

Women and La Historia Oficial

The Reader who picks up Javier Ocampo López's encyclopedic *Historia de las ideas de integración de América Latina (History of Ideas of Latin American Integration)* encounters a rich and ambitious survey of three centuries of Spanish-American political history and thought around the problematics of colonialism, independence, nation-building, and transnational identity. In this impressive panorama, a lone woman makes her appearance: the cigarette seller Manuela Beltrán who on March 16, 1781 in Socorro, Nueva Granada, tore down a tax edict imposed by the Spanish colonial government. Her act, cheered on by an angry crowd, triggered an insurrection (the *conjuración de los alfaiates*) that then spread throughout the provinces, a prelude to Spanish-American independence. The figure of Beltrán in Ocampo's book in many ways typifies the position women have occupied with respect to the official histories of modern times. For the most part they simply have been absent. When they are present, they are isolated figures, and they are not heard to speak – one cannot help but notice that Beltrán's »ideas on Latin American integration« are not what mark her place in history. Though she clearly did have the right idea at the time, it was never a question of recording her thoughts or words for posterity, only her gesture, as a prelude and metonymy for the larger drama.

For present purposes, it is of particular interest that this lone woman is a late eighteenth-century popular revolutionary figure, a Marseillaise *avant la lettre*. She is conspicuously not a member of the criollo (Euroamerican) elites who claimed the American revolutions as their own and went on to fashion themselves into national ruling classes. While women have never been well represented by official histories in any age, it is worthwhile to recognize how particularly limited and repressive the bourgeois republican era has been in producing and imagining women as historical, political, and cultural agents. As Joan Landis has argued in her ground-breaking work on women and the public sphere, the democratization of politics in the nineteenth century brought with it the domestication of women, and the elision of women (along with most other people) as subjects of history. Such elisions are part of the hegemonic project of the official story – as the recent Argentine film of that title (*»La historia oficial«*) reminds us. Indeed, that film exhibits some of the complexities and compromises involved in trying to insert women, especially women of privilege, into modern narratives of national history. At the same time, *»La historia oficial«* bears witness to the current emergence of new forms of female political and historical agency in Latin America, in mothers' movements, production cooperatives, shelter networks, squatters' movements, and other innovative, often cross-class forms, of female activism. The discussion to follow is offered in deliberate relation to these extraordinary contemporary developments.

Feminist scholarship on Europe has long recognized the end of absolutism as occasioning profound transformations in gender systems. In Spanish America, the end of absolutism was experienced as the end of colonialism. Nineteenth-century struggles around gender coincide and coarticulate, then, with the dynamics of *deco-*

lonization. The latter process, in Spanish America as elsewhere, was overwhelmingly shaped by the inauguration of European and North American *neocolonialism*. Colonial discourse studies, particularly as articulated in English studies, have been notorious for treating European colonialism as a phenomenon that erupted in the nineteenth century and ended with the decolonization movements of the 1960s. Hispanists have long, and legitimately, fumed at the elision of the so-called »first wave« of European colonialism initiated by Spain and Portugal in the late fifteenth century and elaborated into the gigantic colonial apparatuses of the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Americas. The 1992 Columbus Quincentennial went some way toward raising scholarly consciousness on this point. Within English studies, the new historicism gave rise to research paradigmas for studying sixteenth- and seventeenth-century colonialism, and these even include Iberian expansionism from time to time.

In contemporary parlance, the term »postcolonial« has (at significant cost, it would seem¹) become the reference point for studies in Euroimperialism. The term is commonly understood as chronologically anchored in the post-1960s present, designated as the postcolonial era. Here again, hispanists and americanists have a brief, for again the historical rhythms of the Americas are overlooked – if postcolonial refers to the aftermath of colonialism, then the Americas were postcolonial in the early 1800s. There is heated debate among Latin Americanists about the appropriateness of applying the term postcolonial to the nineteenth-century Americas (»applying« the term itself smacks of metropolitan academic imperialism). Nevertheless, much can be learned about contemporary postcoloniality by examining its nineteenth-century antecedents, especially as regards neocolonial forms of European and capitalist expansion.

In the cases of both northern Europe and the Americas, the nineteenth century is broadly seen as a period of nation-building in the context of secular republicanism and the consolidation of bourgeois rule. In northern Europe, however, these processes occurred in conjunction with aggressive imperial expansion abroad; in Spanish America, on the other hand, nineteenth-century nation-building goes on in the context of decolonization (with respect to Spanish colonialism) and neocolonial intervention (on the part of northern Europe). The latter form the bases for ideologies of progress and, in the twentieth century, modernization and development. Though seemingly shared on both sides of the Atlantic, these ideologies deployed themselves along different and often opposing lines as Europe (and then its proxy, the United States) sought to stringently subordinate America's modernization to its own.

Decolonization and neocolonialism, then, form the context for the following discussion of the negotiation of gender and nationhood in nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Spanish America. After some general considerations on how women are situated by masculinist ideologies of nation, this essay looks at how such ideologies are played out in some key Spanish-American literary texts by men and women writers. The examples all undertake to focus interest on the ways Spanish-American women writers and intellectuals have symbolized themselves in this socio-semantic field, and how they have problematized masculinist ideologies of citizenship.

In the previous section reference was made to the limitations within bourgeois republicanism for creating or imagining women as subjects of history. The term »imagining« is introduced here as it is used by Benedict Anderson in his stimulating book *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. In this work Anderson explores the idea of the nation as an *imagined* political community whose totality can never be experienced concretely: »The members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion« (15). In fact, Anderson argues, all human communities tend to be imagined entities. Communities differ, he argues, »not by their falsity/genuineness, but by the style in which they are imagined« (15). Anderson introduces three useful terms to characterize the style in which the modern nation is imagined:

»The nation is imagined as limited because even the largest of them ... has finite, if elastic boundaries beyond which lie other nations ... It is imagined as sovereign because the concept was born in an age in which Enlightenment and Revolution were destroying the legitimacy of the divinely-ordained, hierarchical, dynastic realm ... Finally it is imagined as a community, because, regardless of the actual inequality and exploitation that may prevail in each, the nation is always conceived as a deep, horizontal comradeship. Ultimately it is this fraternity that makes it possible, over the past two centuries, for so many millions of people, not so much to kill, as willingly to die for such limited imaginings.« (16)

Anderson's analysis of the character of modern nationalism is of particular interest to Latin Americanists. One of his most radical, though not entirely convincing, suggestions is that the modern nation as a political idea arises not in Europe, but in the Americas, in the republicanist movements that fought for independence. (Hence, perhaps, the stress on autonomy and sovereignty in ideologies of the nation.) As the nation-states of continental Europe sought to consolidate themselves and define national destinies in the nineteenth century, Anderson argues, it was to the American republics that they looked for guidance and example. Anderson's analysis is of considerable interest to literary scholars as well, because he singles out print culture, notably the novel and the newspaper, as necessary conditions for creating the invisible networks that form the basis for the imagined national community. This factor is of particular interest with respect to women.

