras... Que nos lo cuente bien, y es todo cuanto le pedimos. Y a la verdad, lo cuenta de perlas. (1063)

Loti, as I have been suggesting, marks a complex anxiety in Pardo Bazán's description of the "special merit" of Feced's book on the colonial Philippines. Loti's association with the Parisian literary vanguard gives him a special literary authority that is undermined by her sense of its feminization of literary taste that marks a devolutionary direction in relation to post-Romantic literature. This feminine orientation to the colonial space in Loti is further thematized in "esa impregnación de la atmósfera de un país" which leads him to pursue those differences in feeling and thinking that "enciende su curiosidad y subyuga su fantasía." Feced's book, if it is also "impregnated" with the atmosphere of the Philippines, Pardo Bazán quickly resolves the ambiguities and sexual anxieties by giving Feced's book the decidedly more masculine and reassuring role of evoking "de ese país una imagen *pintoresca* y viva, que podemos concretar, y que nos calma, en cierto modo, la excitación de la fantasía cuando aspiramos a representarnos comarcas que nunca vieron los ojos." (my emphasis) That is, the very procedure which she condemned in Galdós's idealist tendencies, is in Feced's colonial realism entirely calming to a fantasy excited by the threatening circumstances of imperial interlopers like Germany or "una media docena de mestizos [... que] capitanea desde Bohemia un extranjero." Pardo Bazán gets her revenge on the "foreigner" Blumentritt by siding with Barrantes and implicitly dismisses the intellectual production of that "media docena de mestizos."

The image that Feced evokes in his *Filipinas*, at least in Pardo Bazán's reading, is reassuring on all counts. Feced's *Filipinas* strictly maintain the "otherness" of the Philippines as absolute thereby containing the assimilationist threat indefinitely.

Similarly, the difficulty posed by colonial sexuality to that difference is doubly safeguarded. First, Feced himself is meticulous in his sublimation of the erotic component of his colonialist fantasy. Whenever the occasion presents itself, colonial sexuality is downplayed and the attractiveness of the native Filipinas is defused by gestures of cultural chauvinism. In a typical scene, Feced describes a ‘Soiree’ given at the house of one of the local Principales (Capitana Honorata Séneca, viuda de Dalmacio de Austria). The party is announced in a letter written to the local priest (Padre Facundo) inviting him (and “ese señor español”) to attend the dinner and dance. Feced is surprised that the priest is invited to the dance and asks, “¿c”omo se atreven á invitar á un baile á persona revestida de hábito y carácter?...” To which Padre Facundo responds,

—¡Ta! ¡ta! Pero hombre, no diga V. tonterías. ¿Pues qué, es esto Europa? ¿No sabe que aquí estamos casi en los antípodas y porque estamos en los antípodas todo es aquí al revés? Al fraile á veces no se le avisa para un funeral; allá se las arreglan con el coadjutor indio; pero á un baile y una cena, sí. [...] Mas no vaya á creerse que un baile aquí es como allá. No señor, aquí el baile es gimnasia, es ejercicio; ostentación de mangas bordadas, dijes y perendengues, y es pasatiempo formal y hasta grave y serio. Nada de galanteos, arrumacos y carantoñas. El dios Cupido tiene muy poco que hacer en un baile de naturales. Y porque es así y por tener este carácter y temperamento, toman parte en él hasta los viejos setentones, y es claro que, por todo esto y otras razones más, nosotros asistimos, sobre todo por su inocencia casi infantil, as esas fiestas domésticas[...] la razón de todo esto estará en la condición peculiar des estas gentes, en la escasa cantidad de hombre que habita estos cuerpos edebles” (Feced, *Filipinas* 86-7)

This truncated sexuality is sublimated in his quasi erotic attachment to the natural beauty (and economic potential) of the “virgin” landscape:

¡Y qué riberas tan espléndidas! ¡Cuánto abacá, cuánto café y cuánto cacao podría salir de estas faldas y collados, si la virgen fertilidad tuviera a su lado á su esposo el trabajo! Esta doncellez triste es la que no ven los que allá desde España entonan himnos á la producción filipina, á la riqueza agrícola de estas comarcas. (252-3)

By contrast to his lust for the virgin landscape, when Feced is faced with the two young daughters of the host he turns the stock erotic description of their young bodies into an exercise in disillusion:

