CARLOS RIPOLL

JOSE MARTI: INSIDE THE MONSTER AND THE MARXIST INTERPRETATION OF CUBAN HISTORY

In his struggle against the Spanish rule of his native Cuba and of Puerto Rico, Jose Marti (1853-1895) epitomized Latin American nationalism of the nineteenth century. For fifteen years Marti resided in the United States, where he organized the Cuban war for independence and where, as a correspondent for various newspapers of Central and South America, he presented to his readers a comprehensive and objective view of the life and customs of this country. On one hand, he praised its achievements in securing personal liberty; on the other, he denounced the expansionist forces that threatened the Spanish-speaking territories of the continent. For this reason, and because of his stature as a patriot and an apostle of freedom, Marti is revered throughout Latin America and, of course, particularly in Cuba, where the present regime cultivates his image as forerunner of all anti-imperialist movements against the United States.

Marti's commitment to individual rights and liberties is incompatible with the Marxist-Leninist design for the Cuban state. It is virtually impossible to reconcile his concepts of pluralistic democracy and national sovereignty with Soviet-style dictatorship and proletarian internationalism. Nevertheless, in order to implant communism in Cuba, Fidel Castro has had to appeal to traditional patriotic fervor centered on Marti. Even now, in the recently adopted socialist constitution, while effectively conforming Cuba's institutions to Soviet models, he has endeavored to lend authenticity to the regime by fabricating for it indigenous origins. In fact, the preamble of the

constitution concludes with words of Marti which, in the abstract, could be claimed to serve as a directive for any type of government: "I would like the fundamental law of our republic to be the reverence of Cubans for the complete dignity of man."

The current attempt to amalgamate nationalism and socialism can only be accomplished by continuous distortions and selective historiography. Before communism came to power in Cuba, the party disclaimed Marti. His beliefs and goals were treated as having little, if any, relation to socialist or Marxist principles. That was the position disseminated by Juan Marinello, the most distinguished Communist intellectual in Cuba from the foundation of the party on the island through his death last year. In 1934 Marinello, who was also a prominent authority on Marti, urged the Cuban people to "turn [their] backs once and for all" on his doctrines; the forger of Cuban independence, he wrote, was to be respected and admired but not followed, for he had been a "great failure." Moreover, since Marti had "unknowing and unwillingly been an advocate of the rich," to keep his ideas alive "could serve no purpose other than to promote opportunism."[1]

In subsequent years, Marinello amplified his repudiation of Marti as an ideological leader for Cuba, since he considered the latter "a poet drawn into politics by his imagination, not a thorough investigator who made continued use of reason. . . ." The principles of such a man were antiquated, Marinello contended, and could not serve to guide Cuba: "Only in our time, with Lenin, has the political leader who is at once a scientific man come into existence,"[2] and only that Leninist mold was capable of shaping the island's future.

With the centennial of Marti's birth, in 1953, followers of almost every religious persuasion and political ideology pronounced their adherence to Marti's doctrines. Batista had planned a lavish national celebration and was foremost in the wholesale demagoguery. After having initially formed part of a coalition government with Batista, the Communists had moved into the opposition, which tried to unite in a massive boycott of the government-sponsored festivities. But some of the party's members and sympathizers found the ingrained habit of manipulating Marti too strong to resist. The moment was ripe for a decisive statement of the breach between the party and Marti, and Juan Marinello was the chosen spokesman. In a sweeping attack calculated to bring all into line, he placed the misguided left-wing intellectuals in the same class with the clergy, and bitterly criticized both alike for misquoting and misinterpreting Marti to make his beliefs appear compatible with their dogma: "In order to destroy such falsifications," asserted Marinello, "it would suffice to bring together everything he [Marti] said—and he said a lot— against education controlled by religious institutions, and everything he said—and he said a lot—that disagrees, directly or indirectly, with the basic principles of Karl Marx."[3] There was no room for doubt—Marti and Marsixm were irreconcilable.

