Learning from the Latins: Waldo Frank's Progressive Pan-Americanism

Sebastiaan Faber

CR: The New Centennial Review, Volume 3, Number 1, Spring 2003, pp. 257-295 (Article)

Published by Michigan State University Press
DOI: *https://doi.org/10.1353/ncr.2003.0009*

Learning from the Latins:

Waldo Frank's Progressive Pan-Americanism

Sebastiaan Faber
Oberlin College

In Praise of the Sleeping Virgin (Waldo Frank Visits Spain)

Waldo Frank, the American cultural critic who visited Spain in the early 1920s and immediately fell in love with the country, ends his *Virgin Spain* (1926) with a fictional dialogue between Cervantes and Columbus that, to today's reader, sounds uncannily prophetic and at the same time hopelessly outdated. The writer and the discoverer are standing at the Spanish Atlantic shore. Columbus, whose eyesight has weakened, asks Cervantes to look westward across the ocean and tell him what he sees. "I see America," Cervantes says. Looking again more carefully, he exclaims:

> A City of White Towers! The men who live in it are little motes. Yet they uphold these Towers! And in their hand, they wield a golden weapon making them the world's master. . . . [But t]hey are not masters of themselves. They are full of chaos . . . Chaos of races, traditions, dreams. They are uneasy. They build the Towers higher. . . . They have lost sight of the True God. Yet they are full of God-hunger, of God-search. To their own works they turn—and worship God in these.[1]

As it turns out, the people who inhabit these chaotic Americas are "dumb as children," although "within them, there is a world of Desire" (296-97). Like Spain in its day, they try to fight disorder and mitigate their insecurities by building cathedrals of sorts, as well as establishing Inquisitions that attempt to drive out the "infidels." Yet, as Cervantes observes, "unlike Spain, . . . they have not succeeded" in this effort. Strangely enough, the news of this failure is a source of joy for Columbus: "There is my hope! If I could go and tell them: therein is *their* hope! They shall not, like Spain, succeed. . . . The New World is in them, underneath the Towers. When they have learned that they can not succeed; that all the Towers and all the machines and all the gold on earth can not crush down this unborn need in them for a true New World—then it will arise" (297-98).

The meeting between Columbus and Cervantes is clearly situated in the 1920s, at the time of the book's writing. At one point, however, Cervantes' vision becomes positively prophetic. Clutching Columbus's arm, he exclaims: "Look! Can't you see? . . . No! . . . God, the Towers are falling! . . . They veer, they twist. They have sunk in the mire of men" (298). Again, the apparent disaster only feeds Columbus's optimism: "Glory to Jehovah! . . . The Seed shall rot. . . . Now shall be the birth of the World which I discovered." (298-99).

Forgetting for a moment about the fall of the Towers, Columbus lets himself be distracted by a meditation on Spain. For him, it is a perpetually giving country, one that, "creating life, has never lived." Spain is a tragic mother, but also an immaculate one: "All worlds have come in, unto her; of all worlds, she has begotten worlds. And she has lain untouched" (299-300). Then, the distracted discoverer remembers that America's White Towers have just fallen. He breaks into an exhortation that is also the justification of Frank's book:

> Ready, Spain! You must stir again. You must give again. Europe has rotted at last into the Grave they called America. Your work is not quite done. You, most broken mother of all Europe, you have preserved a Seed. . . . Your spirit, Spain. They above all will need it, in the north: they whose speech is English and who have led in the building of the Towers . . . For it is written that these

> shall also lead in the birth of the true New World . . . Let them see you, Spain; let them take from you, O mother. For their spirit is weak and childish. . . . But you, Spain, dared to be what you believed; you knew the wisdom of what small men call "madness." . . . Give to the New World now your spirit, that it may surpass you. (300)

The uncanny aspects of this dialogue and its toppling towers are obvious; for our purposes, it is more interesting to concentrate on its outdatedness. To be sure, many people today would agree that the Americas, including the United States, are mired in crisis—but very few would now suggest that their salvation might be found in Spain. In his book, Frank represents Spain as an amazing spiritual reservoir, a sleeping virgin about to wake up (279). But Spain's latent energy is above all, for Frank, a source of inspiration that can help the United States fulfill its destiny as leader of a true New World.

Frank's idealizing representation of Spain was an uncommon one in U.S. intellectual discourse at the time. Spain was generally seen as a nation "once capable of greatness" but now "sunk into stagnation and decay," bereft of vitality, and characterized by a cruelty, ferociousness, and intolerance that sharply contrasted with the image of progress associated with the United States itself.[2] But if Frank's view was unusual in the United States, it was not at all that uncommon in Spain itself. Since the late nineteenth century, numerous intellectuals had been arguing that Hispanic or Latin cultures were ultimately superior to their Anglo-Saxon rivals, and that they were bound soon to surpass them.[3] Indeed, Frank's epigraph, which suggests that Spain's destiny is best expressed through the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, is taken from the first pages of Angel Ganivet's *Idearium español* (1897)—a key work of Spanish "regenerationism," a movement that attempted to analyze the causes of the nation's decadence and help it recuperate its former status as spiritual leader of the civilized world.

Frank's trips to Spain would turn him into a staunch Pan-Americanist. It was in Spain that he discovered the Hispanic world, and it was there where he met Alfonso Reyes, who would, not much later, be his conduit into the salons of the Latin American intellectual elite, where he would become a close friend and collaborator of Victoria Ocampo (to whom he suggested she

found *Sur*), Pedro Henríquez Ureña, José Vasconcelos, and José Carlos Mariátegui, among many others. *Virgin Spain,* which was translated immediately into Spanish and published by Ortega y Gasset's prestigious *Revista de Occidente,* almost overnight made Frank a celebrity in the entire Spanish-speaking world—a renown further fueled by an extensive, seven-month lecture tour through Spanish America in 1929, which quickly propelled Frank to star status.[4] For the next two decades, he would be the "best-known contemporary American author in the Spanish-speaking world."[5]

That Spain would awaken Frank's Pan-Americanism might seem odd, since the Pan-American movement is generally associated with an outright rejection of Spain and everything it stands for. Pan-Americanism, after all, insofar as it proclaims that Hispanic and Anglo America share a common destiny—one essentially different from Europe's—is the direct opposite of Pan-Hispanism, which is based on the assumption that the cultural unity of the former Spanish empire should not be broken, especially not by its Protestant Anglo-Saxon rivals. Most Pan-Hispanists have indeed been highly suspicious of U.S. attempts to woo its southern neighbors (Pike, *Hispanismo,* 142). Yet this suspicion was not necessarily mutual; Pan-Americanists, especially from the United States, have as a rule been much less distrustful of Spain. In fact, as James Fernández argues, U.S. political or economic interest in Latin America has generally spurred a *cultural* interest in the "mother country" ("'Longfellow's Law,'" 124).[6]

Pan-Americanism can be loosely defined as the conviction that the English- and Spanish-speaking peoples of the continent would strongly benefit from a greater degree of mutual understanding and cooperation because, in the end, there is much that they share. Clearly, there are many different ways to hold this conviction, and correspondingly there have been many different Pan-Americanisms—economic, political, cultural, academic, diplomatic—with widely different political orientations and goals. In addition, it is useful to distinguish between forms of official, state-sponsored Pan-Americanism and others that are much more spontaneous and informal. Official Pan-Americanism really started in the late nineteenth century, with the first Pan-American conference (1889-90), organized in Washington by U.S. Secretary of State James G. Blaine. Soon after, however, the United

States' agressive rise to economic and political power undermined Latin American confidence in the desirability of Pan-American unity under U.S. leadership.[7] It was not until 1933, when Franklin D. Roosevelt assumed power, that Pan-Americanism again could create some goodwill in the South. Under Roosevelt, the U.S. government abandoned the (until then) dominant ideology of Anglo-Saxonism—which assumed Latin America to be intrinsically inferior[8]—and its concomitant aggressive interventionism. Instead, Roosevelt's Good Neighbor policy emphasized the "commonality of the hemispheric experience in contrast to other parts of the world" in a discourse of mutual respect, understanding, and cooperation.[9] Thanks to an intense program of cultural and economic exchange, accompanied by publicity campaigns, the following decade became the golden age of Pan-Americanism as a broad political and cultural phenomenon (Fagg, 52).