The language of fraternity and comradeship used in the passages just quoted displays (without commenting on) the androcentrism of the modern national imaginings. Indeed, Anderson's three key features of nations (limited, sovereign, fraternal) are metonymically embodied in the finite, sovereign, and fraternal figure of the citizen-soldier. (Anderson goes on to discuss cenotaphs and tombs of the unknown soldier as some of the »most arresting emblems of the modern culture of nationalism« (17). Military service and electoral politics, domains originally limited to males, have been obvious central apparatuses for producing the imagined community of the modern nation-state, along with mass print culture in which women have participated.

Though he does discuss the ways ethnic, racial, and class subgroups become incorporated into national self-understandings, Anderson does not take up the que-

stion of gender. His own terms make clear, however, that the issue is not simply that women »don't fit« the descriptors of the imagined community. Rather, the nation by definition situates or »produces« women in permanent instability with respect to the imagined community, including, in very particular ways, the women of the dominant class. Women inhabitants of nations were neither imagined as nor invited to imagine themselves as part of the horizontal brotherhood. What bourgeois republicanism offered women by way of official existence has come to be called »republican motherhood,« the role of the producer of citizens. So it is that women inhabitants of modern nations were not imagined as having intrinsically the rights of citizens; rather, their value was specifically attached to (and implicitly conditional on) their reproductive roles. As mothers of the nation, they are precariously other to the nation. They are imagined as dependent rather than sovereign; they are practically forbidden to be limited and finite, being obsessively defined by their reproductive capacity; their bodies are sites for many forms of intervention, penetration, and appropriation. As feminist scholars such as Landis have shown, these gender asymmetries were sharply resisted by late eighteenth-century feminists as bourgeois challenges to absolutism unfolded. Ultimately, however, their resistance was either defeated or co-opted.

The fundamental instability accorded to women subjects may be one of the features that distinguishes the modern nation from other forms of human community. But, of course, to say that women are situated in permanent instability in the nation is to say that nations exist in permanent instability. Gender hierarchy exists as a deep cleavage in the horizontal fraternity, one that cannot easily be imagined away. Women are, after all, expected to cohabit with men, not in separate parts of the city or national territory. It is through women that the horizontal brothers reproduce themselves. At the same time, the reproductive capacity so indispensable to the brotherhood is a source of peril, notably in the capacity of those nonfinite, all too elastic female bodies to reproduce themselves outside the control of the fraternity. It is no accident that modern nations denied full citizens' rights to illegitimate offspring, or that women's political platforms, like that of the Sección Femenina of the Peruvian APRA party in 1933, demanded those rights.

In the face of their exclusion from the national fraternity, as historian Francesca Miller has shown, the political and social engagement of Spanish-American women became heavily *internationalist*, and often *antinationalist*. Women activists established a long-standing presence in such spheres as the Pan-American movement, international pacifism, syndicalism, and transnational debates on health, education, and human rights. Perhaps it is the consistent, relentless pacifism of these activists that expresses most clearly their dissociation from the fraternal, soldierly imaginings of nationhood.

In the domain of culture, other interesting ambiguities emerge. In the eighteenth century, women of privilege had gained access to the all-important networks of print culture that would underwrite the imagined national communities. As writers, readers, critics, salon-keepers, and members of literary circles, they were legitimate, though far from equal, participants in the sphere of letters. In the nineteenth century, despite pressures toward domesticity, women retained their foothold in lettered culture (though they were constantly obliged to defend it). Thus, though lacking political rights, they remained able *legitimately* to assert themselves

in national print networks, engage with national forms of self-understanding, maintain their own political and discursive agenda, and express demands on the system that denied them full status as citizens. To a great extent, this entitlement was anchored in class privilege.

Women as National Icons: Mármol, Gorriti, and Manuela Rosas

The uneasy coexistence of nationhood and womanhood is played out in that paradoxical republican habit of using female icons as national symbols. For every unknown soldier there is a Statue of Liberty, a Britannia, a Marseillaise, a national virgin – in the Americas, the indigenous figures of the Malinche, Pocahontas, the Virgin of Guadalupe. In patriotic speeches, sculpture, poetry, novels, and plays, female icons turn up to symbolize the nation – symbolizing, often enough, that which is at stake between warring groups of men. Such symbolizations played a conspicuous role in the extraordinary drama of national self-fashioning that took place in Argentina following independence from Spain. In its cultural and literary dimensions, that drama provides a vivid instance of the postcolonial tangle of nationalism, militarism, republicanism, fraternity, and womanhood.

In a configuration that has some points in common with the American Civil War, the battlelines in Argentina in the 1830s and 1840s were drawn between two camps, the *unitarios* and the *federales*. Roughly speaking, the *unitarios* were led by Buenos Aires-based Europe-oriented liberal republicans advocating free trade and a centralized, secular, progressive, republic centered in Buenos Aires. The *federales* who opposed them are generally seen as constituting an alliance of two groups: first, traditional land-based elites of the interior defending local autonomy, a semi-feudal economy, trade protectionism and preservation of church power; and second, a new wave of capitalists who had entered the cattle industry in Buenos Aires province after other forms of commerce with Europe failed to expand. Following independence from Spain, the *unitarios* had formed a centralized Argentine Republic, consecrated in the Constitution of 1826. The effort was short-lived, however. By 1830 power had been lost to the *federales*, and the two groups remained locked for twenty years in a devastating civil war. In terms highly charged in the context of decolonization, the *unitarios* called the *federales* barbarians and the *federales* called the *unitarios* savages.