Soon a new opposition force made itself heard and gained popularity by proclaiming a revolution based on Marti's thought. Fidel Castro announced in the manifesto of the 26th of July Movement that Marti was the source of its ideology, which rested on

democracy, condemnation of all forms of dictatorship, guarantees for individual freedom and inviolability of human rights, respect for the constitution and the laws, and unimpaired national independence.[4] However, the commitment to the avowed ideals did not last. Once the revolution had triumphed, it found itself at odds with its original credo. Castro transformed the *martiana* revolution into a Marxist-Leninist state, but he dared not erase Marti's name in the process. So began the current era of falsifications and distortions.

Two Cuban dictators had preceded Castro in the art of refashioning Marti to serve their purposes.[5] Machado, first, and later Batista were adept at quoting Marti to the Cuban people in order to justify their arbitrary and ruthless governments. When Machado began to feel the sting of American disapproval, he published for mass consumption a re-edition of Marti's 1889 criticism of the United States.[6] Batista used the centenary to his advantage in every conceivable way. Following their example, Castro too purported to justify his actions by invoking words of Marti, and he lost no time in preparing a new edition of Marti's complete works and in publishing a government-sponsored journal about Marti, just as Batista had done before him.[7]

It was an urgent task to link Marti and Castro in the public mind. The memory of Marti is deeply rooted in every Cuban, and it was necessary to give a *martiano* flavor to the Marxist-Leninist dictatorship. The problem remained, would the ghost of party disavowal of Marti's ideology haunt the new government? How would the Cuban Communists revise their earlier assessment of Marti and retreat from the stance Marinello had so strongly advocated? The answer came in 1963 when, disregarding his previous statements, Marinello himself declared that "Marti's positions couple with every egalitarian transformation of society and are a strong and legitimate precedent for our socialist stage. . . . The nation created by Fidel Castro's revolution brings to all Cubans the promises made by the liberator of 1895."[8] Shortly afterwards he reiterated: "The present revolution was heralded and shaped by Marti's preaching. . . . The liberation movement headed by Fidel Castro is the most exact projection into the time of socialist victory of Marti's objectives."[9]

There have been numerous official efforts to persuade the Cuban people that Castro is virtually following a course charted by Marti to create a communist society. But the simplest and preferred way to show Marti as a forerunner of the current regime has been to take out of context and to overemphasize chosen strains of his thought. The American public is now exposed to a similarly oblique presentation of Marti in a volume of his writings entitled *Inside the Monster*. Its editor, Philip S. Poner, states in the preface: "What makes Marti's words especially significant is that his life fulfilled the promise in them, and that, as the recent revolutionary history of Cuba fully demonstrates, he stood on much more than 'columns of smoke.' "[10]

The Apocryphal Marti

Professor Foner is the author of two other books about Cuba,[11] both of which are closely patterned after the standard Marxist version of Cuban history as it was estab-

lished by the Cuban Communist Party in 1944[12] and is followed exclusively on the island today. Although Foner had access to Cuban libraries and received the help and advice of some of the best known Communist historians of Cuba in writing those two books,[13] they are full of inexcusable errors that reveal, at best, haste in their preparation and, without doubt, an inadequate grasp of the subject. Some deal with Marti and shed light on the deficient knowledge about him possessed by Foner before undertaking to publish *Inside the Monster*.[14] But factual mistakes are of small import as compared to the baseless assertions and the fictionalizing about Marti's handling of the relations between black and white, rich and poor, capital and labor within the revolutionary movement he organized.

For example, Foner says of Marti's first speech in the United States, in 1880: "To the discomfort of the wealthy aristocratic émigrés, but to the delight of the Negro and white tobacco workers who filled the rear of the hall, Marti dealt with the Negro question as it affected the revolution in Cuba."[15] This impression of the effect of the famous lecture is indeed surprising; it suggests that Marti failed to communicate his meaning to the audience in Steck Hall, or that he unwisely wrote a text that defeated the very purpose of the gathering: to raise funds among the wealthy Cuban émigrés in New York and to encourage harmony between the black and white elements of the exile community. It would certainly have been foolish and counterproductive to address the racial issue in a manner that would only divide blacks and whites along class lines. The lecture itself explicitly scorns the Spanish campaign to do precisely that, to undermine revolutionary unity by alienating the blacks and by instilling in the well-to-do whites fear of a black uprising against them. The lecture sought to dispel such fears and to unify rich and poor by praising both equally for their past contributions to the revolutionary cause—the former for their disinterested sacrifice of fortune, the latter for their unshakable faith: ". . . you, the rich," Marti said, "who have had the energy and courage to disdain your riches and to build new wealth beneath an honest roof, where the whip [of Spain] cannot reach you; you, the poor, who, with the sacred joy of the faithful and with serene intuition for goodness unblemished by vanity or hope of gain, cherished the holy ideal [of the revolution] when it was sick and agonizing, . . . you yourselves form the community that is arising. . . ."[16] The lecture clearly contradicts Foner's supposition. In fact, one of its most telling passages indicates that the wealthy and the whites would have left Steck Hall rather more pleased with themselves than uncomfortable: "They [the blacks] know that we have suffered as much as and more than they; that under political servitude the educated man is hurt more deeply than is the ignorant under the servitude of slavery; that pain is proportionate to the sensitivity of the one who must endure it; and that they did not make a revolution for our freedom, and we have made such a revolution, and we continue bravely to sustain it now, for our freedom and for theirs."[17]