In what follows, I wish to analyze Waldo Frank's Pan-Americanist discourse as an important early version of what one could call "progressive intellectual Pan-Americanism." This brand of Pan-Americanism was formulated and promoted, starting in the 1910s and 1920s, by a diverse group of intellectuals associated with U.S. counterculture, including Bertram Wolfe, Herschel Brickell, Frank Tannenbaum, Samuel Guy Inman, and Carleton Beals, who saw it as their task to interpret the Hispanic to their fellow countrymen. This they tended to do through media of leftist orientation, such as *The Nation* and *The New Republic*. From the outset, their Pan-Americanism was characterized by a rejection of mainstream U.S. culture, a critical stance toward U.S. policy in Latin America, a positive evaluation of Latin American cultural difference, and, ultimately, the wish to forge close alliances between the intellectual elites of North and South.[10]

While the figures of Wolfe, Brickell, Tannenbaum, Inman, and Beals are interesting enough, Waldo Frank stands out among them as a phenomenon in his own right. The following analysis of his life and work has three principal aims. In the first place, I wish to determine with a bit more precision the place of Spain in the ideological edifice of Pan-Americanism, especially in light of the Spanish Civil War (1936-39). Secondly, I wish to use the case of Frank to clarify the relation of these intellectuals' Hispanophilia to their own political position in the United States, which tended to waver between

an idealist, semi-elitist non-conformism and a more clearly pronounced radical leftism. Ultimately, it is my hope that this analysis will help put into perspective current debates within "Latin Americanism" about issues of *authority* and *legitimacy* in the representation of the Hispanic world within the North American—and, increasingly, "global"—public sphere. As Neil Larsen has noted, this authority has generally been assumed as a given; the metropolis has rarely had to justify its interest in, and writing about, Latin America. This tendency started with the first chroniclers of the conquest, who "never gave much thought to what, from a strictly intellectual and secular standpoint, authorized them and not others to convey the knowledge of the New World"; as Larsen notes, "the possibility of simply *citing* the local authorities—indeed, the very possibility that ultimate authority *could* be local—did not occur to 'outside observers' such as these."[11] More recently, a growing self-consciousness about these unquestioned assumptions, fueled in part by the rise of cultural and postcolonial studies, and by the crisis of area studies after the end of the Cold War, has thrown the field of Latin Americanism into somewhat of a turmoil. Waldo Frank, I will argue, was aware from the outset of the fact that his legitimacy as Anglo "interpreter" of the Hispanic world was precarious and anything but self-evident. Also, contrary to the chroniclers and most of their successors, he tended to carefully respect the local intellectual "authorities." Whether Frank's exceptional sensibility in this respect might help provide a way out of what has lately been referred to as Latin Americanism's "crisis of self-authorization" (Larsen, 15)[12] is a topic that I will address at the end of this essay. First, it is necessary to analyze this crisis in closer detail.

Know the Other as Thyself (The Crisis of Latin Americanism)

For quite a while now, a large section of U.S. discourse on Latin America has been plagued by a nagging problem: it is often not accepted as true or relevant by Latin America's own intellectual elites. For some reason, Latin Americans have tended to believe there is an unfortunate disconnect between the academic or political discourse, agendas, and concerns of U.S.

Latin Americanists, on the one hand, and daily-life reality in Latin America on the other. Also, they suspect that the North is, as a rule, hesitant to recognize Latin America's cultural difference, and that even when it does recognize that difference, it tends to interpret it in negative terms—as an obstacle to development rather than as a value to be protected, preserved, or simply learned from. U.S.-sponsored Pan-Americanism has been particularly suspicious in this regard, and U.S. universities are often seen as its conscious or unconscious accomplices. Moreover, the artificial, insular atmosphere of U.S. academia is believed to encourage a regrettable alienation from Latin American historical reality—an alienation manifested, at its best, in abstruse theorizing and political naiveté, and, at its worst, in a form of coarse scholarly imperialism intent on obliterating Latin American historical specificity.[13] North American Latin Americanists in turn, whether of Anglo-Saxon or Latin American origin, believing themselves to be on the cutting edge of their field, have been prone to arrogantly overlook or disqualify the intellectual production of the "autochthonous" intelligentsia, considered to be hopelessly "traditional" or "old-fashioned." This, in turn, is seen by some to lead to an unfortunate "division of labor" whereby Latin America's role is reduced to providing the sociological "raw material" for a cultural analysis to be practiced, in English, within the confines of a North American academia claiming the monopoly to knowledge production (Achugar, 381; Ramos, 243).[14]

Needless to say, the matter is extremely complex. The first thing to take into account is that, ever since Latin America's independence from Spain, its intelligentsia have been obsessively preoccupied with proving its culture to be both *different* and *valuable*—first, in opposition to metropolitan Spain, and later, especially after the Spanish-American war, in opposition to the United States. In defiance of the U.S. claim to embody the only true kind of modern progress—and its sometimes violent attempts at imposing that progress on the South—Latin American intellectuals have consistently tried to point out the dangers and defects of Anglo-Saxon modernity. At the same time, they have proposed their own cultural heritage as the basis for an alternative modernity, one more fitting for Latin America itself, and perhaps even for the United States as well. Generally, this defense has been founded on two

pillars: a romantic, essentialist discourse of cultural identity; and the Platonic dichotomy of spirit and matter, or, as the case may be, of "disinterested" aesthetics and the barbaric, philistine materialism of the market. Within this framework, the Latin American intelligentsia—whether conservative, liberal, or radical—have rejected "materialist" Anglo-Saxon modernity, which in their eyes is marred by a spiritual deficit whose long-term consequences are disastrous, and have advanced the argument that their own Hispanic or Latin culture is intrinsically more prone to a balanced spirit/matter budget, or even something of a spiritual surplus. While locating the source of this spirituality in the Latin American folk, they have at the same time profiled themselves, *qua* intellectuals, thinkers, or poets, as the creators and managers par excellence of this aesthetic or spiritual treasure chest.

As has been pointed out by Ramos, among others, an issue uncomfortably lurking in the background of this "culturalist" or "Arielist" stance[15] is that of hierarchy or privilege.[16] This hierarchical dimension is played out on three different levels: between the United States and Latin America (with Latin America claiming cultural superiority in the face of a de facto North American hegemony in economic and political terms); between "high" and popular or mass culture (with the former being granted the aesthetic high ground, while seen as threatened by the rising tide of the latter); and between intellectuals and masses (with the former assuming the role of interpreters and spokesmen, but also educators and restrainers, of the restless *"masas incultas"*).[17] The Arielist Latin American intelligentsia have traditionally rejected the hierarchy of "progress" implicit in Anglo-Saxon modernity, which relegated Latin America, purely on the basis of material development, to a position of cultural "backwardness." But in spite of this generally anti-imperialist—and therefore seemingly progressive—rejection of U.S. hegemony, Latin American intellectuals have not necessarily rejected the convenience or need of hierarchy as such, either internationally or within the context of their own domestic societies. On the contrary—in their eyes, the flaw of U.S. society was precisely the *lack* of hierarchy implicit in its embrace of democracy understood in absolute, numerical terms. Even worse, for many, the United States had established a dangerously inverted hierarchy that had placed the lowest common denominator—represented by

the uncultured masses or the greedy business man—at the top of the social pyramid. Latin America, they granted, might be less economically developed, but at least its thinkers and poets still enjoyed the prestige they deserved.

As Ramos is right to point out, strictly speaking, the notion of "Latin Americanism" includes this "vernacular" tradition of cultural self-knowledge—of intellectual self-definition and self-defense—which lives in perpetual tension with the scholarly knowledge produced by Latin Americanism as an academic field, especially in the United States (Ramos, "Genealogy," 241). The issue of knowledge, central in today's debate, was already singled out by José Martí—widely recognized as one of the founding fathers of this vernacular Latin Americanism—as crucial to any viable form of Pan-American unity. Martí also identified the knowledge *gap* between North and South as the principal obstacle to an harmonic continental future. His famous injunction in "Nuestra América"—written in 1891 to warn his fellow Latin Americans against the insidiousness of their northern neighbor—that "[1]os pueblos que no se conocen han de darse prisa para conocerse," should be read in both a reflexive and a reciprocal sense: What is needed is self-knowledge *as well as* mutual knowledge, because, as Martí was right to predict, the moment was near when the North would approach the South in demand of "intimate relations."[18] To make this inevitable encounter a fruitful and consensual one, Martí tells "his" America that it should "show itself like it is" to counteract "the disdain from its formidable neighbor, who does not know it." Martí is convinced that once the North *knows* the South, it will "out of respect" keep its covetous hands in check (22).

It is worth noting that Martí does not see this knowledge gap as unavoidable or determined by fate; he believes the North and the South should and *can* know each other. Nor does Martí question the logical chain connecting knowledge, understanding, and respect. After Foucault, this naïve assumption has of course become untenable, and an important part of the current debates around issues of legitimacy in Latin Americanism has focused precisely on this hermeneutical aspect, wondering out loud whether Northern knowledge of the South (or the scholar's knowledge of the subaltern) is in fact desirable, or even possible in the first place. The tendency to tie legitimate

knowledge to the knowing subject's direct *locality*—an ironic outgrowth of Martí's "our-Americanism" that fundamentally questions the ability to understand Latin America of anyone not situated directly in it—has been rejected by Alberto Moreiras as an ultimately self-defeating Catch-22.[19] On the other hand, Doris Sommer has argued that the community-constituting discourse of a *testimonio* like that of Rigoberta Menchú purposely *excludes* its "foreign" audience, sabotaging the latter's quest for intimate knowledge of the Other by keeping certain secrets from the reader as "outsider." Sommer, however, can appreciate (i.e., "understand") this suspicion on Rigoberta's part, and believes it fulfills an important function insofar as it teaches the outside readers a lesson in respect.[20] Here, then, Martí's argument has been reversed: respect is not a result of knowledge any more, but of a *renunciation* of knowledge (Larsen, 14-15).

In any case, Martí was too optimistic. Mutual knowledge and respect have not been particularly characteristic of U.S.–Latin American relations over the past hundred years—either in politics or at the level of intellectual interchange. To be sure, until two or three decades ago, Latin American Arielist or culturalist intellectuals—even the most radical of whom tended to hold on to the superiority and emancipatory force of aesthetic disinterestedness—had their natural Northern allies in the pioneers of literary and artistic modernism, and especially in the latter's institutional canonizers, housed in the literature departments of U.S. academia (Larsen, 6). Since the advent of cultural, postcolonial, and subaltern studies, however, even those small islands of North American high-culturalism have been conquered by the powerful lure of the popular masses. To make matters worse, with U.S. academia occupying an increasingly hegemonic position in global Latin Americanist discourse, the wave has spread to Latin America as well, chipping away at the pedestal of the aesthetic as a supreme civilizing tool and the intellectual as its primary wielder (Richard, 357-58; Moreiras, 246).[21] Among Latin American intellectuals, this process has given rise to what John Beverley has dubbed "Neo-Arielism," characterized by a deep suspicion of North American Latin Americanists, and an unwillingness to hand over their "hermeneutic authority" to the "popular reception" privileged by U.S. cultural studies (Beverley, 18).