Until the victory of the unitarians in 1852, this scene was dominated by the figure of the now legendary federalist dictator Juan Manuel Rosas. Having become leader of the federalists (in part by assassinating the opposition), the politically talented Rosas ruled the country from 1838 to 1852 with an iron hand and a secret police force that sent scores of Argentinians to their deaths or into exile. Debate still goes on in Argentina as to whether Rosas was a crude leftover from the colonial era, or the first great Argentine nationalist, but there is no question as to how the *unitarios* saw him. The *unitario* leadership were urban intellectuals deriving from the colonial bureaucracy and the colonial universities. They were prolific writers, passionately devoted to the project of decolonizing their culture, of creating an enlightened republic of letters. Lacking control of the economy, one form of production they did control was print. During the Rosas period they produced an immense

body of writings, mainly journalistic, including a corpus devoted to Rosas himself which must be one of the great literatures of denunciation of all time.

In 1844, Jose Mármol, a key unitarian intellectual, began publishing the serial novel *Amalia*, which became and has remained a canonical testimonial to the period. The title character is a young and beautiful upper-class Buenos Aires woman. Through family ties, and her love for a unitarian militant, she becomes embroiled in political intrigue and exposed to Rosa's reign of terror. When an attempt to overthrow the dictator fails, she and her lover arrange to marry and flee the country. The novel ends minutes after the marriage, when Rosa's henchmen invade Amalia's house, killing her lover and leaving her in the hands of a benevolent, but federalist, uncle. Mármol's novel is not at all simplistic, but the national symbolics are clear. Amalia's initial situation allegorizes the moment of Spanish-American independence: as a young woman, her father dies and her mother marries her to an old family friend for protection. After a year of passionless union, the friend dies as does the mother, leaving Amalia, a young, beautiful widow (a postcolonial near-virgin) of considerable resources, including her own house. At the end of the novel, Amalia is still an unexchanged woman, the frustration of her marriage echoing the failure of the unitarian national project. The sexual and the domestic are homologous with the political and the military. No new national family has been founded to replace the already defunct colonial patriarchy. The entire drama takes place, of course, among the white criollo elite.

Though republican ideals remain unfulfilled in the novel, they are not unexpressed: the language with which Mármol's characters describe their political aspirations echoes Anderson's account of the modern nation. In this passage from near the end of the novel, the hero, Daniel Bello, calls for a »spirit of association,« and attributes the unitarian defeat to

»the habits of association among our cultured class; our want of association everywhere and in everything; our life of individualism; our apathy, our neglect; our selfishness; our ignorance regarding the value of the collective strength of men... Let him who strives among us when liberty has been won teach our children that this liberty will last for a very short time if the nation does not unite as one man to defend it; that they will have neither a country, nor liberty, nor laws, nor religion, nor public virtue until the spirit of association shall have destroyed the cancer of individualism, which has made and which still makes the misfortune of our generation.« (366-67)

Since we are talking about a civil war, it is no surprise to find that Amalia, the unitarian national symbol, has a federalist counterpart in Mármol's novel. She was a real person – Manuela Rosas, daughter of the hated dictator. A woman the same age as Mármol himself, she too has been the subject of a sizable literature of praise and condemnation. Historically, Manuela Rosas became her father's confidante and a chief political agent after her mother's death in 1838. In Mármol's novel, she appears as a competent, appealing person victimized by her father's crude tyranny. Like Amalia, she remains an unexchanged woman at the end of the novel (as she did in real life, marrying in her thirties only after her father went into exile in England).

Apart from her fictionalization in *Amalia*, Manuela Rosas turns up elsewhere in Mármol's writings, as the pretext for prescribing the future of women in the new republic. In 1851, Mármol published an essay on Manuela Rosas analyzing her life

and characters. It reads as a fairly straightforward exhortation to domesticity and republican motherhood. Mármol sees Manuela as »the victim of that terrible imposition to live unmarried.« With »a different upbringing and a different father« she would become capable of falling in love with a suitable man and would no longer be found attending orgies, dancing »even with Negros,« or, in a particularly regrettable lapse, serving to an English naval officer the salted ears of a unitarian colonel.² Thus, as I will suggest more fully below, Mármol's writings portray elite women as both symbols and historical agents in the ongoing drama of decolonization and nation-building; at the same time, their absorption into domesticity will be the very sign that the nation has indeed been born.

Juana Manuela Gorriti was also the same age as Mármol, and as engaged as anyone with the future of the emergent Argentine nation. Daughter of a prominent unitarian landowner, she too left Argentina during the Rosas period, to begin an extraordinary life of literary and political activity in Bolivia and Peru. Around 1850 she wrote a very popular story around the civil conflict, titled »El guante negro« (»The Black Glove«). In this story, too, the drama of nation-building is played out in love relations, and women are important both as symbols and agents in that process. Gorriti's story, however, presents a much less orderly symbolic structure than *Amalia*. Here, the sexual and the domestic do not operate homologously with the political and the military. Love, politics, patriotism, and militarism tangle around each other in complex fashion.

Like *Amalia* »El guante negro« embodies the national conflict in two women, a unitarian named Isabel (note the courtly name) and Manuela Rosas. Both are in love with the same soldier, a young federalist named Wenceslaus (another courtly name) whose sincere affection for Manuela has been overwhelmed by a newfound passion for Isabel. Unlike *Amalia*, Isabel does not espouse her lover's political cause as her own. Rather she places her own politics above love, and demands Wenceslaus prove his faith to her by enlisting in the unitarian army. He, placing love above family and politics, does so. His father, a federalist colonel, hears this news and, placing his politics above family, arranges to murder his son for disloyalty. Wenceslaus's mother hears this news and, placing family above politics and motherhood above marriage, murders her husband to prevent him from killing her son. Wenceslaus hears this news and reverses his earlier choice. His mother's sacrifice, he decides, obliges him to return to the federalist army and the arms of Manuela Rosas. He does so and is promptly killed on a battlefield. The story ends with the unexchanged, unfulfilled unitarian Isabel – alias the still unformed nation – standing on the battlefield in the midst of a tangled pile of male corpses, among which she has found that of her beloved Wenceslaus. She loves on two counts: the unitarians have lost the battle, and her federalist lover has been killed. Manuela Rosas reaps a Pyrrhic victory, and it remains unclear in whose hands the national future ought to rest. The men in the story are all dead.