Dos niñas, de diez y seis y diez y ocho años, tipos de su raza. Negra y abundante cabellera, coronando un rostro deprimido; nariz hundida en la raíz y de ancho y ampuloso remate; labios salientes y sin carmín; la color de castaña y el cuerpo escurrido y anguloso. Ausencia total de la línea curva, la línea de la belleza; la recta dominando todo el conjunto, hasta en el seno, deprimido é inerte como tabla y hasta en las caderas escasas y diminutas. (90)

If Feced truncates the erotic element of fantasy, what he in turn indulges without reserve is the fantasy of grandeur that the colonial order provides a *castila* like himself:

¡Con qué aire de superioridad mira á sus hermanos de raza el indio que ha logrado del español trato y comunicación, y la aceptación de sus obsequios y finezas! Es el niño que se pavonea al lado de hombre de importancia y poder. Por esto, cuando el carruaje embocó una calle, vióse desaparecer rápidamente á los que llenaban las ventanas de la casa de la fiesta; la musiquilla cortó en seco una habanera, y distintamente llegó hasta nosotros la voz de alarma: ¡el padre y el *castila*! ¡el padre y el *castila*! (88)

If for Pardo Bazán, Feced's narrative elicits in her a connection to the exotic eroticism of Loti, the troubling prospect of erotic desire between "us" and "our" *lejanas tierras* is comfortingly whisked away by Feced in a fantasy of "our" grandeur (as castilas) and in a sublimated fantasy of civilized work. For just as Feced sublimates his own sexuality and the threat of miscegenation into a "civilizing" lust for the marriage of the virgin landscape and "her husband" work, Pardo Bazán particularly enjoys the repressed "paternal" sexuality of Padre Facundo in the punishing crack of his bejuco whip on the soulless bodies of servile *indios*:

Aquel clima disolvente, aquellos indígenas malayos, reducidos por la naturaleza a eterna infancia, pedigüenos, trapaceros, serviles, cándidos a su modo, no admiten más dirección que el bejuco del P. Facundo, admirable organización, enérgica y tosca, de colonizador y de padre material, allí donde *no hay espíritu sobre que la paternidad se ejerza*. (80)

And now to a final anxiety which Feced's narrative seems to conveniently solve: the question of the "masculinity" of Filipinos. I would like to suggest that Pardo Bazán's acute pleasure in Feced's vision of the Philippines, the reason that this vision "nos calma"—that is calms her insofar as she can imagine herself as part of an imperial/national

“we”— by giving an image of the Philippines that may not be exact, but to which “we” can say with confidence, “así *puede* ser Filipinas,” is because it addresses the distressing circumstances with the prospect of a bright future. In particular, it offers a vision of a static meaning of the Philippines when so much was in flux. The colonial space where “we” know who we are in contradistinction to them, where “we” are *castila* with all of its exaggerated grandeur and childish seriousness, reminds “us” what empire is all about when that imperial dominion is more precarious than ever. This is why, at the end of her review, Pardo Bazán take such pleasure in the symbolic emasculation of the Filipino. And it is not difficult to suppose that her desired emasculation of the “indígena malayo” is related to the fact that in her review she has systematically repressed the presence of “virile” Filipino intellectuals participating in the “we” that her community of readers means to preclude. Just as nature can be counted on to keep these “indígenas malayos” in a state of perpetual infancy, Spanish worries over the threats to the “integridad nacional en Filipinas” could be comfortably allayed. Furthermore, nature herself permanently emasculates those “indígenas” with her torrid embrace:

¡Qué lucha tan desigual la del hombre con la naturaleza de semejantes países! Ella le envuelve, le estrecha, se le infiltra, le roba toda acción y toda resolución; en vano el indígena busca el agua y menudea el baño, tratando de tonificarse; la relajación de la fibra y la secreción perpetua de la piel resisten á toda hidroterapia y a todas las fricciones imaginables; enervado y vencido, el hombre se entrega á una lasitud perezosa, languidez infinita, que para el infeliz *bago*, el recién llegado europeo, son preludio del *aplatanamiento* final. (80)

It seems, the Realist aesthetic that Pardo Bazán proposes for her project of modernizing literary Spain is not germane to the Philippines, since there “la naturaleza” is not “fallen” and the spiritual *combate* that describes the soul has been inverted in the “antípodas” of Europe. That is, if in Europe,

Sólo la caída de una naturaleza originariamente pura y libre puede dar la clave de esta mezcla de nobles aspiraciones y bajos instintos, de necesidades intelectuales y apetitos sensuales, de este *combate* que todos los moralistas, todos los

psicólogos, todos los artistas se han complacido en sorprender, analizar y retratar.
(144)