Surely, Latin American intellectuals cannot be blamed for feeling threatened by this process. It not only undermines their local authority and status—already weakened by political repression, economic crises, and the advance of IMF-style global neoliberalism—but also their traditional role as mediators between their national-popular masses and the foreign metropolis. Cultural studies almost inevitably end up calling into question their legitimacy as translators and interpreters of Latin American cultural identity. The prestige and credibility enjoyed in the non-Hispanic West by such giants as Octavio Paz, Carlos Fuentes, Juan Rulfo, and Mario Vargas Llosa as reliable *representers* of their cultures is increasingly something of the past. Practitioners of cultural and subaltern studies tend to be populists, suspicious of intellectual elitism; they prefer to bypass the sophisticated, Paris-educated spokesmen and go directly to the subaltern source (Moreiras, 17). Instead of reading Rulfo, they go straight to Comala, or, as the case may be, Rigoberta. What is more, they think they have better access to the popular than the vernacular intelligentsia, whose metropolitan education—once their passport into the intellectual salons of metropolitan modernism—is now considered the source of their hopeless estrangement from their own national-popular base. Thus, paradoxically, the *local* cultural hegemonies, whose authority was based on a notion of the aesthetic as a superior value, are pushed into opposition—a subalternity of its own kind—by the *international* cultural hegemony of U.S. academia, for whom the aesthetic has become much less important—or less interesting—than the not-yet-hegemonized "subaltern" (Richard, 346; Moreiras, 8-10, 242). At stake here, then, are fundamental issues of authority and legitimacy: *Who* has the right to speak about Latin America, *from where,* and with what *purpose?*

Meanwhile, it is clear that the history of intellectual Pan-Americanism can also be read as a series of unfortunate *desencuentros:* a dysfunctional relationship characterized by mutual contempt, misunderstanding, and, ultimately, lost opportunities. To complicate things even further, since the late 1960s, when a good part of U.S. Latin Americanism wiggled itself out from under the grip of the State Department and, shifting to the Left, became less automatically accepting of U.S. foreign policy, the field itself has been divided around very similar issues (Berger, *Under,* 101-2). The promi-

nent conservative historian Mark Falcoff, for instance, in a recent book tellingly entitled *A Culture of Its Own: Taking Latin America Seriously,* argues that many U.S. Latin Americanists work under the "delusion" that "the region as a whole is constantly in a state of revolutionary or pre-revolutionary turmoil, largely due to the nefarious policies of the United States and the multinational corporations, often regarded as one and the same thing." Since these scholars consider anti-Americanism "the measure of both political respectability and cultural authenticity," they tend to cheer "fascist or fundamentalist" movements in Latin America as "wholesome expressions of Enlightenment values." In reality, however, "by pretending that these countries are merely picturesque extensions of American power, rather than societies with lives of their own . . . they end up by trivializing whole societies and pushing them aside." In the end, then, their supposed solidarity is nothing but a form of national narcissism.[22] Falcoff obviously relishes his role as the right-wing bad boy of a predominantly leftist scholarly field; but his condescending mention of the knee-jerk anti-Americanism of U.S. Latin American Studies and the Latin American intelligentsia also makes clear that, in the end, all manifestations of Pan-Americanism—of which U.S. Latin Americanism is one—necessarily imply an attitude toward U.S. hegemony on the continent, be it in politics, economics, culture, or knowledge production (Ramos, "Genealogy," 245). And as Berger argues, much of U.S. Latin American Studies has—directly or indirectly, willingly or unwillingly—contributed to maintaining that hegemony (*Under,* 2).

Waldo Frank

The life and work of Waldo Frank (1899-1967) constitute an important and instructive chapter in the history of intellectual Pan-Americanism. As it turns out, Frank was one of the few North Americans who did not suffer from the legitimacy problem pointed out above. Contrary to many professional U.S. Latin Americanists, Frank, as an amateur, *was* perceived as sharing the concerns of the Latin American intelligentsia. Even though he had no training whatsoever in Latin American culture or history, and had not traveled south of the Río Grande until 1929, he opened his first major book

on the continent, written a year later, with the bold promise to give his readers "an experience of the truth" about "America Hispana."[23] In spite of this self-confident claim, which his Anglo reviewers were quick to debunk,[24] Frank's interpretation of Spanish American history and culture were received very well in the Spanish-speaking world (Williams, 122).

In his prologue, Frank explains how he managed to read up on Latin America, and what he did to compensate for his relative lack of expertise in the field: he devoured all the major cultural journals and maintained a permanent dialogue with his Latin American peers, four of whom read the manuscript before publication. It never occurred to Frank, in other words, not to take the intellectual production of the Hispanic world seriously. This was an exceptional attitude at the time and, in a sense, it still is. Of course, this commendable stance does not mean that Frank's representation of the Hispanic Other is not highly problematic. My point is not to restore Frank's status as expert on Latin America, but rather to present his case as a useful illustration of hermeneutic and epistemological issues that still haunt the field. In addition to his respect for local intellectual authorities, Frank's trajectory is useful to point out the curious interrelations between official, government-sponsored Pan-Americanism and its more informal, intellectual brands. In fact, Frank's case serves to illustrate the complex political dimensions of Pan-Americanism as a whole.

Waldo Frank was born on 25 August 1889, in Long Branch, New Jersey, into an upper-middle class Jewish family. He grew up in New York City, where his father worked as a successful lawyer; his mother was an accomplished musician. After graduating from Yale in 1911, he worked as a reporter for the *New York Times*. In 1913 he spent seven months in Paris. His readings of this time, building on the foundations laid by Whitman, Emerson, and Thoreau, had a decisive influence on his future writing; he was especially interested in Spinoza, Bradley, Nietzsche, and Freud. In 1916, back in the United States, he founded (together with James Oppenheim) the influential journal the *Seven Arts*—an important outlet for a group of radical young intellectuals, who combined a penchant for social criticism with a strong belief in the revolutionary powers of the aesthetic, and a passionate, alternative patriotism.

Frank's first novel, *The Unwelcome Man,* appeared in 1917 (he would publish a total of fourteen novels during his lifetime). In 1918 and 1919, he traveled to the American Southwest, where for the first time he came in contact with Hispanic and Native American cultures. In 1919 he published *Our America.* While highly critical of the United States' materialistic, overindustrialized "machine" culture, its lack of "spiritual substance," and the "decadence" of its political leadership, this book also expressed the hope that the country's "creative minority," partly inspired by more "primitive" cultural minorities, might make aware its spiritual potential and help it fulfill its "luminous" destiny.[25] The year 1919 also saw Frank's first bout of hands-on political activism, as he worked for a month as an organizer for the Non-Partisan League in Kentucky. In 1921, Frank took his first short trip to Spain, which fascinated him immediately. He returned in 1924 to write a series of magazine articles that would turn into *Virgin Spain* (1926). In 1925, Frank had become contributing editor for *The New Republic;* from 1926 to 1930 he also wrote in *The New Masses.* In 1929, he published *The Re-Discovery of America,* which continued and updated the argument begun in *Our America.* Europe, he argued, had lost its "sense of the Whole," the organic integration of science, politics, life, and religion that had fueled its greatness. Contemporary America was little more than "Europe's grave," the place where the Old World's outdated values had come to die. The chaos of the "American jungle" in fact represented an intensified version of Europe's decadent, alienated "machine culture." Yet out of this chaos, a new sense of wholeness was bound to arise, sparked by the creative energies latent in America's women, folk, and mystic tradition. The latter's contemporary heirs—writers and artists such as Frank's friend Alfred Stieglitz—were called upon to lead the nation to "a higher stage of consciousness in which social order and fulfillment would replace alienation and chaos" (Williams, 115).

Frank spent a good part of 1929 on a lecture tour in Latin America. During the following four years, with the United States sunk in depression, he again got involved in social activism. He also traveled to the Soviet Union, publishing *Dawn in Russia* in 1932. While Frank admired Soviet Communism, he was also critical of it, and rejected it as a model for the United States. Nevertheless, this was without doubt the most radical period of his

career. In 1932, Frank was heading the Independent Miner's Relief Committee in Harlan, Kentucky; writing a revolutionary manifesto in *The New Masses;* and endorsing Earl Browder's presidential ticket for the Communist Party (CPUSA). Three years later, he was elected as first chairman of the League of American Writers, one of the CPUSA's main front organizations.