While in *Amalia* it is clear that the heroine's happiness and her lover's life have been sacrificed to the tyranny of Rosas, no such clear conclusion can be drawn from »El guante negro.« Love, politics, and family weave in, through, and around each other in unpredictable ways. In *Amalia*, women characters are embedded in family structures that are weak, parentless, and sometimes perverse; in »El guante negro,« the family has disintegrated even further. Isabel and Manuela are without visi-

ble family ties in the story; both, for example, are presented traveling alone to Wenceslaus's bedside. Wenceslaus's mother, far from being sheltered by her family men, finds herself murdering one to protect the other. While Amalia is often called upon to defend heroically the sentimental/domestic sphere of her house from political violence, in »El guante negro« both the house and the battlefield are sites for both sentimental/domestic and political action, by either sex.

In *Amalia* and »El guante negro,« the abandoned fiancée left standing after the final shoot-out symbolizes the failure to consolidate the republic. At the same time, in neither text can the women be said to function solely as national symbols. They are also active protagonists in the political drama. They have not been domesticated; Republican motherhood has not been consolidated (though the stage is seemingly set for it). *Amalia*, and to an even greater extent »El guante negro,« support the suggestion that in at least some sectors of Spanish-American society, this post-revolutionary period marked a historical aperture for women, an experimental moment in which they could be imagined as players in the drama of nation-building.

The 1920s and 1930s: Country and City

Like the 1830s and 1840s, the decades following World War I were a period of intense nationalisms and debates on nationalism in many parts of Latin America, this time in the context not of independence but of modernization. Many countries had experienced internal economic expansion as they grew to meet Europe's needs during the First World War. Internal markets and small industry developed, creating in some countries national business classes and middle sectors strong enough to challenge land-based oligarchic interests. Urbanization and industrialization created conditions for the emergence of the first modern mass political movements. Industrial working classes developed and became a political force in some places. Challenges to traditional oligarchical orders were often expressed as internationalism, urban cosmopolitanism, Latin American continentalism, and critiques of nationalism. Such challenges reflect, among other things, shifting directions in the neocolonial relations between Latin America and Europe, plus its new imperial proxy, the United States. At the same time, in response to changing demographic and political landscapes, nationalist visions were formulated both by those seeking change (in Peru, for instance, the indigenous majority leaps into the foreground of national concern) and by those opposing it (in Argentina, Rosas is revindicated, for example).

Print culture, as Benedict Anderson's argument predicts, was active in formulating dramas of modernization and competing national self-understandings. In every capital city, cosmopolitan avant-garde movements undertook to create modern, urban high cultures. At the same time, regionalist literatures emerged seeking to consolidate urban-based discourses about the countryside while affirming, rejecting or parodying visions of rural progress.

It is a symptom of the time that both regionalist and avant-garde movements operated to the complete, and often aggressive, exclusion of women. The canonical women poets of these decades – Alfonsina Storni, Juana de Ibarbourou, Gabriela Mistral – were widely acclaimed, but never accepted in avant-garde circles. Today they are benignly classified in literary typologies as »postmodernistas« distinct

from the avant-garde, and the experimentalism of their writing goes largely unrecognized by the literary establishment. While the male avant-garde often combines a critical perspective with an eager radicalism and enthusiasm for modern urban life, equally cosmopolitan women writers often depict urban modernity as a source of confinement, fear, or despair. While for some male poets the mobile figure of the urban *flâneur* became a vehicle for elaborating a vigorous aesthetic of the city, such an aesthetic seems to have lacked plausibility for many women writers. A critique of domesticity and suburban boredom emerges, consolidating itself in the 1940s in the work of such writers as Chilean María Luisa Bombal.

No women writers appear in the canons of regionalist literature either. This is not to say, however, that women did not write about rural life. No contrast could be more revealing than that between the two classic Venezuelan texts that appeared in 1929; Rómulo Gallegos's *Dona Bárbara* and Teresa de la Parra's *Las memorias de Mamá Blanca*. Gallegos's novel became Venezuela's canonic epic of modernization, in which an enlightened, urban-educated man returns to the countryside, takes over a ranch owned by a crude and powerful woman rancher, and tames and marries her daughter, thus securing the national future for reason, progress, and the patriarchal family. De la Parra, through the reminiscences of an elderly woman city dweller, nostalgically evokes elite rural life as a femino-centric paradise of girls, women, and servants, still identified with the colonial era. Modernization is represented by a catastrophic move to the city, where the young female protagonists experience a drastic loss of liberty in the name of a highly repressive urban femininity.³

The schematic contrast between *Dona Bárbara* and *Mamá Blanca* should not obscure their common ground. Symbolically, gender operates similarly in the two works, though with contrasting value signs: both Mamá Blanca and Dona Bárbara stand for preindustrial social structures inherited from the colonial period and now seen to be passing. Both represent forms of female power and entitlement destroyed by decolonization and progress. Both remind us that, from a purely socioeconomic standpoint, the development of urban centers of power and elaborate state apparatuses threatened to deprive women heirs and property owners of an economic base for which there was no urban equivalent.⁴ Elite men could leave family estates to become lawyers, bankers, or businessmen, but the city held few such new beginnings for their female counterparts. Transposed to the house in the suburbs, class privilege realized itself in new ways that perhaps seemed narrow and small in comparison with the *hacienda* or *fundo*.

As literary creations, *Dona Bárbara* and *Las memorias de Mamá Blanca* register in contrasting ways the impact of early twentieth-century feminism on the lettered imagination. De la Parra seeks to revindicate a lost oligarchic mother, while Gallegos feminizes and »barbarizes« the figure of the oligarch in order to dispel it from the national landscape. In Peru, at this same time, a very similar fate was being dealt to another national icon, the figure of the indigenous woman, to which I now turn.

One of the oldest and most durable myths of white self-definition in Spanish America is the sexual appropriation of the indigenous woman by the European invader. It is a genuine narrative of origins, dating back to the tale of Hernando Cortés and his Aztec mistress La Malinche (or in North America, to Pocahontas and Captain John Smith). Endless repetitions and variants have mythified this figure, simultaneously victim and traitor, as the mother of the American mestizo peoples. At the same time, this subordinated woman has stood for all the indigenous peoples conquered (feminized) and co-opted (seduced) by European expansion. Nowhere have these symbols remained more active than in the Andean region, where indigenous majorities continue to live in (and out) cultural and political paradigmas laid down in the colonial period.