In the Philippines, there are neither “necesidades intelectuales” nor “apetitos sensuales” and the paternal authority of Spanish dominion is a “paternidad material” since “allí donde *no hay espíritu sobre que la paternidad se ejerza.*”

In this image of the final and absolute “relajación de la fibra” (i.e. colonial emasculation) we find the operative motif behind the patriotism of the imperial fantasy that underwrote the colonial battlecry “la integridad nacional en Filipinas”. The colonial anxieties had to be assuaged at all costs and even the slightest provocation produced the most ferocious reactions. Behind this impulse to emasculate the “indígenas” of the Philippines lie the perceptible emergence of Filipino masculinities in Spanish metropolitan society. The “we” projected by Emilia Pardo Bazán onto her community of readers did not correspond to her actual readers, and the strategies of symbolic emasculation that underwrite her imperial fantasy provoked some rather virile responses from that “media docena de mestizos [... que] capitanea desde Bohemia un extranjero.”

Afterword: The End of Empire

It is a historical commonplace to say that the summer of 1898 changed everything. But this does not mean that the fall of Manila or the surrender of Santiago were historical endgames of an ineluctible historical destiny. Yet, the drama of the utter collapse of Spanish political dominion over the Philippines and the Antilles has tended to skew the historiographical record of the culture of empire at the end of the nineteenth century. This study has tried to show that the feel for the meaning of empire was future-oriented and often optimistic among Hispanic literatos in the metropole, in the overseas provinces and in the cosmopolis. Of course, this did not mean that intellectuals from the periphery imagined the future of empire in the same way as their metropolitan counterparts. Quite the contrary, writers from the peripheries, especially those *peregrinos* committed to the erasure of the “colonial difference” imagined a future dignity for their part of the world. Meanwhile, writers from the metropole committed to the program of ensuring “toda ventaja para la madre común,” imagined the regeneration of Spain’s national prestige as beginning at the edge of empire as much as built from within.

In “Nuestra América” (1891) José Martí prognosticated cheerfully that “estos países se salvarán,” (233) meaning that they would successfully root out the divisive legacy of colonialism and in its place would lay the groundwork of solidarity against the encroachments of a new imperialism: “¡Porque ya suena el himno unánime [...]!” (236) José Rizal declared in “Filipinas dentro de cien años,” that the “espíritu de la nación” would have taken shape and that sooner or later the Philippines would make itself known: “la llama divina del pensamiento es inextinguible en el pueblo filipino, y de un modo ó

de otro ha de brillar y darse á conocer. No es posible embrutecer á los habitantes de Filipinas!” (436)

This same unanimity of desire and optimism also characterized metropolitan attitudes toward the retention of the imperial periphery. Ministers like Víctor Balaguer imagined a bright future for imperial Spain in the Philippines and Africa. He worked to compensate for the deficiencies of past imperial administration and to bring the imperial periphery within the structures of modernity for the greater glory of Spain. Pablo Feced or Vicente Barrantes imagined a prosperous commercial colony devoid of the bothersome haughtiness of Filipino intellectuals and writers where the *indios* were deferent to their racial superiors and meekly produced agricultural and industrial labor. And Emilia Pardo Bazán imagined a social order in the Philippines where the anxieties of modernity could be forestalled by the comforting presence of a community of *niños grandes* forever subjected to the organizing logic of a racial deficiency and an overpowering natural environment. The Philippines was a place where gender trouble was naturally solved with the *bejucazos* of Father Facundo’s whip.

Of course, this did not mean these same writers did not indulge pessimistic thoughts about the future of their respective place in the “interpretive grid of modernity.” Yet all of them in their own way worked against analogous regimes of difference. If metropolitan Spaniards longed to solve their problematic and fractious modernity by unifying around a radicalized imperial superpatriotism, this often worked to the political detriment of those intellectuals on the imperial periphery. And while those intellectual pilgrims who traveled to the metropole and beyond and did so to break down the “imperial consensus” that held them at bay in their desire for a full-fledged cultural and political dignity, they understood that their strategies in the Peninsula or in other *analogous* imperial centers and peripheries worked to isolate identifiable relations of

friend and enemy. To put this another way, the powerful pull of imperial fantasies made reconciliation with the desires of those at the margins very difficult and the meaning of empire in the late nineteenth century exacerbated these fundamental divisions. There were, of course intellectuals from the periphery who were not pilgrims for dignity but rather identified against their homeland. But even these struggled to overcome the omnipresent stigma of peripheral origins which often manifests itself in curious ways.