Another of Foner's misstatements further illustrates how mere conjecture substitutes for history in the author's portrayal of Marti's work: "In organizing the Cuban Revolutionary Party," Foner asserts, "Marti had brought together 'as many elements

of all kinds as could be recruited.' . . . He accomplished this, moreover, without yielding to the prejudices of certain elements in the alliance. He refused to yield to those who insisted that he place the Negro in a subordinate position in the revolutionary movement. He likewise rejected the demand of wealthy exiles that the Socialist working class leaders be eliminated from the movement."[18] Historical facts belie this undocumented assertion. The wealthy founders of the Party, Ramon L. Miranda and Gonzalo de Quesada among others, gave it their support with full knowledge that among the closest collaborators of Marti, men with whom they would be working hand in hand, were Sotero Figueroa and Rafael Serra--both black, one a Puerto-Rican printer, the other a Cuban teacher and cigar manufacturer. Moreover, neither the wealthy nor any Cuban in his right mind would have made such a demand; a revolt against Spain would have been inconceivable without the joint military command of the white general Maximo Gomez and the black general Antonio Maceo, not to mention the leadership of Jose Maceo, Guillermo Moncada, and Flor Crombet, each a key figure in the past revolutionary movements. It is similarly difficult to lend credence to the alleged fears of socialism within the Revolutionary Party; it is absurd to picture any Cuban asking Marti to eliminate a handful of virtually unknown and harmless socialists and anarchists among the exiles when Marti himself was regarded by the Cuban reactionaries, the autonomists and annexationists, as the really dangerous element in the revolution.

To superimpose the impressions of a twentieth-century mind on the audience of a speech delivered in 1880 and in a manner manifestly at odds with the text of the speech, to embellish the past with fictional details and nameless people in order to fit conveniently the development of the revolutionary movement of 1895 into a preconceived mold, is to write sloppy history. Beyond this, not even the most generous reader can lightly dismiss the misrepresentation of well-documented events in which Foner engages. His handling of the 1893 tobacco workers' strike in Key West is a case in point. Not content to portray all Cubans save the poor and the black as selfish and indifferent to the future of their country, he presents the Cuban cigar factory owners as traitors. By his falsified account, they connived with the Spanish government in breaking the strike to protect their economic interests and, in doing so, cared nothing about subverting the revolutionary cause. Foner writes:

> Taking advantage of the business depression, the employers cut wages to the bone. Eight hundred Cuban workers answered by calling a strike. Immediately Spanish agents in Key West approached the employers and offered to assist them to break the strike through the importation of strikebreakers from Cuba. . . . The employers took up the Spanish proposition even though as émigrés themselves it might have been expected they would have been somewhat embarrassed to unite with the Spaniards. But their class interests were paramount. A committee of employers went to Havana, conferred with the Captain General, published advertisements, and with the aid of the Spanish authorities, arranged for strikebreakers.[19]

According to Foner, this incident had a profound effect on Marti who, through it, came to realize that he had misplaced his trust in the factory owners and that the revolution could count only on the masses for support:

> The fact that the Cuban employers had been so eager to cooperate with the Spanish authorities in breaking the strike proved how little they could be relied upon in the struggle for independence. As never before, Marti realized that the revolution had to base itself on the Cuban masses. He pointed out, moreover, that the anti-labor alliance of employers and public officials in Key West proved that 'since Cubans had no security in the land of liberty, they ought more than ever to create a free land for themselves.'[20]

Were all this true, the picture would be an almost too perfect illustration of the forces of materialism at work shaping the course of history; it would, indeed, outdo Marx and Engel, who acknowledged "elements of the superstructure" that do not fit into such a simplistic interpretation. But Professor Foner has wrongly identified the characters in the plot and has distorted the facts. There are numerous reliable sources that deal with the strike;[21] had he consulted or treated them with integrity he might have resisted the temptation to revise history at the expense of the reputation of the Cuban factory owners whom he so carelessly maligns.