In 1924, the Peruvian writer and Francophile Ventura García Calderón published a short story, almost a vignette, entitled »Amor indígena,« which grotesquely reenacts the classic American drama of conquest as rape. Three Spanish (i. e., non-indigenous) Peruvians, a landowner, a businessman, and an anonymous but educated narrator, are traveling together on horseback in the Peruvian sierra. They stop for a midday meal in a town that is celebrating the feast of its patron saint. They spot a beautiful young Indian woman in the procession, and playfully flip a coin to decide »whose she will be.« The narrator wins the toss. Led by the feudal landlord Don Rosendo, the trio amuse themselves by terrorizing the town at gunpoint and laughing at the desolation of the inhabitants as their prized possessions are destroyed. »Now we were masters of that lonely village, and life had the golden color of autumn mornings in barbaric lands« exults the narrator. Deciding it is »a matter of duty« that they fulfill their intentions toward the young Indian woman, Don Rosendo with his horsewhip disperses the crowd of relatives around her, and brings her by force to the narrator. The pair are left alone in the *tambo* (tavern). »It was savage,« reports the narrator, »as in the times of the Conquest«:

»I shut myself in, dismissed the terrified mestizo, and the Indian girl was mine, sobbing words that I could not understand. She was exquisite in her hallucinated fear and her servile respect for the white man. For the first time I was animated by the joy of the Spanish forefathers who would knock over the women on the road for the pleasure of an hour and ride off proudly, feeling neither love nor remorse. The lovely girl looked up at me submissively as if at her master.«

The group saddles up and leaves town, only to hear footsteps behind them. The narrator turns around to find »his little girl« (»mi chiquilla«) following him, looking up »with such a helpless, slavish pleading, that I felt a burst of pride in my heart.« The narrator picks her up and places her on the back of his horse, concluding that he has found the best woman life will ever afford him:

»Who else would love me like that, following the hoofprints of my horse, searching the pathways for the Beloved, as in the holy song of Solomon? What other woman would follow me, desheveled, forgetting her family and giving herself for life? My lordly forefathers were reawakening in my blood, and I obeyed their atavism.«

As in *Dona Bárbara*, a stereotype of the rural, uneducated woman is presented as an erotic ideal for the urban, educated man. Colonial racial subordination provi-

des the image of ideal marriage and the paradigm for male privilege. Again, one is justified in seeing such images in part as reactions to the feminist visions of sexual equality to which these urban writers (García Calderón lived nearly all his life in Paris) were inevitably exposed.

García Calderón's contemporary version of the rape story is startling precisely because of the mechanical exactitude with which it simulates the ideology of conquest (right down to the guns and horses). It is as if nothing at all had happened in the nearly four hundred years between Pizarro and himself. Conscious but not critical of the drama's anachrony, the narrator sees himself as recuperating a lost self, and at the same time regards the contemporary colonial figure, Don Rosendo, with a parodic distance. It is this combination of conscious anachrony and a touch of parody that marks this brief text as the reactionary document that it is. García Calderón reaffirmed the legacy of the conquest precisely at the moment in which both were being intensely questioned in Peru. The »problema del indio« was coming to occupy the center of Peruvian political discourse, signaling a modernization of national imaginings.

The status of the indigenous population in Peru constituted one of the great national dialogues of the 1920s and 1930s. Intensely exploited under semifeudal conditions or withdrawn into marginal regions, the indigenous majority had never been integrated into the imagined national fraternity – despite the fact that they formed the great majority of the population, of the work force, and of the army. Indeed, it is usually argued that Peru's military defeat by Chile in the War of the Pacific (1879-1884) first called attention to the need to make fullfledged citizens of the Andeans – the defeat was blamed on their lack of national identity and purpose. (One recalls Anderson's view of military sacrifice as the ultimate test of nationalist imaginings.)

Modernization in Peru produced great pressures on the semifeudal structure of the agricultural economy, based on exploitation of the indigenous labor force. Progressive urban middle sectors made it their goal to challenge the political hegemony of the landowning oligarchy, develop industry and commerce, and integrate the country. It was with these items at the top of the agenda that socialism took root in Peru in the 1920s, under the leadership of José Carlos Mariátegui. Again, literature and journalism were actively engaged in the ideological project of reformulating national self-understanding. Discussion of nationalism, the national future, and the »problema del indio« flourished on the pages of the magazine *Amauta*, founded by Mariátegui in 1926. *Indigenismo* became a full-fledged literary movement as urban-educated writers sought to engage imaginatively with the subaltern majority of which they remained so woefully ignorant. There was no indigenous participation in the movement.

Writings about the Indian in this period display several kinds of ideological momentum. On the one hand, there is a sincere effort to come to grips with the reality of indigenous life and incorporate it into national self-understanding. An effort, in other words, to decolonize. At the same time, an exoticist tendency distances, objectifies, and dehumanizes the indigenous peoples in an decidedly nonfraternal way. At best they are seen as a national »problem« that the new urban leaders are called upon to solve. Yet in the symbolic realm, a fraternal appropriation also occurs: the new intellectuals often identify with indigenous tradition, adopting a strong cult of authenticity toward Incaic culture and language. The very title of the

magazine *Amauta*, for example, is a Quechua word that in Inca times referred, as the magazine tells us, to »a wise man who, in his capacity as teacher, socialized his knowledge to some extent and, as educator of the public servants required by the empire, had become the pivot of the administration« (*Amauta* 1:10). And it is, of course, this iconic male figure who adorned the cover of the magazine when it first appeared (should one speak here of republican fatherhood?).

The elite intellectual in the service of the state readily sums up the *Amauta* group's aspirations for themselves. The »problema del indio« in their writings is a terrain on which the group works out its own self-identification as a national political force. It becomes a mirror for the self-understanding of a young, oppositional sector committed to transforming a national social structure and economy dominated by the landed oligarchy. Thus, at a time when nationalism itself was often questioned as retrogressive and provincial, the preoccupation with indigenous peoples seems to operate as a kind of displaced nationalism. In identifying with what they themselves define as the interests of 'the Indian', the new intellectuals identify themselves as authentic Peruvians, while distinguishing themselves from other sectors of Peruvian society, and of their own class. At the level of social and political agency, however, their project left the indigenous population as disempowered as ever.