For example, Luis Bonafoux, the Puerto Rican journalist who was once nearly lynched by an angry mob in San Juan while there from Spain to visit his ailing mother. The conflict arose because while in Spain, Bonafoux had published a two-part *cuadro de costumbres* titled “Carnaval en Antillas” in which he lampooned the uncouth traditions of Puerto Rico’s Carnival celebrations. The violence of the reaction of the mob which besieged his house for days and very nearly succeeded in avenging their anger, demonstrates the stakes in questions of dignity and the power of the politics of publicity.⁶³ Bonafoux escaped alive after having been escorted to a departing ship by armed soldiers. But if Bonafoux had sarcastic words for his fellow Puerto Ricans, he was just as brutal with peninsular Spaniards. When he arrived in Spain for the first time as a young student, Bonafoux came dressed not only in the “colonial” clothing typical of Puerto Rico, but also wearing the helmet of a conquistador (*capacete de Indias*) because, he said, “siempre creí que la residencia en Madrid exigía llevar puesto un casco de explorador” (31) Of course behind the farsical nature of the gesture, a serious effort to counter the indignities of the colonial difference was at work in the very provocation that such a gesture implied. Bonafoux soon suffered the consequences of his provocation, for after having been followed by a group of young men, he turned on them to say: “¿Qué queréis de mí, jóvenes igorrotos?” (31) Here, Bonafoux has turned the imperial ideoscape

⁶³ For this story see Dicenta, *Luis Bonafoux* pp. 44-5.

on its head and reversed the indignities of the colonial difference with a series of theatrical gestures. This last example (“jóvenes igorrotos”) is almost certainly a falsified memory since his reference to “igorrotos” came in the 1870s long before the idea of “igorrotos” as a placemaker for “savages” was in common use in the metropole. After 1887, “igorrote” did indeed enter the popular lexicon of the Peninsula and Bonafoux most certainly misremembered the actual insult hurled. But the *meaning* of the insult, we can be safe in assuming was *analogous*.

As these, and other examples show, imperial relations entailed complex negotiations of prestige, insult, adulation and concern that made the meaning of one’s place in the geographic imaginary deeply and constantly felt. But, again, in the summer of 1898, those negotiations either abruptly ceased or were radically restructured. I will end this study with a final example of the meaning of imperial relations from the writing of Emilia Pardo Bazán, but this one taken from after the *desastre*. In an article published first in *La Ilustración Artística* in August of 1899, Pardo Bazán considers the topic of the loss of the Philippines to the United States in the context of the worsening brutality of the 7-month-old war raging between the Philippine Republic and a United States invading force. At the news that things have not been going well for the United States in the campaign, Pardo Bazán cannot resist the urge to indulge a vengeful gloat: “No lo puedo evitar, ni me importa que se califique de pueril y de mezquino este sentimiento; llámenle como gusten y repuébenlo si les parece: yo me alegro, me alegro, me alegro tres veces y tres mil veces de los reveses, desengaños y complicaciones que atrae a los yankis la injusticísima anexión de Filipinas. (“La pérdida” 75) But her feelings toward the perfidy of the United States was not the only changed feeling after the loss of the Philippines and the Antilles. For the same Filipinos who Pardo Bazán imagined as perpetually emasculated by the tropical heat, were now showing themselves quite capable in their

defense of their sovereignty from the invading Americans. But more than simply describing the successes of the Filipino soldiers against the invaders, Pardo Bazán elaborates a complex fantasy of revenge and of patriotic dignity that would have been impossible before 1898:

Y la opinión sensata de los Estados Unidos, que siempre miró con disgusto la aventura filipina, se pronuncia cada vez más contra Mac Kinley y su política exterior, al ver la brillante defensa que de la recién ganada autonomía hacen los tagalos. Esa raza mirada hasta hace poco con desdén benévolo, como raza de niños, revela y demuestra ahora una energía y una aptitud singular para la guerra de guerrilla, de estratagema y emboscada, en que el terreno se defiende palmo a palmo. Los yankis han sufrido ya, en el tiempo que hace que lidian con las fuerzas de Aguinaldo, sorpresas parecidas a las que España en 1808, experimentaron los ejércitos de Napoleón. Destacan los yankis un piquete de soldados para guarnecer un fuerte, y al enviar provisiones no hallan en el fuerte sino cuerpos sin cabeza y cabezas separadas del tronco; sitúan ocho o diez parejas de polizontes distribuidos en una larga calle, y evapóranse tres de las parejas sin advertido siquiera de qué modo fueron sus compañeros amordazados y arrastrados al suplicio. Todo del terreno, producciones de la naturaleza, ponzoñas mortíferas de la exuberante flora y la rara fauna de aquellos países feracísimos y todavía misteriosos. Por medio de una manga hábilmente dirigida proyectan sobre los norteamericanos agua en que han macerado una planta cuyo zumo produce horribles irritaciones en la piel; y los yankis, ignorando el sencillo remedio con que se curan esas irritaciones, se revuelcan entre crueles torturas. Así, en las guerras de independencia, el suelo y el aire se alían con los hijos del país. (77)