To begin with, there never was an alliance of Cuban employers with the Spanish authorities, and Marti knew this well. The eight hundred strikers mentioned by Foner were employees of "La Rosa Española," a cigar factory owned by William Seidenberg, a German, who had two minor Spanish partners. Seidenberg threatened to move his factory to Tampa if the Cubans did not return to work. The move would have been ruinous for Key West, and, to prevent it, American businessmen and authorities of the city arranged with Spanish agents to import strikebreakers from Cuba. Contrary to Foner's narrative, the committee that went to Havana was not one of "Cuban employers"; it was a seven-member delegation including George W. Allen, Judge L. W. Bethel, William H. Williams, John F. Horr, W. R. Kerr, Judge A. J. Kemp, and the Reverend Charles M. Fraser, all Americans, none of whom was directly involved in the tobacco industry. These prominent local citizens, politicians, and government servants acted, not only with indifference for the prosperity of the Cuban cigar workers in exile, but with disregard for American immigration laws. It was their conduct that led Marti to state, as Foner quotes, that "since Cubans had no security in the land of liberty, they ought more than ever to create a free land for themselves." Marti's ire is clearly expressed in an article he wrote shortly after the events and had printed in English in the revolutionary weekly, *Patria:*

> . . . that city, built by Cuban effort, . . . those judges placed on their chairs by Cuban votes, those citizens of emancipated colonies, . . . those very men whom the Cubans upheld in true friendship, . . . left the city created by the Cuban revolution to beg a foreign monarchy for soldiers known to be the rabid enemies of the American citizens and American-born men who built the town. . . . Men of a free people mounting the stairs of a hypocritical foreign despot to solicit from him workingmen with whom to impoverish, soldiers with whom to humil-

> iate, those whose guilt is to will today, as the North-Americans once willed it, the freedom of their country.[22]

A complaint was registered with the federal authorities in Washington, D.C., by a lawyer Marti appointed, and the incident was brought to a close by an order of deportation against the strikebreakers, but the relations between the Cubans and the "Conchs," or natives of Key West, were permanently damaged. Hundreds of tobacco workers joined their Cuban employers, who were as fervently patriotic as they, in moving to Tampa and Ocala, where they sought a place to pursue in safety both their livelihood and their cause.

Inside the Monster

The serious deficiencies in Professor Foner's knowledge about Marti were not erased before he undertook to devote an entire volume to the life and writings of the great Cuban. The biographical introduction itself proved to be an endeavor beyond Foner's reach, and is full of inaccuracies that could have been avoided through the most elementary research.[23] And if the introduction to the anthology is not a reliable source of information, neither are some of the annotations to the texts a useful tool to further our understanding of Marti's views on the United States. For instance, Marti had occasion to write about the growth of the abolitionist movement, from the foundation of the Liberty Party through Lincoln's election. His description extolled the movement: "Where has man seen a higher form of nobility, such generous enthusiasm, such a flaming message, such unselfish leadership, such fruitful and militant courage?" The comment is annotated by Foner as follows: ". . . it should be borne in mind that the Republican Party was not an Abolitionist party, and stood solely for opposition to the further extension of slavery in the territories and not for interference with the institution where it already existed."[24]

When Marti again waxes lyrical about Lincoln, saying that he "set four million slaves free in a promise to God to 'give them their freedom if the Confederates were thrown out of Maryland'," Foner demonstrates an acuity for detail that is notably absent from his biographical sketch of Marti: "This is not," he writes, "accurate. Lincoln never actually set four million slaves free. The Emancipation Proclamation issued by President Lincoln on January 1, 1863, as a military measure, gave freedom only to slaves in those states which were in rebellion against the Union. . . . The abolition of slavery for all held in bondage did not occur until the ratification of the Thirteenth Amendment later, in 1865, by which time Lincoln was dead."[25]