As an iconic figure, the *amauta* radically displaced the traditional icon of the indigenous woman violated by the Spanish conqueror. This displacement is often vividly dramatized in the *indigenista* poetry and fiction of the period (for which *Amauta* was an important mouthpiece). One particularly memorable example is found in a story entitled »El campeón de la muerte« (»The Champion of Death«) by Enrique López Albújar. López Albújar was one of the early progressive *indigenista* writers, and this story was published in 1920 in a collection entitled *Cuentos andinos* which, according to one critic, »convulsed the literary scene« when it appeared. As this story opens, an indigenous father is trying to locate his only daughter who has been carried off by a renegade *indio malvado*. As he chews his coca seeking a vision of her whereabouts, he hears a voice behind him. In the dark there appears the hand of the renegade holding a bloody sack whose contents are dumped out on the ground. It is the dismembered corpse of the violated daughter, whom the reader has never seen alive. This almost allegorical scene of horror inaugurates a long tale of revenge in which the grieved father hires a mestizo assassin to join him in hunting down and methodically killing the rapist one bullet at a time.

Several key transformations occur here. First, indigenous origin is anchored in a father, not a mother. Second, the rape is transferred from a gun-toting European conqueror to a knife-wielding (i. e., premodern) Indian. Third, the raped woman does not survive as a symbol. She is literally disposed of, in the most aggressive and misogynistic fashion. The colonial symbol is substituted by a fraternal pair (the father and the hired assassin), creating a new masculinized and militarized symbolic space. This new fraternal pair is explicitly modern: they bear guns; their relation is horizontal; it is mediated by professionalism and cash. More important, they represent an alliance of mestizo and indigenous individuals, long-standing enemies in Andean society. López Albújar is credited as being one of the first Andean writers to create complex indigenous characters and social agents. At the same time, his narratives inaugurate an intensely masculinized universe in which images of female power and agency are virtually absent.

Given the masculinism of nationalist and indigenist imaginings of the period, it is hardly surprising that women writers and intellectuals of the time seemed not to join in them. The early women collaborators in the *Revista Amauta*, notably Dora Meyer de Zulen, Blanca Luz Brum, Magda Portal, and María Wiese, tended to write on contemporary politics, art, and everyday life. Their lack of engagement with the »problema del indio« contrasts with the activism of the previous century, however, when race was a very much a women's issue. Antislavery movements were heavily female, for example, while in the literary sphere, Gertrudis Gómez de Avellaneda's *Sab* (Cuba, 1841), Clorinda Matto de Turner's *Aves sin nido* (Peru, 1889) and Harriet Beecher Stowe's *Uncle Tom's Cabin* (United States, 1852) attest to the engagement of women intellectuals with issues of racial oppression. In Peru, the torch apparently passed into the hands of men, and into mainstream politics. Indeed, this shift is enacted in the opening issue of the *Revista Amauta*. The issue includes an article by Dora Meyer de Zulen, co-founder of the now-defunct Asociación Pro-Indígena, one of the first public lobbies for indigenous rights. At the request of Mariátegui, Zulen writes the history of the organization, including its demise in 1915. Her article has the effect of an act of closure on the older movement and an acknowledgement that the initiative now lies elsewhere.

When the women writers of *Amauta* do engage with the issues of identity, authenticity, and the indigenous majority in Peru, their work often contested conventional *indigenista* paradigms and located national problematics along lines other than race. One striking example is a text by short-story writer María Wiese that appears in issue 11 of *Amauta*. The story, entitled »El forastero« (»The Outsider«), opens on the figure of an aged indigenous woman receiving with joy the news that the young white aristocrat whom she cared for from birth is returning to the *hacienda* after a ten-year absence in Europe. The woman, so the genre might lead one to suspect, will represent a pole of cultural authenticity through which the Europeanized surrogate son might recover his authentic Peruvian identity. The story takes quite another turn, however. The mother icon is invoked only to be quickly moved off-stage, and the problem of national identity is articulated in quite another set of terms. Conflict breaks out between the European-educated son who indeed expected to return home to the »authentic« *hacienda* of his youth, and his »authentic« Peruvian brothers whose way of life has been transformed by imported European goods and practices. The nostalgic returnee is heartbroken at the presence in the paternal home of English furniture and English food, the change to single-crop agriculture, and the move from feudal paternalism to intensified, rationalized exploitation of indigenous labor. The brothers have not patience with the returnee's longing for old, uncomfortable, and inefficient ways. The story ends on a bizarre but very real contradiction: the traveled, cosmopolitan brother aligns with colonial traditionalism and questions modernization, while the narrow provincials are the ardent partisans of the foreign and the modern.

Wiese's story broaches a set of contradictions the *indigenista* discourse begs: what exactly can national identity be if the »authentic« values and practices of the dominant class are imported from outside? Is attachment to nonindustrial lifeways simply alienated nostalgia of the kind Europeans thrive on, or are things of real value being lost? What can nationalism be in the context of neocolonialism? Wiese adroitly moves in on these questions from within conventional *indigenista* themat-

tics, embodied in the figure of the Indian surrogate mother. This figure is invoked as a gesture, only to be declared anachronistic and irrelevant. Wiesse locates the problem of authenticity and national identity not in the indigenous majority, but squarely within the nonindigenous ruling classes, within the national brotherhood now divided around issues of modernization and identity. An even more complex contestation of *indigenista* discourse occurs in the final text to be examined here, Gabriela Mistral's *Poema de Chile*.

Gender, Race, and Nation in the Poema de Chile

Winner of the 1942 Nobel prize for literature, Chilean Gabriela Mistral achieved international prominence as a writer, intellectual, and social advocate in the 1930s and 1940s. Her *Poema de Chile* is a collection that Mistral began in the 1920s and worked on for twenty years, much of the time living in Brazil and traveling widely as an international intellectual figure. It is perhaps in keeping with the problematic relation between women and nation, and between women writers and nationalist writing, that the collection was never finished. It was edited posthumously by her companion Doris Dana. Though a work of major proportions (77 poems in 250 pages), the collection is quite marginalized in the critical legacy on Mistral. The *Poema de Chile* is problematic for patriarchal criticism in a way other writings of Mistral are not. Most of Mistral's writing has been subjected to the common critical strategy of reading women's texts as autobiographical or »personal«, contained in a private sphere that is an appendage of the domestic. Nationalist or patriotic writings by women tend to confound this strategy. They cannot easily be read back into the domestic sphere, for they take as their very subject matter the impersonal entity of the nation-state; their authorial voice is that of the citizen. What follows is not an attempt to »rescue« the *Poema de Chile* from obscurity or to nominate it for admission into the poetic canon. Rather it is an attempt to think about this remarkable and problematic work in connection with gender and traditions of nationalist and patriotic discourse.