In reality, however, his relationship with the Communists was strained. After publicly criticizing the Stalinist purges in 1935, he would finally break with Browder in 1937 over the issue of Leon Trotsky. Much later, in his memoirs, Frank would relativize his affiliation with the CPUSA. "I accepted the workers' 'saving grace' that fated them to change the world," he writes, but "I never lost my critical stance toward the over-simple Marxist psychology." Given, however, that the Communists appeared as the "sole organized instrument for the transformation of the capitalist into a socialist society," Frank "devised a plan": to collaborate with the party, but as a secret "spy of God," in hopes of gaining "the confidence of the 'comrades' by sharing their perils and their pleasures and thus gradually to win them to a deepening of their doctrine." Needless to say, his plan failed. To the Communists, Frank writes, "I was a mystic; . . . almost as bad as being a moron."[26]

In spite of his conflicts with the Communists, Frank's initial reaction to the Spanish Civil War was rather standard. In *The New Masses,* he declared that "Spain is fighting the good fight for us all"; in late 1936 he headed up the American Society for Technical Aid to Spanish Democracy; and in January 1937 he addressed the Congress organized by the Mexican Liga de Escritores y Artistas Revolucionarios (LEAR) with a speech, "For the Cause of the Spanish People." In the summer of 1938, he finally travelled to Spain himself, publishing articles on Spanish culture and politics in *The Nation* and *The New Republic.* In 1939 Frank also published *Chart for Rough Water,* arguing that the United States was morally obliged to join the war against fascism. Three years later, he undertook a second lecture tour of Latin America, now as unofficial representative of the U.S. government. Starting in the mid-forties, Frank's U.S. fame declined rapidly. His prestige in Latin America remained high, however; in 1948, Frank was asked by the Venezuelan government to write a biography of Bolívar. In 1959 he was invited to Cuba as "friend of the Revolution"; the next year he became temporary chairman of

the Fair Play for Cuba Committee and received a $25,000 grant from the Castro government to write a book on Cuba. *Cuba: Prophetic Island* appeared in 1961.

Premature Anti-Fascists and Other Good Neighbors

When Frank achieved his Hispanic fame, Latin American Studies as such barely existed. In fact, the whole of the United States lagged about ten years behind Frank, Wolfe, Beals, and Tannenbaum in discovering Spain and Latin America. It wasn't until the 1930s that two developments broadly sparked Americans' interest in the Hispanic world: Roosevelt's Good Neighbor policy and the outbreak, in July 1936, of the Spanish Civil War. The two make for an interesting comparison. In both causes, intellectuals played a major role, either at their own initiative or enlisted by political parties and the government; both events were very present in the U.S. public sphere. And yet they had a very different feel to them. Pan-Americanism was safer and much less controversial than the Spanish Civil War. It was a discourse of friendship, understanding, and peace—not one of conflict; its overarching slogan was "democracy," conceived of in a providential way as a continentally American value. In the turbulent 1930s, this Pan-Americanist invocation of democracy carried an explicit anti-fascist undertone, but also, unmistakably, an anti-communist one. And even though official 1930s Pan-Americanism fed off important countercultural currents, in the end it was perfectly compatible with the most mainstream of U.S. patriotisms (Pike, *United,* 272-81).

The Spanish Civil War, by contrast, was a much trickier affair. In Spain, anti-fascism was directly aligned—or contaminated—with communism. (As is well known, this "contamination" would justify the persecution during the Cold War of the "premature antifascists" who had rallied to the defense of the Spanish Republic.) Also, taking sides in the Spanish conflict went against the government's official stance of neutrality. Roosevelt, to be sure, was known to be sympathetic toward the Republic; but while he did not sign the Non-Intervention Agreement drawn up by the other Western

democracies, domestic pressures prevented him from taking an international stand in the Republic's favor.

While both the Spanish Civil War and the Good Neighbor policy were profoundly political in nature, then, only the former was perceived as such. This had important consequences for the engagement in both by the U.S. academic community, whose professionalized standards of scholarly objectivity were generally seen as antithetical to politics. The leadership of the authoritative American Association of Teachers of Spanish (AATS), for instance, preferred to ignore the Spanish Civil War altogether and continue business as usual. In late 1936, the editors of the Association's organ, *Hispania,* explicitly refused to publish any article on the war that might "be construed as biased," and declared that the war had nothing to do with the Association's sole aim, "to wit, to advance the study of the Spanish language in the United States."[27] In contrast with the relative freedom of political commitment enjoyed by independent intellectuals such as Frank, the professional scholars' fear of politics in effect compelled them to accept and respect the powers that be—either at home (Roosevelt) or abroad. When, less than a year after Franco's victory, the AATS celebrated its twenty-third annual meeting in San Francisco, it invited Spain's consul-general, Juan G. de Molina, who used the oppportunity to amply quote Francoist martyr Ramiro de Maeztu.[28] In fact, Molina's whole speech was printed in *Hispania,* together with a Pan-Americanist letter by Cordell Hull, the U.S. secretary of state. The luncheon speaker was no other than Ben M. Cherrington, chief of the Division of Cultural Relations for the State Department.

Cherrington held an important position. Partly in response to the increase in fascist propaganda efforts, the U.S. government had discovered in the late 1930s that it could use cultural relations to secure its position of power in Latin America and "to channel US economic and cultural influence throughout the hemisphere" (Berger, *Under,* 50). Together with Nelson Rockefeller's Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs (CIAA), founded in 1940, Cherrington's Division, itself created in 1938, was a key element of Roosevelt's government-sponsored Pan-Americanism.[29] Cherrington was cheered in San Francisco; and as part of the resolutions adopted at its convention, the AATS declared itself "fully in accord" with

the State Department's Pan-Americanist aims ("Twenty-third Annual Meeting," 13). In this respect, the attitude of the AATS was representative of the North American academic establishment as a whole. While the overtly politicized Spanish Civil War was largely ignored, the covertly political cause of Pan-Americanism was adopted all the more enthusiastically. In fact, the CIAA's efforts in the area of scholarly exchange, in which it was supported by private U.S. foundations, helped create the conditions for the coming of age of Latin American Studies as a widely-practiced field on U.S. university campuses; and by the early 1940s, "Pan-Americanism had become central to the dominant professional discourses on Latin America" in the country (Berger, 45).

The Continental Matchmaker (Waldo Frank's Peculiar Pan-Americanism)

Ironically, the rise of academic Latin American Studies eclipsed Waldo Frank's authority in the United States as an expert of the Hispanic world. And even though Frank helped lay the foundation for the early successes of the Good Neighbor policy, his relation to it was an ambivalent one. When, in April 1941, the State Department offered him four thousand dollars for a lecture tour meant to counteract the fascist propaganda offensive, Frank initially turned it down; the bombing of Pearl Harbor made him change his mind. From mid-April until October, 1942, Frank once again toured almost all of Latin America, this time adapting his previous message to include explicit and urgent warnings against the dangers of fascism, to sing the praise of the Roosevelt government, and to convince his audience that things had changed since his first visit in 1929. Frank was no exception any more; now the whole of the American people looked with love and interest toward their southern neighbors.[30] This time, however, Frank did not find open arms everywhere. The Argentine government, sympathetic to the Axis, declared him *persona non grata*, and the next day he was assaulted by five henchmen in his Buenos Aires apartment. The incident made the front page of the *New York Times* and temporarily propelled Frank back to the status of American hero.

Although Frank obviously savored his valiant role as the democratic North's cultural ambassador to the Hispanic world, it would be wrong to fully identify him with the brand of Pan-Americanism represented by Roosevelt and Rockefeller. Frank's conception of continental unity fit neither the CIAA's diplomatic-economic mold, nor the social-scientific one of the emergent U.S. Latin American Studies. Ultimately, Frank rejected the premises and motivations of both: not only the ways they conceived of the "knowledge" of Latin America to be gathered and spread, but also the uses to which he suspected they aimed to put that knowledge—that is, to further U.S. domination. To understand this rejection, it is necessary to delve into the philosophical foundation of Frank's thinking. As mentioned above, from an early age all of Frank's intellectual and artistic endeavors were driven by his philosophy of "wholeness." He strongly believed that the "individual," a product of Western modernization, had lost his sense of connection with the Cosmos ("the Whole"), and that it was imperative for the future of mankind that this modern individual again become a fully integrated "person," that is, "an individual transformed by his awareness of totality into a cosmically-oriented man."[31] Starting in the Renaissance, Frank argued, the West had progressively lost the religious integrity that had characterized medieval life, founded on the "Great Tradition" of spiritual unity inherent in the Judeo-Christian legacy. Instead, the West had embraced a culture of the "machine." The machine, however, originally conceived as a tool in the service of mankind, soon turned into a force that enslaved it, fragmenting the ordered whole of society into a chaos of individual atoms pursuing only their own material well-being. According to Frank, this process of atomization had been especially pronounced in the Protestant North of Europe. In the Catholic South, some vestiges of the old sense of wholeness had been preserved, but only in partial, fragmented, and anachronistic ways. For Frank, U.S. society was perhaps, out of the entire modern world, the most advanced on this path of atomization and, therefore, the most deficient in wholeness. Yet paradoxically, he also believed it was the one nation destined to overcome this deficiency—thanks in large part to the creative energy of its artistic and intellectual elite. As we have seen, Frank started formulating these ideas in *Our America* (1919), developing them further in *Re-Discovery of America* (1929).

In the first book, Frank had already suggested that the catastrophic lack of wholeness in mainstream U.S. culture might be remedied, not only by its intellectual minority but also by an injection of spirituality from its marginal, more "primitive" Native American and Hispanic populations.[32] It wasn't until his first contacts with Spain, however, that Frank began to conceive of the Hispanic world as the United States' almost exact opposite and, therefore, its ideal "marriage partner" in its quest for wholeness. If, as we have seen, in *Virgin Spain* Frank calls on the Iberian Peninsula to lend its spiritual energy to North America, in *America Hispana* he goes one step further, prophesying the emergence of an "Atlantic world" from the Platonic fusion of the two "half-worlds" of Anglo- and Hispanic America. The North and the South could provide each other with precisely the elements they lacked to become "whole" and each fulfill their destiny.