Marti often commented on the travel memoirs of North Americans who visited Latin America and was keen to detect in their impressions anti-Hispanic prejudices and stereotypes as well as airs of Yankee superiority. But in his review of an article by William Eleroy Curtis that appeared in *Harper's Monthly Magazine,* he reported that Curtis, in dealing with what he had seen in Argentina, "praises, admires, and treats everything with great respect, although at the pace of a traveler; . . . he puts

aside the presumption which makes the man from North America stand out as unique among people." Marti was pleased by Curtis's belated acknowledgment of such advances as Argentine industry, wealth, schools, and electrical and railroad networks. Foner read the article in *Harper's,* and his annotation says that "Curtis called for American economic penetration of Latin America."[26] The observation is irrelevant to Marti's treatment of the Curtis article. Had Marti perceived such an attitude underlying the comments about Argentina, he would have denounced Curtis's intentions; his position on this issue was one of equanimity: he advocated the development of Latin America's potential and resources by foreign enterprise when national capital and efforts were insufficient, so long as the purpose of the foreign investment was not predatory. Mutually beneficial commerce is what Marti understood Curtis to beckon, not "economic penetration in Latin America." Marti's ideas on the subject are clearly conveyed in an article he wrote months before his death on "Honduras and the Foreigners." He ends it by telling his readers that "every producer is like a root, and ample ground must be opened [in Latin America], as though for a new tree, to whoever brings it useful work, whether he comes from a cold or a warm land."[27] And his thoughts were the same with respect to Cuba, as is manifest in his declarations, only days before his death, to the *New York Herald*: ". . . the freedom of Cuba will open to the United States the Island closed to it today by the [commercial] interests of Spain."[28]

Two valuable anthologies of Marti's works in English translation preceded *Inside the Monster,* one edited by Juan de Onis,[29] the other by Luis A. Baralt.[30] The texts in both are well chosen to represent a cross section of Marti's writings about the United States. But according to Foner, neither collection "includes Marti's articles on capital and labor in the United States nor those in which he dealt with the rising menace of U.S. imperialism."[31] This is false: in fact, Foner himself took from Baralt's anthology, *inter alia,* "The Labor Problem in the United States" as well as "The Chinese in the United States," and the Onis volume contains one of Marti's most important essays, "Our America," with its famous and explicit warning about the impending danger of U.S. expansionism, as well as Marti's "political testament," his letter of March 25, 1895, to Federico Henriquez y Carvajal, in which the subject of U.S. imperialism is given clear perspective within the body of Marti's thought. The volume by Foner is, however, decidedly different from the anthologies by Baralt and Onis, since the latter two both gather in fair proportions Marti's praise and criticism of the United States.[32]

The editorial techniques used by Foner sometimes serve to avoid such a balanced approach and are contrary to the sound practices of responsible anthologists. For example, he excerpts fragments that present only one aspect of the extensive articles in which they originally appeared; taken out of context, the fragments are deceiving—their meaning within the whole is lost to the reader. Since many of Marti's chronicles are structured so that each part draws sense from its relation to the others, the disfigurement of a fragment excised by Foner's method is bound to be substantial. For exam-

ple, what Foner presents under the title "The Negro Race in the U.S." is but the last part of an article that also deals with "Veterans in the White House," "A Marvellous Scene on the Gettysburg Battlefield," "The Blue and the Gray," "The Widow of a Confederate General," "The Fourth of July," and "A Somber Procession in the South." The title and dominant theme of the whole is "The Incident of the Two Flags," a symbolic Independence Day celebration in Gettysburg at which soldiers of the Confederacy and of the Union met to shake hands in the battlefield. Marti praised President Cleveland for risking his popularity by publicly encouraging the nation to bury the past. Rejoicing at the spirit of reconciliation in which Cleveland spoke and in which the act in Gettysburg was organized and carried out, Marti reminded his Spanish-American readers: "Only here [in the United States] have such things happened until now, because until now this is where reason has shone with greatest freedom."[33] It is in purposeful contrast with this applause that Marti condemns, in the section offered by Foner, the disgraceful treatment of the black in the South. Marti described the good and the bad side by side and with equal frankness, but through the edition of the article, *Inside the Monster* silences Marti's words of approval and augments the volume of those of censure.