From this perspective, one of the the most conspicuous features of the *Poema de Chile* is that its author opts entirely out of a long-standing heroic tradition of patriotic poetry that celebrates official history, singing the glories of battles, generals, sons in service of the motherland, and so forth. This is the tradition of such canonical works as Ercilla's *La Araucana* or Olmedo's *Victoria de Junín*, revived in a radical, counterhegemonic guise by Neruda in his *Canto general* (1950).⁵ In contrast with this historical, often militaristic tradition, Mistral writes about Chile exclusively as nature. The *Poema de Chile* consists of titles like »Cobre« (»Copper«), »La chinchilla« (»Chinchilla«), »Luz de Chile« (»Light of Chile«), and »Manzanos« (»Apple Trees«). The official or public history of Chile plays no role in the work; patriotism and nationalism in their political guise, affirming the imagined community, are absent. Rather, love of country is expressed through a passionate engagement with ecology and geography.

At first glance, one might see Mistral's focus on nature as a straightforward »feminine« choice. But to do so is to insert her poem into patriarchal meaning systems and to obscure its intervention in those systems. Within modern patriarchal

forms of knowledge, nature is female and history male. With respect to the normative male subject, nature/woman is an Other, and the object which that subject appropriates. Nature is the woman-object on which men sow the deeds of history; on which men bestow the nomenclatures of science; which the explorer discovers and the colonizer develops or tames. In the case of neo-romantic poetic tradition, nature is that which the poet contemplates, and appropriates as a correlate of his inner state. Men's dominance over nature in such writings is often expressed symbolically by the speaker's position on a high point or promontory (the »promontory poem« is recognized as a lyric subgenre), and through fantasy in which the landscape is transformed in the poet's imagination. One thinks of José María Heredia at Niagara atop the Teocalli; of Alexander von Humboldt's influential writings on America which sought to merge the poet and scientist into a single speaker-seer surveying the American landscape. This traditional configuration of the (male) poetic subject inspired by contemplation of (female) landscape, impinges heavily on Mistral and is one she reorganizes in her poem.

Though passivity is most often associated with the woman-landscape on which the male acts, it is important to note the equal passivity and immobility of the contemplating man-poet in neo-romantic nature poetry. It is precisely this immobile observer Mistral abandons. In a highly original gesture, she substitutes a mobile poetic voice and a narrative configuration. The speaking subject in the *Poema de Chile* is a woman who returns to Chile as a spirit after many years of absence. She travels through the country on foot in the company of an Indian boy child. Moreover, the traditional subject-object relation between man-poet and woman-landscape is substituted in Mistral's poem with an intersubjective one, the mother-child relation between the poetic »I« and the Indian child who accompanies her on her trek through Chile. Nearly all the poems in the collection are addressed to the child, or are dialogues with the child. The speaker's project in many of the poems is to pass on her knowledge of Chilean nature to her offspring, a mentoring activity quite distinct both from romantic self-expression and scientific classification. Indeed, the verb *mentar* – »to name« or »to mention« – is a key term throughout the work, as Mistral's »I« names the world for the accompanying child (see, for example, »El Mar« or »Salvia«).

Historicity is thus present in the *Poema de Chile* not in the form of canonical history (battles, treaties, dates to be commemorated) but in the »micropractices« of social reproduction through which one generation continually shapes the next. Indeed, masculine heroics are explicitly set aside in poems like »Perdiz« (»Partridge«), where the poet/mother admonishes the child for wanting to catch birds. Racial hierarchy, on the other hand, is not set aside. Like her compatriot Neruda, Mistral maintains white authority in a parental relation with an infantilized indigenous protagonist whose enfranchisement is in her hands, not his own. On the other hand, this addressee is anything but the silent recipient of her words. Their relation is dialogic, conflicted, continuously challenged by the contentious, querying child. At times, it is quite unclear who is leading whom. Mistral's mother-child dyad is in many ways true to life, capturing vividly the experience of women who move through their days from task to task in the constant company of a small child. At the same time, Mistral's dyad contrasts markedly with classical stereotypes of the mother-child pair: the silent motionless icon of Mary and the baby Jesus, both parties

looking outward with no possibility of dialogue between them; the eternally mobile Llorona who, unlike Mistral's ghost mother, is moving in search of, not in company with, her children. In effect, Mistral puts republican motherhood – and white supremacy – in motion, generating an albeit unusual citizen-building project. She pulls the mother-child dyad out into the street and makes it into a locus of social agency, power, and consciousness.

In addition to reworking established poetic stereotypes, Mistral explicitly challenges the identification of women with the domestic. Hatred of houses is a recurrent theme in the collection, developed at greatest length in the poem »Flores« (»Flowers«), which opens with the child challenging his mother's habit of avoiding houses. The mother replies at length, saying she prefers »hills and mountains« to »roses and carnations« because »mountains tell stories / and houses few or none« – a clear ironic inversion of established identification of history with the human world.

This theme is picked up in a number of the poems, such as »A dónde es que tú me llevas« (»Where are you taking me«), in which the child wonders,

»Or is it, tell me, that we will never have
this thing they call »home«
where I can sleep without fear
of wind, lightening or snow?«

The mother's reply is that what she seeks for her son is not a house, but racial justice and land:

»I am taking you to a place
where looking at your face
they do not call you
'split-footed Indian'
where they give you a piece of land
fully measured and reckoned.«

What she seeks for herself, however, is never stated. The »I« of this remarkable work remains a deracinated, dispossessed ghost in a national limbo, and at the same time a spokesperson with a sense of national identity and entitlement. Conspicuously, urbanization and industrialization, the realities of modernization, play no role in that mission. Not a single city, or even a town, is encountered by the wandering pair. No smokestacks or slag heaps besmirch the landscape. Modernization has no role in the future she projects.

In sum, the *Poema de Chile* reorganizes the literary patrimony in a poetry of movement and action which is not, however, a poetry of heroics or transformation. Nationalism and *amor patrio* are deployed in the intimate domains of mother-child relations and personal reminiscence; yet these intimate domains are explicitly dissociated from a domestic sphere. They are transposed into an idealized outdoor world through which woman moves with freedom and authority in relations that are vertical and maternal, not horizontal and fraternal. There is no imagined community in the poem (an extreme contrast with Anderson's model of the modern nation), only the national territory naturalized as an ecological entity, and a single maternal relation. Though there is patriotism in the work, there are no politics in any explicit sense of the term.