When the possibility of an imperial future was lost, the characters who had lately served as the context for Pardo Bazán's imperial fantasies have now occasioned an anti-imperial fantasy of revenge and solidarity. Those Filipinos who could not have been permitted even the modest assimilationist reforms are now compared to the heroes of the guerrilla resistance of 1808. Nature who in her imperial fantasy had through the "relajación de la fibra" emasculated any troublesome virility among Filipinos now conspired to amplify their "energía y aptitud singular para la guerra." Nature conspired, in fact to visit a vicious series of punishments on the vile American soldiers. The point to all of this is not

that the processes of geographical fantasy had ceased to function after the *desastre*, but that they had simply altered the possible meanings of empire in the Hispanic world.

WORKS CITED

- Anderson, Benedict. *Spectre of Comparisons: Nationalism, Southeast Asia, and the World*. London and New York: Verso, 2000 (1998).
- . *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Revised edition. London and New York: Verso, 1991.
- . “Responses.” *Grounds of Comparison: Around the Work of Benedict Anderson*. Eds. Jonathan Culler and Pheng Cheah. New York and London: Routledge, 2003.
- Asún, Raquel. “El europeísmo de «La España Moderna».” *La España de la Restauración: Política, economía, legislación y cultura*. Ed. José Luis García Delgado. Madrid: Siglo XXI, 1985.
- Balibar, Etienne. “Fichte and the Internal Border: On the Addresses to the German Nation.” *Masses, Classes, Ideas: Studies on Politics and Philosophy Before and After Marx*. Trans. James Swenson. New York and London: Routledge, 1994. 61-84.
- Bécquer, Gustavo Adolfo. *La Ilustración de Madrid: Textos de Gustavo Adolfo Bécquer acompañados de dibujos de Valeriano Bécquer publicados durante los años 1870 y 1871 en La Ilustración de Madrid*. Ed. María Dolores Cabra Loredó. Madrid: Ediciones El Museo Universal, 1985.
- Blanco, John David. “Encomium Admirabile: Debt and Redemption in José Rizal’s *Noli Me Tangere* and the Rizal-Pastells Correspondence.” *The Likhaan Book of Philippine Criticism, 1992-1997*. Ed. Neil C. Garcia. Quezon City: LIKHAAN and University of the Philippines Press, 2000. 373-405
- . “Vernacular Counterpoint: Filipino Enlightenment in a Late Colonial Context, 1837-1891.” PhD Dissertation. UC Berkeley, 2001.
- Blumentritt, Ferdinand. “La España remota” *La Solidaridad* 3:61 (August 15, 1891) Reprinted in *La Solidaridad*. 8 vols. 3:388-94. Manila: Fundación Santiago, 1996.
- . “Prólogo.” *Sucesos de la Islas Filipinas* by Antonio de Morga. Ed. José Rizal. Manila: National Historical Institute, 1991.
- . “Quioquiap Generis Femenini” *La Solidaridad* 1:9 (June 15, 1889) Reprinted in *La Solidaridad*. 8 vols. 1:98-101. Manila: Fundación Santiago, 1996.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. *The Field of Cultural Production*. Ed. and Intro. Randal Johnson. New York: Columbia UP, 1993.