The same procedure is followed in "Indians and Negroes," which is only part of a longer article the first half of which celebrates the ideals and practices of religious and political freedom brought to these shores by the Pilgrims.[34] In the part rejected by Foner, Marti extols the tolerance and harmony with which Catholic, Protestant, and Freemason join, guided by reason and under a free government that wisely separates Church and State, to sing the hymn "America." Marti was just as concerned to convey this message to his readers as to inform them of the plight of the Indian and the black; indeed, he treated the racial problem in the same chronicle with the inauguration of a monument to the Pilgrims in order to show that the injustices suffered by those minorities were the product of deviations from fundamental American principles of freedom and equality. Foner mutilates the integrity of the chronicle and, thus, deprives the American reader of the perspective from which Marti examined the racial problem in the United States.

In "Mexico and the United States" Marti declared that "in order to know a country one has to study it in all its aspects and expressions: in its elements and its tendencies, in its apostols, its poets, its bandits." Foner, contrary to the spirit of Marti's policy, abridges that very article by excising all of its enthusiasm for the enhanced commercial relations between the two countries that would surely follow their new mail treaty, the warm reception given to the daughter of Benito Juarez at the White House, and a generously pro-Mexican article by Arthur Howard Noll published in the *American Magazine*. Marti's article also deals with the imperialist philosophy of a group of Americans who had been advocating the annexation of Canada, Mexico, and countries in Central America and the Caribbean. That was the "disagreeable part" that Marti said should be discussed and "got out of the way first." But it is the only part that *Inside the Monster* offers. When Marti ceases to write of the "bandits" and begins to address

favorably the postal treaty and to express his appreciation for the Noll article and the White House reception, the selection in the anthology is abruptly cut short.

In "The Chinese in the United States" Foner again presents only those paragraphs of an extensive article that recount a shameful moment in American history--a murderous raid on the Chinese section of a Wyoming town by white miners belonging to the Knights of Labor who were incensed by the Chinese immigrants' willingness to work for cheap wages. The translation is taken from the Baralt anthology, where it is identified as only an excerpt. But Foner gives the reader no such warning: the fragment, which, out of context, deceptively seems to support Foner's prejudice (revealed elsewhere in the book) against that labor organization which rejected the more radical doctrines and tactics of socialists and anarchists, appears as if it were a complete article. But in the original it is followed by a general apologia of the Knights of Labor. Marti reproved that incident in Wyoming but generally agreed with the organization's moderate answers to the labor question in the United States: "They are powerful because they respond to their own [American] problems. It [the Knights of Labor] is not transplanted European socialism. It is not even nascent American socialism. Here there is no caste system to defeat, there are no family crests tied to large land holdings, there are no privileged classes that legislate or influence national legislation. . . . Here the worker knows that today's monopolist was a worker yesterday. . . ." He rejected as foreign and inappropriate to America the tactics of those who promoted class struggle and violence, and he enthusiastically reported that the ranks of the Knights of Labor were growing, and that they marched in the Labor Day parades "not dressed in the garb of war, but in the suit one wears on election day."[35]

In a recent interview in Havana, on the occasion of his sixth trip to Cuba and commenting on *Inside the Monster*, Foner said:

> The writings of Marti that have been published there [in the United States] in English do not reflect or refer to the basic questions covered by Cuba's hero; they are not an expression of the profound, radical political thought of Marti nor his keen powers of observation and analysis of the class struggle in the United States, the labor movement, his ideas on Karl Marx, and especially his awareness of the growth of monopoly capitalism, the beginning of U. S. imperialism and the danger that this represented for Latin America in general and Cuba in particular. In other words, it was only one aspect of Marti, perhaps the least important, that was presented to U. S. readers.[36]