Frank's characterizations of these half-worlds are worth quoting at some length. *America Hispana* opens with a chapter on the Panama Canal that sets the scene for what Frank calls the great "American drama" (22). Its main actors are Simón Bolívar, presented as a noble and far-sighted statesman, and Theodore Roosevelt, a greedy, aggressive, and narrow-minded Yankee. Bolívar's plans for the continent were magnificent, but he tragically failed to realize them because, as Frank writes, he "lacked the *tool*": he simply did not have the organizational recources. The people of the North, on the other hand, were "masters of the tool" and therefore "destined masters of the age to come, when the *instrument* would be the primal need of the new world's cohering body." And yet they had their own flaws; their excessively instrumental outlook on life had compelled them to make the earth herself into an instrument, and had driven them away from any sense of wholeness (10). On the one hand, it is clear that Frank's admiration for the Hispanic world exceeds his esteem for the Anglo-Saxon North. On the other, however, he strongly believes that the former will never rise out of its "chaos" and "confusion" without the help of the latter, in spite of the fact that the North lives in a much more dangerous chaos, of a spiritual kind, which has brought it, and the whole continent, to the edge of disaster. The United States has in fact "sunk in a decrepitude of spirit," and Roosevelt himself is the prime example of this decadence, presaging "the spiritual failure of his people."

Bolívar, by contrast, "is a great historic figure because even in his defeat he projects the possible victory of a new human culture" (21–22).

At the end of the book, Frank returns more extensively to the idea of the North and the South as two complementing Platonic halves. In the North, he summarily states, "there is order that lacks life"; in the South, "life that lacks order" (340): "In the North, the person . . . destroyed what did not conform and created a world almost purely in his own image." The Spaniard, by contrast, "was less atomic, and vastly more receptive": "He fused with his world, rather than destroyed it . . ." (319). The culture of the North is characterized by the three principal elements of Protestantism, Pragmatism, and Democratism, all three of which are based on dangerously mistaken, individualistic notions of human nature and destiny. Therefore, "the bases of life as it has been built in the United States are inadequate for the creating of whole human beings" (330). However, not all is bleak. In spite of its fundamental defects, the United States has three things going for it. First, its "creative forces," that is, its artistic minority, who are the only ones capable of preventing the impending cultural catastrophe. Second, the United States has shown itself capable of "raising . . . the standard of common living." Third, the North boasts "a triumphant popular morale" due to the fact that its collective ideals are closely connected to the daily life experience of the population. With the exception of the Soviet Union, all other nations have to live with a disheartening discrepancy between their outdated cultural ideals and their actual existence (333).

In "America Hispana," too, the gap between cultural ideals and their actual realization could not be bigger. Since Spanish America was created out of a fusion of cultures, it finds itself in an earlier, more chaotic, and much less "perfect" state of development than the United States. Yet for Frank, paradoxically, this very lack of perfection is what constitutes the South's hope. The abyss between the political and cultural ideals of Latin America and its daily social reality, he argues, has allowed the ideals to preserve a kind of purity, and therefore a potential redemptive power, that would be unthinkable in the pragmatic North (335). Still, given this lack of continuity, collective morale in "America Hispana" is extremely low. But if a *collective* morale of the South is lacking, the Hispano-American still has an important

individual moral strength; regardless of region or class, "the Hispano-American has direct contact with his soul and his soil" (336-39). Contrary to the North Americans, then, the Latins are still *persons*.

The North, with its exuberant morale, its organization, discipline, and control, is ultimately empty; the South, though lost and confused, is still full of spirit. The metaphoric structure—North is body, South is spirit; North is male, South is female—leaves no room for doubt. The two are clearly meant for each other: "America Hispana, even more than the United States, is a half-world. With striking symmetry it has what the North lacks and lacks what the North has made for itself. . . . The North . . . has a body inadequate in base but strong in surface. . . . It has a tradition of wholeness which has never died, from Roger Williams to Walt Whitman, but which is weak. . . . America Hispana has no body at all. . . . [But] America Hispana has a strong tradition of life as an organic Whole" (339-41). At the same time, given that the problems of the United States are representative of the West in general, the continental marriage that Frank proposes is necessary to save all of humanity (346-47).

Frank is not too specific on the practical details for consummating this marriage. What is clear, however, is the central role that intellectuals are to play in the process. In Frank's view, continental unity will have to be prepared by the conscious effort of a like-minded, transnational, intellectual elite. Only people like himself, endowed with an exceptional aesthetic sensibility, are capable of seeing the need for wholeness and releasing the "folk" from the alienating lockstep of modern life. It is unclear, however, how much voice, if any, is actually given to this "folk." Casey Blake argues that there is an unresolved tension between Frank's "revolutionary" progressivism and his painful lack of democratic sensibility. In fact, Frank's "romantic model of intellectual leadership often bordered on being reactionary in its implicit disdain for the inarticulate, slumbering masses." Similarly, Frank's sense of the "whole" seems hopelessly out of reach for the common man, and only accessible to "a select group of prophets" (Blake, 1990, 174-75).

While Frank's steadfast adherence to his mystic philosophy of wholeness drives almost all of his intellectual production—and is in large part responsible for his immediate and lasting appeal in the Hispanic world—it is also

his political weak spot. It was the cause behind his initial, albeit hesitant, success in the United States, but also of its quick decline after World War II. It explains his enthusiastic but always half-hearted association with radical leftism, and his break with it in the late 1930s. It also determined his ambivalent relationship to official, U.S. state-sponsored Pan-Americanism, and, as we shall see in a moment, his ambivalent evaluation of the Spanish Republican cause. And yet, given the current crisis of Latin Americanism sketched above, is there anything in Frank's legacy that can be salvaged? The fierce debates within the field can't mask the fact that today's highly professionalized, esoterically academic Latin Americanism is, in the end, politically impotent; with a White House and its "global" allies (the IMF, World Bank) as anti-intellectual, interventionist, and business-oriented as ever, academic Latin Americanists are powerless while the United States continues to impose its cultural, political, and economic hegemony on the South. In this depressing context, reading Waldo Frank lambasting Theodore Roosevelt, or putting the United States in its place, is a strangely refreshing experience. But is this sensation purely based on a nostalgia for good-neighborly presidents and vociferous, plain-speaking public intellectuals? Or is there anything we can still learn from the case of Waldo Frank?

Nadie es Profeta en su Tierra

One cannot study Frank's work and career without stumbling upon a number of curious asymmetries. For one, as we have seen, his prestige in the Hispanic world was much greater and longer-lasting than in his own country; similarly, his "poetic" or "symphonic" representations of the Hispanic world were taken seriously in Spain and Latin America, but practically ignored in the United States. Secondly, there is the matter of Frank's intellectual affiliations. In the United States, he is widely considered to have been a radical, or is at least categorized among the intellectual Left. His position within the Hispanic world, however, seems much less clearly leftist. With the exception of Mariátegui, his friends and supporters were mostly liberals, and conservative liberals at that: Ocampo, Ortega y Gasset, Vasconcelos, and Reyes were not exactly revolutionaries. A third asymmetry is the fact that

Frank idealizes the Hispanic world, but never gives up on the idea of ultimate U.S. leadership. Similarly, while in many instances he idealizes the "simple" folk, especially of more "primitive" civilizations, he rarely seems to consider the idea of granting them any agency. This, in turn, should be considered in the context of his fundamentally ambivalent relation to modernity. As Blake has shown, Frank's cultural criticism alternates from the outset between a deeply-felt nostalgia for the pre-modern, and the conviction that it is modernity, albeit a transformed one, that will lead humanity to the wholeness he longs for.[33] Similarly ambiguous is his belief that only the hard-core organizational modernity of the U.S. will be able to pull the South out of the chaos of its organic *mestizo* morass (276-77).

Of this series of contradictions, all of which are interrelated, the issue of Frank's uneven prestige is the most interesting to my argument here, in part because it helps illuminate the more general problems of U.S. Latin Americanism. Curiously, the asymmetry still persists: while the Hispanic world has never really stopped admiring Frank, many of the more recent re-evaluations of his work within the United States, from both Left and Right, have been sharply critical.[34] Why was the Hispanic world so much more ready to take Frank seriously? Ogorzaly, following Pike, thinks it was because he said what the Hispanic elite "wanted to hear" (Pike, *Politics,* 192-98).[35] But this is an unfair representation that ignores how much of Frank's stance was genuine. Ogorzaly makes it seem as if Frank's relentless pursuit of intellectual prestige drove him, almost hypocritically, to please his audience at whatever cost. To be sure, much of Frank's life was determined by his preoccupation with his career and reputation, but that does not mean his production can be reduced to this aspect. Frank did not proclaim his message of North American spiritual anemia only to flatter his Latin audiences, and it was not the only explanation for his popularity. Ogorzaly's argument not only debases Frank, but his audience as well: it portrays Frank as one more smart Yankee duping the credulous natives—a ridiculous proposition, given the caliber of the personalities supposedly duped.

A more generous explanation would be that Frank was taken seriously in the Hispanic world because he took *it* seriously. In Mexico, the first thing he said was: "I have come . . . to learn."[36] This declaration of modesty, apart

from being a rhetorical strategy, expresses Frank's position as "knower" vis-à-vis the Latin American object to be known. Instead of positing a subject-object hierarchy and a desire for control, he directs his gaze to the South to *learn*—that is, he admits and welcomes the possibility that his contact with the object of his gaze will change him. This attitude makes it much easier for the Latin Americans to accept Frank: they are not just being observed, but placed in the position of teacher. At the same time, it relieves some of Frank's onus of self-justification ("Who are *you* to write about *us?*"). And this leads us back to the issue of legitimacy and authority: Who has the right to write about Latin America, from where, and for what purpose? Or, to ask the question that has been haunting Latin Americanism for the past decade and a half: If one is not a Latin American residing in Latin America, is there any way to "write the South" legitimately?