- . *The Rules of Art: Genesis and Structure of the Literary field*. Trans. Susan Emanuel. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1996.
- Bürger, Peter. *Theory of the Avant-Garde*. Trans. Michael Shaw. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984.
- Caballero, Fernán (Cecilia Böhl de Faber). *La Gaviota*. Ed. Demetrio Estébanez. Madrid: Cátedra, 1998.
- Cabra Loredó, María Dolores. Introduction. *La Ilustración de Madrid: Textos de Gustavo Adolfo Bécquer acompañados de dibujos de Valeriano Bécquer publicados durante los años 1870 y 1871 en La Ilustración de Madrid*. Ed. María Dolores Cabra Loredó. Madrid: Ediciones El Museo Universal, 1985.
- Castillo y Soriano, José del. *Núñez de Arce: Apuntes para su biografía*. 2nd Ed. Madrid: 1907.
- Certeau, Michel de. *The Practice of Everyday Life*, Trans. Stephen F. Rendall. Berkeley: UC Press, 1984.
- Chápuli Navarro, Antonio. *Siluetas y matices (Galería filipina)*. Prol. Javier Gómez de la Serna. Madrid: 1894.
- Chartier, Roger. *The Order of Books*. Trans. Lydia G. Cochrane. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1994.
- Chatterjee, Partha. *The Nation and its Fragments*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1993.
- Congreso Literario Hispano-Americano. Organized by the Asociación de Escritores y Artistas Españoles. Madrid: Est. Tip. Ricardo Fé, 1893.
- Culler, Jonathan. "Anderson and the Novel." *Grounds of Comparison: Around the Work of Benedict Anderson*. Eds. Jonathan Culler and Pheng Cheah. New York and London: Routledge, 2003.
- Darío, Rubén. *España contemporánea*. Madrid: Alfaguara, 1998.
- . *Poesías*. Ed. Pere Gimferrer. Barcelona: Planeta, 1987.
- Davies, Rhian. *La España Moderna and Regeneración: A Cultural Review in Restoration Spain, 1889-1914*. Manchester: Cañada Blanch Monographs, Monographs, 5, 2000.
- Dicenta, José Fernando. *Luis Bonafoux: la «víbora de Asnieres»*. Madrid: 1974.

- Díaz Larios, Luis F. "Los viajeros costumbristas." *Romanticismo 6: Actas del VI Congreso (Nápoles, 27-30 de Marzo de 1996)*. Centro Internacional de Estudios Sobre el Romanticismo Hispánico: Instituto Italiano Per Gli Studi Filosofici. Roma: Bulzoni, 1996.
- de Veyra, Jaime C. "Estudio biográfico." Prologue in *Discursos y artículos varios* by Graciano López Jaena. Manila, Bureau of Printing, 1951.
- Fanon, Frantz. *Black Skin, White Masks*. Trans. Charles Lam Markmann. New York: Grove Press, 1967.
- Feced, Pablo (Quioquiap). *Filipinas: esbozos y pinceladas*. Manila: Ramírez, 1888.
- Faus, Pilar. *Emilia Pardo Bazán: Su época, su vida, su obra*. 2 vols. A Coruña: Fundación Pedro Barrié de la Maza, 2003.
- Fernández Flores, Isidoro. *Discurso de recepción ante la Real Academia Española*. Madrid: 1899.
- Fernández Retamar, Roberto. "Modernismo, 98, subdesarrollo." *Para una teoría de la literatura hispanoamericana*. Bogotá, Instituto Caro y Cuervo, 1995. 143-53.
- Freire López, Ana María. "Los libros de viajes de Emilia Pardo Bazán: el hallazgo del género en la crónica periodística." *Literatura de viajes: El Viejo Mundo y el Nuevo*. Ed. Salvador García Castañeda. Madrid: Castalia, 1999. 203-12. Also available online at <http://www.cervantesvirtual.com>.
- Freud, Sigmund. "Creative Writers and Day-Dreaming." *The Freud Reader*. Ed. Peter Gay. New York: Norton, 1989. 436-443.
- Gómez Carrillo, Enrique. *Treinta años de mi vida*. Guatemala: Editorial "José de Pineda Ibarra," 1974.
- Harvey, David. *Paris, Capital of Modernity*. New York and London: Routledge, 2003.
- Hau, Caroline. *Necessary Fictions: Philippine Literature and the Nation, 1946-1980*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 2000.
- Henríquez Ureña, Pedro. *La utopía de América*. Prologue. Rafael Gutiérrez Girardot. Comp. Ángel Rama and Rafael Gutiérrez Girardot. Caracas: Biblioteca Ayacucho, 1989 (1978).
- Hostos, Eugenio María de. *La peregrinación de Bayoán*. *Obras Completas vol. VIII*. Edición Conmemorativa del Gobierno de Puerto Rico. Havana: 1939.