But the "basic questions covered by Cuba's hero" are by no means those mentioned by Foner, those he highlights in his anthology. This may be proved by a simple thematic comparison of the contents of Marti's complete works with the contents of *Inside the Monster*. Indeed, Marti was concerned with social problems in this country, but he wrote only two pages about Marx, and those were not in praise. Marti scrutinized the myriad aspects of American life; foreign policy was only one of them, albeit an important one for him, because he knew that pro-annexation forces in this country and among Cubans who blindly admired it could jeopardize Cuba's future as an indepen-

dent nation. No matter how embarrassing it may be for totalitarian regimes, especially Castro's, the fact is that Marti fervently defended freedom and the democratic process, and this defense is far from "the least important" aspect of his work. Martí's fear of U.S. expansionism and his sharp and well-taken criticism of the injustices and flaws in the way the American system functioned cannot obscure his denunciation of all imperialisms, not only that of the United States, and all abuse of human rights, nor his open admiration of American institutions when they fostered and protected human dignity and the free development and expression of individual potential. By underplaying these facts, in line with the Marxist interpretation of Cuban history, this volume does a disservice to Marti and to the American reader.

NOTES

1. "Martí y Lenin," *Repertorio Americano* (San Jose, C. R.), 26 January 1935, p. 57.
2. "Carta de Juan Marinello," in Antonio Martinez Bello, *Ideas sociales y económicas de José Martí* (Havana: La Veronica, 1940), pp. 217-218.
3. *El caso literario de José Martí; Motivos de centenario* (Havana: Imprenta Vega y Cía., 1954), p. 27.
4. *Nuestra razón; Manifiesto Programa del Movimiento 26 de Julio* (Mexico: Talleres de Manuel Machado, S. A. [1956]), p. 2
5. Carlos Ripoll, "Martí y los tiranos de Cuba: Machado, Batista y Fidel Castro," *El Tiempo* (New York), 21 May 1972, pp. 18, 19, 58.
6. Jose Marti, *Vindicación de Cuba; José Martí*, Edición de 20 mil ejemplares costeada por el honorable señor Presidente de la República, General Gerardo Machado y Morales (Havana: Imp. de F. Verdugo, 1926).
7. Batista: *José Martí, Obras Completas* (Havana: Editorial Lex, 1953); *Archivo José Martí* (Havana, 1940-44). Castro: *Obras Completas [de] José Martí* (Havana: Editorial Nacional de Cuba, 1963); *Anuario Martiano* (Havana, 1969–).
8. "Martí en su obra," in Jose Marti, *Obras Completas* (Havana, 1963), I, 19.
9. Juan Marinello, *Once ensayos martianos* (Havana: Comisión Nacional Cubana de la UNESCO, 1964), p. 17.
10. Jose Marti, *Inside the Monster; Writings on the United States and American Imperialism*, ed., introd., and notes, Philip S. Foner, trans., Elinor Randall (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1975).
11. Philip S. Foner, *A History of Cuba and its Relations with the United States*, 2 vols. (New York: International Publishers, 1962-63); and *The Spanish-Cuban-American War and the Birth of American Imperialism, 1895-1898*, 2 vols. (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1972).
12. *Cuadernos Populares, Historia de Cuba, I* (Havana: Editorial Páginas, 1944), containing: "El marxismo y la historia de Cuba," by Carlos Rafael Rodriguez; "Seis actitudes de la burguesía cubana en el siglo XIX," by Sergio Aguirre; and "Raíces de la ideologia burgeusa en Cuba," by Jorge Castellanos.
13. After acknowledging his "indebtedness for the facilities" placed at his disposal by the Archivo Nacional of Havana and the Library of the City Historian of Havana, Foner thanks Sergio Aguirre, Julio Le Riverend, Anibal Escalante and Blas Roca "for the opportunity to discuss either in person or through correspondence, certain historical problems relating to Cuban history." *A History of Cuba*, I, xii.
14. *E.g.*, Foner confuses *El Siglo*, the famous newspaper founded in Havana, in 1861, by the Reformist Party, with *El Siboney*, the handwritten flier that Marti and some of his classmates distributed in their school in 1869. Ibid., II, 179. He confuses *Patria*, the revolutionary periodical founded by Marti in New York in 1892 with another identically titled but founded in Havana in 1901 by the conservative Mario Garcia Kohly. *The Spanish-Cuban-American War*, II, 591. He describes Marti as having been a "teacher in many universities in Latin America, ibid.,

p. 12, although it is a well known fact that Marti's only university teaching experience was in Guatemala and lasted but a few months. And Foner attributes to Marti an ode to the Cuban flag that was composed twenty years after Marti's death by Agustin Acosta, as every Cuban schoolchild knows from the time he attends kindergarten. Ibid., p. 666.