In Mistral's Chile there is no fraternity, and in fact there are no men. It is an escapist vision whose limits Mistral was perhaps aware of when she abandoned the

project in the 1940s. Apparently the image of a fully empowered female citizen was as unrealizable then as on the day she was born – and more inaccessible perhaps, than a hundred years before, when Gorriti's virgin Isabel stood up alone among the corpses of the fratricidal national brothers.

Conclusion

Perhaps Mistral was prophetic in eliminating modernization from her national narrative. The 1980s and 1990s have seen the demise of the nineteenth-century-based narratives of progress and development through which neocolonialism legitimated its interventions. At the moment neocolonialism is operating under the mask of the term »democracy,« reduced dishonestly and cynically to the presence of multiparty elections. Simultaneously, public tolerance for genocide and state violence grows, cultivated by industrial elites eager to be rid of the tensions between democracy and capital. Perhaps it was in response to such moral abjection that the Nobel Prize Committee in 1992 awarded its Peace Prize to Guatemalan indigenous activist Rigoberta Menchú, whose political work began in resistance to the state-sponsored genocide that killed some 100,00 indigenous Guatemalans in the 1970s and 1980s and continues today. Her remarkable autobiographical narrative *I. Rigoberta Menchú* bears lucid witness to the layered histories of precolonial, colonial, national, and neocolonial formations that constitute the »postcolonial« present in Spanish America. It suggests many of the ways this latter term must be specified and unpacked if it is to do anything more than mystify the webbed history of the present.

Not surprisingly, attacks contrived to discredit Menchú and her powerful book drew on nineteenth-century politics of race and gender: Menchú was criticized for failing to fulfill the role of national icon and generic racial Other.⁶ As an unmarried, childless, politically engaged woman who traveled and had learned Spanish in the course of her work, she was not, it was argued, »typical« of her people; only typicality could legitimate Menchú's authority to represent their circumstances. But of course, according to the same argument, were Menchú »typical« in these race-reductive terms, she would not undertake such a representation. Like Manuela Beltrán in Ocampo López's history, Menchú could be a metonymic symbol of her people but not a spokesperson for them; she could be permitted the role of a representation but not that of a representative or a representor. Luckily neither she nor Beltrán asked their oppressors for permission to claim citizenship and act in its name.

Notes

* This is a revised version of the essay »Women, Literature, and National Brotherhood« which appears in the volume *Women, Culture and Politics in Latin America*, co-authored by the Seminar on Feminism and Culture (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990), pp. 48-73. Several essays in that volume focus on nineteenth-century issues. The work presented here has been shaped by discussions with many people. My colleagues in the UC-Stanford Seminar have been an ongoing source of guidance and inspiration. I am also indebted to many graduate students in the Department of Spanish and Portuguese at Stanford, who have been vital interlocutors on issues of gender and literary history over the past several years. In particular, this paper has benefited from discussions with Magali Roy-Fequiere (on women and nationalism), Nina Menéndez (on Gorriti), Marcela Prado (on Mercedes Marín del Solar), Elena Feder (on de la Parra), Efraín Kristal (on *indigenismo*), Linda Koski (on Brunet and Bombal).

- 1 For several excellent critiques of the term »postcolonial,« see *Social Text* (1992): 31-32.
- 2 All translations, unless otherwise noted, are my own.
- 3 For extended discussion of gender and ideologies of the national in Argentina in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, see Francine Masiello.
- 4 For extended commentary, see Elizabeth Garrels.
- 5 This theme is also taken up by Chilean Marta Brunet in *Humo hacia el sur* (1946).
- 6 This »official« mode, of course, has not always been completely inaccessible to women. One is reminded, for example, of Mercedes Marín del Solar's »Canto fúnebre a la muerte de don Diego Portales« (1837), considered to be one of the founding texts of the Chilean lyric. In the twentieth century, women poets have participated, like Neruda, in the oppositional, protest-oriented branch of this militant tradition, though perhaps not in the epic dimensions of the *Canto general*. One thinks, for instance, of the militant socialist poet-

try of Magda Portal written in the context of Peruvian labor struggles of the 1930s and 1940s, or of Violeta Parra as the voice of Chile in the 1960s and 1970s.

Works Cited

- Albújar, Enrique López. »El campeón de la muerte.« *Cuentos andinos*. Cuarta edición. Lima: J.M. Baca, 1965. 27-40.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso, 1983.
- Calderón, Ventura García. »Amor indígena.« *Antología general de la prosa en el Perú*. Eduardo Congraíns Martín, ed. Lima: ECO-MA, 1971.
- d'Souza, Dinesh. *Illiberal Education: The Politics of Race and Sex on Campus*. New York: Free Press, 1991.
- Garrels, Elizabeth. *Las grietas de la ternura: Nueva lectura de Teresa de la Parra*. Caracas: Monte Avila, 1986.
- Gorriti, Juana Manuela. »El guante negro.« *Suenos y realidades*. Buenos Aires: Biblioteca de la Nación 1903. 91-127. Vol. 1.
- Landis, Joan. »Women and the Public Sphere: A Modern perspective.« *Social Analysis* (1984): 20-31.
- López, Javier Ocampo. *Historia de las ideas de integración de América Latina*. Bogota: 1981.
- Mármol, José. Amalia. Trans. Mary J. Serrano. New York: E. P. Dutton, 1919. Editora Nacional, 1984.
- »Manuela Rosas.« *Asesinato del Sr. Dr. D. Florencio Varela/Manuela Rosas*. Juan Carlos Ghiano, ed. Buenos Aires: Casa Pardo, 1972. 101-26.
- Masiello, Francine. *Between Civilization and Barbarism: Women, Nation, and Literary Culture in Modern Argentina*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1992.
- Menchú, Rigoberta, and Elizabeth Burgos-Debray. I. Rigoberta Menchú: »An Indian Woman in Guatemala.« Elizabeth Bugos-Debray, ed. Trans. Ann Wright. London: Verso, 1984.
- Miller, Francesca. *Latin American Women and the Search for Social Justice*. Hanover: UP of New England, 1991.
- Mistral, Gabriela. *Poema de Chile*. Doris Dana, ed. Santiago: Pomaire, 1942.