- Kirkpatrick, Susan. *Mujer, modernismo y vanguardia en España (1898-1931)*. Trans. Jacqueline Cruz. Madrid: Cátedra, 2003.
- Kirste, Waltraud. “‘Weltliteratur’ de Goethe: un Concepto Intercultural.” PhD Thesis, Universidad del País Vasco, 2000. Available electronically at <http://www.cervantesvirtual.com/>
- Labra, Rafael María de. *El Ateneo de Madrid: 1835-1905: Notas históricas*. Madrid: 1906.
- Liu, Lydia. “Desire and Sovereign Thinking.” *Grounds of Comparison: Around the Work of Benedict Anderson*. Eds. Jonathan Culler and Pheng Cheah. New York and London: Routledge, 2003.
- Los españoles pintados por sí mismos. Various authors. Madrid: Gaspar y Roig, 1851.
- Martí, José. “Amor de ciudad grande.” *Poesía modernista hispanoamericana y española (Antología)*. Eds. Iván Schulman and Evelyn Picón Garfield. Madrid: Taurus, 1986.
- . “Hierro” *Poesía modernista hispanoamericana y española (Antología)*. Eds. Iván Schulman and Evelyn Picón Garfield. Madrid: Taurus, 1986.
- . “La República española ante la revolución cubana.” *Sus mejores páginas*. Ed. Raimundo Lazo. México: Porrúa, 1992. 23-5.
- . “Nuestra América.” *Conciencia intelectual de América: Antología del Ensayo Hispanoamericano*. Ed. Carlos Ripoll. 3rd Ed. New York: Eliseo Torres & Sons, 1974. 228-36.
- Mignolo, Walter. “The Many Faces of Cosmo-Polis.” *Cosmopolitanism*. Eds. Durham, Duke UP, 2000. 157-87.
- Montes Bordajandi, Juan Bautista. Introduction. *Artículos*. By José Mariano de Larra. Ed. Montes Bordajandi. Madrid: Castalia, 1990. 15-32.
- Núñez de Arce, Gaspar. “Recuerdos de la Guerra de África.” *Miscelánea literaria: Cuentos, artículos, relaciones y versos*. Barcelona: Maucci, n.d.
- Olivié, Fernando. *La herencia de un imperio roto: Dos siglos de política exterior española*. Madrid: Editorial MAPFRE, 1992.
- Palma, Rafael. *Biografía de Rizal*. Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1949.
- Pardo Bazán, Emilia. *Al pie de la torre Eiffel. Obras Completas vol XIX*. Madrid: n.d.

- . “Crónica literaria.” *Nuevo Teatro Crítico*. 1:6 (June, 1891). Madrid: La España Editorial, 1891.
- . “La cuestión académica.” *Nuevo Teatro Crítico*. 1:3 (March, 1891). Madrid: La España Editorial, 1891.
- . *La cuestión palpitante*. Ed. Rosa de Diego. Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva, 1998.
- . “La España remota.” *Nuevo Teatro Crítico*. 1:3 (March, 1891). Madrid: La España Editorial, 1891.
- . “Ojeada retrospectiva a varias obras francesas de Daudet, Loti, Bourget, Huysmans, Rod y Barrès.” *Obras completas*. 3rd vol. Ed. Harry L. Kirby, Jr. Madrid: Aguilar, 1973. 1056-72.
- . “Prefacio de *Un viaje de novios*.” *Obras completas*. 3rd vol. Ed. Harry L. Kirby, Jr. Madrid: Aguilar, 1973. 571-73.
- . “Presentación.” *Nuevo Teatro Crítico*. 1:1 (January, 1891). Madrid: La España Editorial, 1891.
- . *Un viaje de novios*. *Obras completas*. 3 vols. Eds. Federico Carlos Sainz de Robles (vols. 1, 2) and Harry L. Kirby, Jr. (vol. 3). Madrid: Aguilar, 1947, 1973. 1:75-188.
- Paterno, Alejandro. *Ninay: costumbres filipinas*. Madrid: Fortanet, 1885.
- Pratt, Mary Louise. *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*. London: Routledge, 1992.
- Pike, Fredrick B. *Hispanismo, 1898-1936: Spanish conservatives and liberals and their relations with Spanish America*. South Bend: University of Notre Dame Press, 1971.
- Rama, Angel. *La ciudad letrada*. Hanover: Ediciones del Norte, 1984.
- . *Las máscaras democráticas del modernismo*. ???
- Rama, Carlos M. *Historia de las relaciones culturales entre España y la América Latin. Siglo XIX*. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1982.
- Retana y Gamboa, Wenceslao E. *Aparato bibliográfico de la Historia General de Filipinas*. Vol. 3. Madrid: 1906.
- . *Vida y escritos del Dr. José Rizal*. Reprint of 1st edition (1907). Quezon City: Martínez & Sons, 1960.