It is easy to argue that Frank's books on the Hispanic South, for all their good intentions, never really succeeded in understanding it in any important way. And it is true that Frank's representation of Spain and Latin America owe much to his own overwhelming needs and expectations, and that, in many instances, they simply build on cultural stereotypes—with respect to Anglo "materialism" and Hispanic "spirituality," for instance—that had been floating around for a century or so. To an important extent, Spain and Latin America simply function as a screen onto which to project Frank's North American dreams and disenchantments. But this is no reason to dismiss him out of hand. Frank's selfish "use" of the Hispanic world in this respect is not at all exceptional. On the contrary: as Larsen shows, practically the entire history of Northern readings of the South, including its reception of the "Boom" and *testimonio,* can be conceived as similar self-interested projections (5-18). Strangely enough, Larsen's argument here is not all that different from Falcoff's diatribe, quoted above, against the narcissism of progressive U.S. Latin Americanists. Both sense that there is something fundamentally parasitic about the way the North reads the South. In addition to the obvious history of political dominance and economic exploitation, they suspect there has been a form of "ideological" exploitation as well, with the Northern intelligentsia mining the Hispanic South for "spiritual energy," "authenticity," or "purity" with which to strengthen their own position.

What makes Frank so interesting, however, is that, to a large extent, he is *conscious* of the parasitical dimension of his discursive position. If, as Larsen writes, "[t]here is a certain sense in which the act of writing and reading about Latin America, from a location outside it, has never required an apology," especially "when the 'outside' was 'inside' metropolitan Europe and North America" (1), Frank does not take this "common sense" for granted. He might not offer an apology, but he does attempt to justify his hermeneutic position and to provide what one could call a declaration of intent—the kind of thing a traditionally suspicious father (say, José Martí) would demand from his daughter's suitor (say, the United States). Frank, then, makes a conscious effort to break the one-sided hermeneutic pattern described by Larsen—not so much motivated by notions of political correctness, but because he sincerely believes that the South has something to teach him. Frank treats his Southern objects like subjects—like conversation partners, mentors, and comrades in the same struggle.

Of course, as Larsen points out, all writing about the Other ultimately reflects back on the Self: Consciously or not, "writing and reading 'North by South' has had continually to pose the question of its own authority"; and "in directing its attention elsewhere, the North necessarily concedes something about its own sense of identity and authority, its own position on the hermeneutic map" (2). Again, though, Frank is quite aware of this point. If he directs his gaze abroad—first to Europe, then to Spain, and finally to Hispanic America—it is because the United States cannot offer him what he is looking for (Frank, *Memoirs,* 128). His hopeful vision of the Hispanic world is predicated on his critical view of the United States. Frank, then, looks at the Hispanic world out of "national self-interest." As Berger has shown, this is true for most of U.S. Latin American Studies (*Under*). But again, there is a difference: Frank does so out of a sense of *lack,* and not with the idea that knowledge of the Hispanic Other will help or enable the United States to dominate or control it.

The Politics of Wholeness

Still, apart from this generally commendable stance, there remains much to criticize in Frank's work. Here, I would like to focus on the issue of politics,

going back for a moment to the second asymmetry mentioned above: the fact that Frank, a leftist in a U.S. context, connected so well with Latin American intellectuals of liberal-conservative leanings. If Frank, like many of his Latin American peers, was ambivalent about official Pan-Americanism and about modernity in general, he also shared with them a basic uneasiness with regard to modern democracy. As Blake points out, it is here where Frank's discourse at times borders on the reactionary. It is here, too, where we need to look for the explanation of Frank's affinity with intellectuals like Ortega.

In *America Hispana,* Frank had already rejected U.S. "democratism" as the "mystical dogma of mob election" (323), characterized by Rousseau's "antipathy for those disciplines and intellectual orders which predicate minority control" (324). For Frank, U.S. democratism can be traced to the psychology of the pioneer, who "became the instinctive foe of those qualities of mind which interfered with the business of pioneering: meditation, imagination, art" (325-26). While the pioneer's democratism "allowed inequalities in the material realm where they cause disease," it "levelled down to a negative norm in the field of consciousness where hierarchic values must be preserved, lest mankind founder." Here it is not hard to recognize Frank's affinity with Ortega's notion of the "rule of the best." Equally Orteguian is Frank's contempt for the dirty world of practical politics, which in his view would necessarily "always be a game for the tricky, the brutal . . . the shallow" (cited in Blake, 177). Similarly, Frank's persistent tendency to associate U.S. and Latin American defects with the notion of *chaos* reveals a deep-seated longing for a type of *order* that is not necessarily compatible with the daily conflicts and murky compromises of democracy. As we have seen, Frank rarely expresses faith in the capacity of the folk to take charge of its own destiny. It is always the intellectuals, conceived as romantic, prophetic "seers," who are entrusted with the task of deciding for the masses. If Ortega wrote in *The Revolt of the Masses* that in a "healthy" social dynamics, the masses know their place—that is, to follow and obey the enlightened intellectual elite[37]—Frank believed that the leader "is one whom others follow because his action illumes the consciousness and will of what lives integrally in them and because to act with him articulates or fulfills their life."[38]

Somewhat surprisingly, Frank and Ortega also shared an ambivalent position vis-à-vis the political cause of the Spanish Republic. Ortega had

initially supported the Republic, but quickly distanced himself from it, turned off by its radical "excesses." During the Civil War, Ortega made a feeble attempt to occupy a neutral position, even though during much of it he sympathized with the Francoists. Frank's support for the Republic lasted longer, as we have seen: in 1936 he joined the majority of the American progressive intelligentsia in their support for the Loyalists, sharply condemning the military rebels ("Viva España Libre," 12-13).[39] Yet in 1942, when the Civil War was over, and the moment came to prepare the second edition of *Virgin Spain,* Frank adopted a different position. I would like to end this essay with Frank's re-visitation of Spain, because I believe it further illustrates the contradictory political dimension of his Pan-Americanism.

In Praise of the Sacrificed Virgin (Frank Revisits Spain)

In his new foreword to *Virgin Spain,* Frank proudly observed that the major portion of the book had proven as prophetic as he had hoped it to be, and therefore needed little revision. He did, however, add new chapters in which he analyzed the Spanish Civil War and its aftermath. Frank starts out with the standard leftist-liberal lamentation of the Republic's defeat in April of 1939, putting the blame in large part on the cowardly refusal of the Western democracies to stand by its side when it was being overthrown by a rebellious military faction supported by Hitler and Mussolini. Frank also blames the West for creating a self-fulfilling prophecy by pushing Spain into the arms of Soviet Communism, which he sees as an ideology fundamentally alien to the Spanish character.[40] Then, however, Frank abandons the standard left-liberal representation of the war, at the same time that he withdraws some of his support for the Republic. "Not all the good and the brave Spaniards," he writes, "were in the republican lines" (309). Of course, this statement can be read as an illustration of Frank's sense of nuance, in that he refuses to adopt the Manichean representations of the war in terms of Good and Evil. In Frank's case, however, the argument turns into a wholesale rejection of modern, secular democracy that puts him in the uncomfortable company of Spanish proto-fascists like Ramiro de Maeztu, who in the 1930s

proposed a Catholic notion of spiritualist "Hispanicity" as a third way to save the world from the materialist mistakes of capitalism and communism (Maeztu, 1934).[41] To be sure, Frank writes, "[w]ith the Loyalists were a clear majority of the people . . ." But fighting against them were not only "the defenders of caste, privilege and comfort" or "the servile who naturally gravitate to money and title":

> Aside from these born allies of darkness and death . . . the fascists had with them devout thousands of women who saw only that the radicals burned convents; devout thousands of men who hated the arrogant empiricism of the liberals, feeling their own intuitions somehow denied in the blueprint dimensions of the Republic. These deeply offended ones fought, they believed, for God and Spain. If they failed to see the demonism of their own captains, the obscenity of their allies from Italy and Naziland, it was because their eyes were too full of hate for the deniers of Mystery among their own people; too full of anger against men so intent on the justice of bread that they ignored the tragic destiny of man which is beyond bread. (309-10)

According to Frank, part of the blame for the Republic's defeat should be put on the Republican camp itself, because it was solely interested in the "horizontal" aspects of life (social, economic, and class relations), and systematically ignored its "perpendicular" aspects—that is, "the aesthetic and the personally religious" (310). "[L]ike all the modern democracies," Spain's Republic "was built on the shallow eighteenth-century lines of horizontal relations. The perpendicular was excluded from the political and intellectual structure"—a grave mistake, since "[a] man's passion, dream and intuition . . . are the forces in man that most compellingly impinge upon his public action" (310).

This mistakenly one-sided basis of modern democracy, which worked reasonably well in the naturally more shallow Anglo-Saxon nations, and even in the more spiritually inclined societies of France and Germany, was doomed to complete failure in Spain, a "perpendicular" nation if there ever was one. The Republic, Frank predicts, would have collapsed even if fascism had never tried to overthrow it. The Republic's program, with its rigid

separation of religion and state, was simply unfit for the nation. What Spain needed was an "organic democracy" that took into account "the whole man," including "his passional and aspirational powers, . . . his eternity within time" (312). Spain's need in this respect, while more obvious than elsewhere, was in fact universal: "The republic which sets off the poet from the politician, the knower from the lover, abolishes itself, for it is false." The collapse of democracy-*sans*-spirituality in Spain, therefore, was merely a prophecy of the "fate that is upon us [all]," and the "tragedy of Spain is the tragedy of the modern epoch" (312).