15. *A History of Cuba,* II, 285.

16. *Obras Completas,* IV, 186-187.

17. Ibid., IV, 204.

18. *The Spanish-Cuban-American War,* II, xxi.

19. Ibid., xxvii.

20. Ibid., xxviii.

21. Gerardo Castellanos, *Motivos de Cayo Hueso* (Havana: Ucar, García y Cía., 1935); Paul Alpizar Poyo, *Cayo Hueso y José Dolores Poyo* (Havana: P. Fernández y Cía., 1947); Manuel Deulofeu, *Héroes del destierro* (Tampa: n.p., 1900); Manuel Patricio Delgado, "Marti en Cayo Hueso," *Revista Cubana* (Havana), *29* (July 1951-Dec. 1952); Jose Rivero Muñiz, "Los cubanos en Tampa," *Revista Bimestre Cubana* (Havana), *74* (1958).

22. *Obras Completas,* III, 57-58.

23. A few examples will suffice: Foner errs in identifying the date of the Cuban National Holiday as October 19, instead of October 10; he describes Marti as a student of the Colegio de San Pablo when that school had not yet been founded; he asserts that Marti, after having served several months of hard labor, was "transferred temporarily to a prison on the Isle of Pines," where there was no prison; and he calls the eight medical students executed by the Spanish authorities in Cuba in 1871, the subject of a poem by Marti, "student demonstrators shot on the streets of Havana." Foner also mistakenly refers to Rosario de la Peña as "Rosario de la Acuna," confusing her real name with the one by which she was called, "Rosario *la de* Acuña," after the Mexican poet Manuel Acuña, who was enamoured of her, committed suicide. He further errs in stating that, while in Mexico, Marti "gained a reputation as a member of the literary salon of 'Rosario de la Acuna' [sic], which spread throughout much of Latin America, and together with his writings, made him a figure of importance on the continent"; had Foner done some basic investigation he would have learned that the activities of the salon were ignored outside Mexico and that Marti's writings were virtually unknown in the other countries of Latin America until much later. Moreover, he would not have mistakenly presumed that Marti went to Cuba in 1877 with the hope that "his presence might revive the fighting spirit of his countrymen," for he would have learned that the purpose of the trip was to arrange for the return of Marti's family to Havana and to obtain recommendations for his own impending trip to Guatemala, and that at the time no one could have hoped to revive the Cuban fighting spirit, least of all Marti, a poor exile of twenty-four completely unknown to those involved in the war effort.

24. *Inside the Monster,* p. 82.

25. Ibid., p 89.

26. Ibid., p. 333.

27. *Obras Completas,* VIII, 36.

28. Ibid., IV, 160.

29. *The America of Jose Marti,* ed. and trans., Juan de Onis (New York: Noonday Press, 1953).

30. *Marti on the U.S.A.,* ed. and trans., Luis A. Baralt (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1966).

31. "Preface," *Inside the Monster,* pp. 9-10.

32. In this sense *Inside the Monster* is clearly distinguishable from the previous anthologies in English but similar to the one of Russian translations published in Moscow in 1956, *Jose Marti,* eds., V. E. Ermolayev and E. M. Kolchina, trans., V. Stolbov, O. Savich *et al.* The Russian anthology and Foner's coincide in omitting such classics among Marti's chronicles about the U.S. as "Peter Cooper," "The Inauguration of a President," "The Celebration of the Constitution in Philadelphia," "President Garfield," "Longfollow," etc., while including "Jesse James, Great Bandit," "The Secretary of the Navy, Whitney" (the title of which the Russians respect—"Morkoy Minstr. Uitnei"—but Foner changes to "Political Corruption"), "The Truth about the United States," "The United States View of Mexico," and "The Washington Pan-American Congress."

33. *Obras Completas,* XI, 235.
34. "Monumento de los peregrinos," Ibid., XII, 287.
35. Ibid., X, 308, 309.
36. Hector Hernandez Pardo, "Interview with U.S. Professor Philip S. Foner," *Granma* (Havana) Jan. 23, 1977, p. 6.