- Rizal, José. "Al excelente Señor Don Vicente Barrantes." in *La Solidaridad* 2:25 (February 15, 1890). Reprinted in *La Solidaridad*. 8 vols. 2:62-8. Manila: Fundación Santiago, 1996.
- . *Epistolario Rizalino*. (5 vols.) Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1930-1938.
- . "Filipinas dentro de cien años" *La Solidaridad* 1:16 (September 30, 1889); 1: 18 (October 30, 1889); 1:21 (December 15, 1889); 2:24 (February 1, 1990) Reprinted in *La Solidaridad*. 8 vols. 1:376-80, 428-38, 504-12, 2:32-34. Manila: Fundación Santiago, 1996.
- . "La verdad para todos" *La Solidaridad* 1:8 (May 31, 1889) Barcelona. Reprinted in *La Solidaridad*. 8 vols. 1:168-76. Manila: Fundación Santiago, 1996.
- . "Los viajes." *Obras Literarias, Libro Segundo: Prosa por José Rizal*. JRNCC Vol. 3. Manila: National Historical Institute, 1995 (1961).
- . *Rizal-Blumentritt Correspondence: Volume 1(1886-1889)*. Manila: National Historical Institute, 1992.
- Rubio Jiménez, Jesús. "Los viajes de Bécquer a Toledo (Del laberinto de la historia a los laberintos del alma)." *Literatura de viajes: El Viejo Mundo y el Nuevo*. Ed. Salvador García Castañeda. Madrid: Castalia, 1999. 189-202.
- Said, Edward. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York, Knopf, 1993.
- Salinas, Pedro. *Poesía de Rubén Darío*. Buenos Aires, Losada, 1948.
- Sánchez Gómez, Luis Ángel. "«Ellos y nosotros» y «Los Indios de Filipinas», artículos de Pablo Feced y Graciano López Jaena (1887)." *Revista Española del Pacífico*, 8 (1998)
- . *Un imperio en la vitrina: El colonialismo español en el Pacífico y la Exposición de Filipinas de 1887*. Madrid: CSIC, 2003.
- Sarkisyanz, Manuel. *Rizal and Republican Spain and other Rizalist Essays*. Manila: National Historical Institute, 1995.
- Sarmiento, Domingo Faustino. "Contrastes madrileños." Ed. Estuardo Núñez. *España vista por viajeros hispanoamericanos*. Madrid: Ediciones Cultura Hispánica, 1985.
- Schmidt-Nowara, Christopher. "After "Spain": A Dialogue with Josep M. Fradera on Spanish Colonial Historiography." *After the Imperial Turn: Thinking With and Through the Nation*. Ed. Antoinette Burton. Durham: Duke UP, 2003.

- Schumacher, John N., S.J. *The Propaganda Movement, 1880-1895*. Revised Ed. Manila: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1997.
- . “Published Sources on the Cavite Mutiny.” *The Making of a Nation: Essays on Nineteenth-Century Filipino Nationalism*. Manila: Ateneo de Manila Press, 1991.
- Seoane, María Cruz. *Historia del periodismo en España, II: El siglo XIX*. Madrid: Alianza Editores, 1983.
- Shumway, Nicolas. *The Invention of Argentina*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1993 (1991).
- Van Aken, Mark Jay. *Pan-Hispanism: It’s Origins and Development to 1866*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1959.
- Williams, Raymond. *The Country and the City*. New York: Oxford UP, 1973.
- Zulueta, Jesús Manuel. *Viajeros Hispanoamericanos por la Epaña de fin de siglo (1890/1904)*. Cádiz: Universidad Servicio de Publicaciones, 2002.

Vita

Courtney Blaine Johnson was born in Martinez, California on April 6, 1968. He is the son of Blaine LeRoy Johnson and Joanne Rowse. He graduated from Paradise High School in Paradise, California in 1986 and began attending Brigham Young University in Provo, Utah in the fall of 1986. He lived in Argentina from 1988-1989. Upon returning to the U.S., he continued his studies at the University of California at Berkeley in Comparative Literature. He worked in roofing, freeway construction, professional driving, and maintenance while pursuing his degree and received the Bachelor of Arts in August 1994. He received a Master of Arts in Spanish from the University of Texas at Austin in May 1996. He began Doctoral studies in August 1997 in Spanish at the University of Texas at Austin. He is now employed in the Spanish and Portuguese Department at the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Permanent address: 2040 Rusk St. Madison, Wisconsin 53704

This dissertation was typed by the author.