For Frank, the way out of this tragedy is provided by a new social configuration born out of the chaos of the old, reincorporating the positive elements present in all of the three major forces that collided in Spain—democracy, fascism, and communism. Frank believes that even fascism contained "a fragment of truth," to wit, "its perverted adoration of the blood, . . . its mass movements joyously serving the blood and its acceptance of the individual's need to worship and serve." Communism had "a large fragment of truth: in its devotion to justice, its faith in man's destiny, its Biblical insistence . . . that justice is worship and that good deeds are praise of the Lord." The "high-sounding political tenets" of French, British, and U.S. democracy, meanwhile, "masked economic exploitation," while "their science worship was a dark idolatry, their tolerance had become too often a sleazy lovelessness, and their vaunted separation of church and state confessed their failure to bring into politics the religious and esthetic vision without which politics is, and ever will be, a stench and a corruption" (312–13).

Just like in the fifteenth century, Spain's role in the twentieth was destined to be sacrificial and universal. Back then, it failed in its attempt to "incarnate the Christian Republic," but created the Americas; "[n]ow, again, she enacted a scene of a universal drama: the failure to establish a democracy of man if Man is ignored—the failure which was fated to go before the humbler search and striving that now lie within us" (313). Frank's logic curiously turns the defeat of the Republic into an inevitable event. "The Loyalists fought well," Frank writes, "[b]ut it was not written that a Republic founded upon a fragmentary truth, within a world whose every side held only fragments of the truth, could live." Fascism, meanwhile, with its "fragments of

truth," is turned into an instrument of Providence: "The victorious fascists in Spain murdered thousands. . . . But Spaniards went out from Spain, chiefly to Mexico and other lands of America Hispana. Spain went out from Spain into the whole world. In order that the world, through Spain's disaster, may become the home and the receiver, again, of Spain's spirit" (314). In this last passage, Frank is referring to the approximately 250,000 Spaniards who were driven into exile, among whom were most of the Spanish intelligentsia. For Frank, these intellectuals, "the poets and seers of this Republic," now form "a Diaspora of lamentation," whose task it is "to meditate upon calamity and their own sin in it" (314).

Conclusion

Not surprisingly, Frank saw no need to revise or suppress the dialogue between Cervantes and Columbus that closed the first edition of *Virgin Spain:* Spain, in his view, remained more than ever an Immaculate Virgin capable of saving humanity, albeit only through acts of sacrifice and sublimation. Its role in Frank's providential drama is like that of the Holy Spirit, infusing the hemispheric marriage of North and South America with the spiritual energy to build a new and better world. Spain, then, occupies an important place in the ideological edifice of Frank's Pan-Americanism, but only to the extent that Spain can be de-territorialized, disembodied, and, ultimately, *depoliticized.* As we have seen, this depoliticizing tendency has in fact been symptomatic of Pan-Americanism in general.

Determining the place of Spain within the complex structure of Pan-Americanism, however, was only one aim of this essay. Its other two main goals were to analyze the political position of progressive Pan-Americanist intellectuals such as Frank, and to shed light on issues of legitimacy and authority haunting Latin Americanism today. With regard to the second of these, I have suggested that a fruitful way to view the current crisis of Latin Americanism is to see it as a crisis of *intellectual Pan-Americanism,* with Pan-Americanism being defined as a desire, and potential program, for hemispheric cooperation and understanding based on some notion of shared continental traits and interests. Clearly, as long as U.S. Latin

Americanism is seen as incapable of respecting or understanding the South, this crisis will not be solved. The most important Southern obstacle to a viable form of intellectual Pan-Americanism, in turn, has probably been the ideological shortcut that fully identitifies the North with materialism, capitalism, and prosaic philistinism; and the South with spirituality, disinterestedness, and poetic purity. As has been pointed out by Ramos and others, this intellectual paradigm is in large part a projection on a continental scale of divides and tensions that are as much *intra-* as *inter-*American. For Rodó, the uneducated Latin American masses are really the "Anglo-Saxon" element in the context of his own society, whereas a certain portion of the North American intelligentsia, Frank among them, could pass for "one of us" in the South.

This relatively rigid identification of Anglo-American and Latin American identity in terms of spirit and matter was a defensive reaction on the part of the Latin American intelligentsia *as Latin Americans* against the growing hegemony of an Anglo North oblivious to the South's political and cultural automony, but also *as intellectuals* against certain aspects of modernity, ranging from a surge in immigration to a burgeoning mass culture, as well as the increasing professionalization, specialization, and incorporation into the market of intellectual labor. The problem in deconstructing this ideological shortcut is that it has served for over a century as the South's main line of anti-imperialist defense. It is legitimate to wonder, as Achugar, Moraña, and Sarlo do, whether breaking down this defense—and undercutting the power of its intellectual guards—in the name of cultural or subaltern studies would not leave Latin America even more vulnerable to the "bad," unilateral kind of Pan-Americanism that it has been rightly fearing since the early 1890s, threatening it with a definitive loss of identity and relinquishing the hope of ever realizing its *own* kind of modernity. John Beverley does not think so: he believes that holding on to the "culturalist" notion of culture—a disinterested realm of "high" culture guarded by traditional intellectuals—simply amounts to a denial or obstruction of democratizing movements in Latin America itself, movements that necessarily end up displacing the authority of the "literary" intelligentsia. But at the same time, Beverley is confident that "the issues that divide sub-

altern studies from its Latin American critics may be less important in the long run than the concerns we share" (Beverley, 18-19, 111).

The case of Frank shows that, historically, intellectuals of the North and South do, in fact, share many concerns. Frank helps us understand that, in reality, many Northern intellectuals were as anxious about modernity as their Southern peers, and were equally uncomfortable with the United States' aggressive exportation of it. In this sense, Frank's case suggests that Pan-American intellectual solidarity, cooperation, understanding, and respect *are,* in the end, possible. A second, more ironic, conclusion is that the critique that can be leveled against Frank—with respect to his lack of democratic sensibility, his modernist penchant for elitism, and his failure to think about popular political participation beyond a vague, idealized notion of a "folk" blindly following an enlightened intellectual minority—can also be legitimately leveled against the Arielist intelligentsia in Latin America. This is in fact what Beverley does.

As I have suggested, the basic worldview that informs all of Frank's writings also underlies much of Spanish and Latin American left-liberal as well as liberal-conservative thought. Briefly summarized, these are its premises: (1) There is progress, but it is not automatic (it requires hard work—the specter of decadence is always around the corner); (2) this progress is *principally* one of spiritual perfection, although accompanied by material development; (3) in this process of perfection, there are natural or "destined" leaders and natural followers: the leaders are the artists and writers, whose aesthetic production foreshadows this spiritual perfection. If this natural hierarchy is not respected, however, disaster—decadence—ensues. These are the premises that explain Frank's affinity with "culturalist" and avowedly "apolitical" intellectuals like Ortega y Gasset, Ocampo, and Reyes. For Frank, Latin America had, in a sense, the *key* to spiritual progress, which he called "wholeness." Its "backwardness" in economic and political terms, however, made it incapable of leading the New World. The United States had the *power* to do so, but it needed America Hispana's spirituality. Thus, the ideological role attributed to Latin America in Frank's thought was similar to that granted to the "folk": to be the provider of energy and inspiration, but not of leadership.

Ultimately, a critical history of intellectual Pan-Americanism—to which this essay hopes to be a contribution—will have to come to terms with the legacy, in the South as well as the North, of modernism. This is particularly true with regard to the status that modernism grants: first, to the *aesthetic* as the realm par excellence in which to protest, escape, or subvert the more objectionable aspects of modernization (dehumanization, materialism, desacralization, massification, and the like); and second, to the intellectual (artist, writer) as the privileged agent of this protest. From Romanticism, this modernist notion of the intellectual inherited a profoundly ambivalent attitude vis-à-vis "the people." Like the Romantic, the modernist intellectual constantly wavers between a democratic/revolutionary interest in, and idealization of, the masses as a source of revolutionary and aesthetic energy, and an elitist disdain for those same masses that rears its ugly head as soon as the intellectual feels frustrated in his attempts at realizing his revolutionary goals—which is at the drop of a hat.

Modernism, then, is in the end as much an incentive for political struggle as a lofty excuse to withdraw from it. As we have seen, Waldo Frank was very much a modernist in this sense, and this explains both the strengths and weaknesses of his Pan-Americanist vision. What Beverley identifies as a "Neo-Arielism" among a certain group of the Latin American intelligentsia—that is, their hesitation to give up a notion of the aesthetic or literary as a privileged realm of values, and a notion of themselves as somehow representing and defending those values—clearly shows the persistence of this modernist legacy in Latin America, where, as stated, it has been the principal ideological basis of anti-imperialist resistance. Yet in reality, as Larsen has shown, U.S. Latin Americanism remains equally indebted to this legacy (1-22).

Perhaps the best way to illustrate this point is to go back to the notion of privilege. One could say that, within the ideology of modernism, the intellectuals' privilege is *ontologically* constituted by their "special" access to the aesthetic, which destines them "naturally" to the role of leaders. At the same time, it is expected that this ontological privilege be accompanied by a corresponding *social* privilege, translated into prestige, respect, and even obedience from the rest of the population. Now consider the current situation:

When Beatriz Sarlo laments the fact that intellectual practice, and particularly literary criticism, is not as "socially meaningful" any more in Latin America as it used to be, she expresses a nostalgia for the loss of the intellectuals' *social* privilege, based on a persistent notion of their *ontological* privilege, which in turn is rooted in the idea that "literature is valuable" in ways that other types of discourse are not.[42] When Beverley and Moreiras reject this stance as a form of "Neo-Arielism" or outdated "value thinking," they disqualify Sarlo's nostalgia as illegitimate, because they believe her notion of ontological privilege has lost its validity (Beverley, 18; Moreiras, 252). Ironically, however, the Northern Latin Americanists direct this accusation from a position that is itself highly privileged, at least in material terms. And while they generously, albeit always "in theory," cede some of their ontological privilege to the "subaltern," there is little indication that they are willing to give up the safety of the social and economic privileges that allow them to dedicate themselves full-time to their Latin Americanist practice—their job, salary, and publication outlets with global distribution, much of which their Southern peers are lacking.

In a sense, this imbalance is a harmful continuation of a tendency that has been present in U.S. Latin Americanism from its birth: the habit of conceiving U.S.–Latin American intellectual relations as a one-way street, with the Northern scholars studying, criticizing, and teaching the South—always from the premise that the South should change, but without admitting the possibility or desirability of real change on their own part. It is a very similar premise that underlies what Larsen calls "a romantic 'third worldism,' in which radical agency of any sort belongs exclusively to the South while Northern radicalism can safely situate itself on the 'theoretical' sidelines," and which he sees as still informing contemporary Latin Americanism (16).

Meanwhile, of course, "Latin Americanism" as a practice, both North and South, is, in a strictly *political* sense, more marginalized than ever, and the need for Pan-American intellectual solidarity might never have been greater. The common enemy seems strong, obvious, and global enough to warrant North-South coalitions of several kinds. The recognition that there is indeed a common enemy will determine the strength and durability of

these new Pan-American coalitions, in the same way that Popular Frontism—repeatedly invoked as a model by Beverley (88-96)—found its strength in the shared recognition of the dangers of fascism. Waldo Frank realized this early on, and it was the underlying message of all of his Pan-Americanist endeavors, from his first letter to his Latin American peers in 1924 to his 1942 lecture tour. What Frank also realized, however, was that such coalitions require sacrifices from both sides: they need to be conceived as *mutual* processes of teaching and learning. If the enemy is truly common, so are the problems and solutions. One need not adopt Frank's modernist-mystical worldview to recognize the importance of his *attitude* vis-à-vis Latin America; it is an open one, accepting and appreciative of cultural difference, respectful of local self-knowledge, while never ceasing to be critical. If in the end, as Beverley hopes, the shared interests, concerns, and goals between Southern Latin Americanists and their colleagues from the North will prove more powerful than their mutual differences, and the building of a true, intellectual Pan-Americanism can finally begin, Waldo Frank will have to be recognized as one of its founding fathers.

NOTES

1. Waldo Frank, *Virgin Spain: Scenes from the Spiritual Drama of a Great People* (New York: Boni and Liveright, 1926), 295–96.
2. Richard L. Kagan, "Prescott's Paradigm: American Historical Scholarship and the Decline of Spain," in *Spain in America: The Origins of Hispanism in the United States,* ed. Richard L. Kagan (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2002), 248–76.
3. Lily Litvak, *España 1900: Modernismo, anarquismo y fin de siglo* (Barcelona: Anthropos, 1990), 156; Fredrick B. Pike, *Hispanismo, 1898–1936: Spanish Conservatives and Liberals and their Relations with Spanish America* (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1971), 55–69.
4. M. J. Bernadete, "Waldo Frank, to Hispano-America," in *Waldo Frank in America Hispana* (New York: Instituto de las Españas en los Estados Unidos, 1930), 1–16.
5. Fredrick B. Pike, *The United States and Latin America: Myths and Stereotypes of Civilization and Nature* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1992), 255–56.
6. James D. Fernández, "'Longfellow's Law': The Place of Latin America and Spain in U.S.

Hispanism, circa 1915," in *Spain in America: The Origins of Hispanism in the United States,* ed. Richard Kagan (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2002), 122–41.

7. John E. Fagg, *Pan Americanism* (Malabar, Fla.: Krieger, 1982), 21–47.
8. Mark T. Berger, *Under Northern Eyes: Latin American Studies and US Hegemony in the Americas, 1898–1990* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995), 35–36.
9. Mark T. Berger, "A Greater America? Pan Americanism and the Professional Study of Latin America, 1890–1990," in *Beyond the Ideal: Pan Americanism in Inter-American Affairs,* ed. David Sheinin (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 2000), 55.
10. Virginia S. Williams, *Radical Journalists, Generalist Intellectuals, and U.S.–Latin American Relations* (Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen Press, 2001), 2; Jefferson R. Cowie, *The Emergence of Alternative Views on Latin America: The Thought of Three U.S. Intellectuals, 1920–1935* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Department of History, 1992), 10–11.
11. Neil Larsen, *Reading North by South: On Latin American Literature, Culture, and Politics* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1995), 1.
12. Julio Ramos, "Hemispheric Domains: 1898 and the Origins of Latin Americanism," *Journal of Latin American Cultural Studies* 10, no. 3 (2001): 237–51.
13. Hugo Achugar, "Leones, cazadores e historiadores: A propósito de las políticas de la memoria y del conocimiento," *Revista Iberoamericana* 63, no. 180 (1997): 386.
14. Antonio Cornejo Polar, "Mestizaje e hibridez: Los riesgos de la metáfora (Apuntes)," *Revista de Crítica Literaria Latinoamericana* 24, no. 47 (1998): 7–11; Nelly Richard, "Intersectando Latinoamérica con el latinoamericanismo: Saberes académicos, práctica teórica y crítica cultural," *Revista Iberoamericana* 63, no. 180 (1997): 348.
15. This stance can be called "culturalist" because it privileges the development and achievements of "culture," understood as a disinterested realm of spirituality—mostly associated with "high" art, literature, philosophy, and the like—over "material" (economic, industrial, commercial) progress. Among the many texts arguing that Latin American or Hispanic culture is intrinsically more spiritual than that of the Anglo North, José Enrique Rodó's *Ariel* (1900) has been among the most influential—hence, "Arielist."
16. Julio Ramos, *Desencuentros de la modernidad en América Latina: Literatura y política en el Siglo XIX* (México: FCE, 1989), 194, 198, 243; Idelber Avelar, "Toward a Genealogy of Latin Americanism," *Dispositio/n,* no. 49 (1997 [2000]): 123–24.
17. Sebastiaan Faber, "The Beautiful, the Good, and the Natural: Martí and the Ills of Modernity," *Journal of Latin American Cultural Studies* 11, no. 2 (2002): 188–90.
18. José Martí, *Obras completas* (La Habana: Editorial Nacional de Cuba, 1963) 6:15, 21.
19. Alberto Moreiras, *The Exhaustion of Difference: The Politics of Latin American Cultural Studies* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2001), 6.
20. Doris Sommer, "Rigoberta's Secrets," *Latin American Perspectives* 18, no. 3 (1991): 32–50.
21. John Beverley, *Subalternity and Representation: Arguments in Cultural Theory* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1999), 17.

22. Mark Falcoff, *A Culture of Its Own: Taking Latin America Seriously* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction, 1998), 1–2.
23. Waldo Frank, *America Hispana: A Portrait and a Prospect* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1931), ix.
24. J. F. Normano, review of *America Hispana,* by Waldo Frank, *Hispanic American Historical Review* 12, no. 2 (1932): 223–25.
25. Waldo Frank, *Our America* (New York: Boni and Liveright, 1919), 5–7, 231.
26. Waldo Frank, *Memoirs of Waldo Frank,* ed. Alan Trachtenberg (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1973), 184–85.
27. "Editorial," *Hispania* 19 (1936): 467.
28. "Twenty-third Annual Meeting," *Hispania* 23 (1940): 5–6.
29. Frank A. Ninkovich, *The Diplomacy of Ideas: U.S. Foreign Policy and Cultural Relations, 1938–1950* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 29.
30. To prove this point, Frank told his audience how, the day before leaving on his lecture tour, he was asked to have lunch with Vice-President Henry Wallace, who had expressed a "profound personal interest in Latin America." "Perhaps," Frank said, "you don't completely understand the significance of this fact. Henry A. Wallace is a simple man from the agricultural region of Iowa. . . . He belongs to a race of men who have never stood out for their interest in other peoples—not even for the culture of their own country." And, in spite of his background and his extremely busy schedule, the vice-president, "this expert in feeding pigs and classifying cereals, this defender of the poor farmer, . . . is genuinely, humbly, humanly interested in the peoples of Ibero America. In a certain inarticulate way, this man loves America Hispana; he wishes to approach it, to understand it, because he feels that he is lacking something" (Frank, *Ustedes y nosotros. Nuevo mensaje a Ibero-América* [Buenos Aires: Losada, 1942], 163–65).
31. Paul J. Carter, *Waldo Frank* (New Haven, Conn.: Twayne, 1967), 8.
32. What had inspired him to this idea were his first contacts with Mexicans in Pueblo, Colorado, from which he concluded that the Mexican, though socially repressed, was in fact superior to the Anglo American in cultural terms; he was "attached to his soil and loved it," seeking "happiness in harmony with his surroundings" and "life by cultivation, rather than exploitation" (Frank, *Our America,* 94–95).
33. Casey Nelson Blake, *Beloved Community: The Cultural Criticism of Randolph Bourne, Van Wyck Brooks, Waldo Frank and Lewis Mumford* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1990), 268–71.
34. For conservative commentator Falcoff, Frank was "perhaps the most overrated literary figure of his generation" (87). Pike and his pupil Ogorzaly ridicule Frank's naïve idealism, and even blame Frank for helping "doom" Latin America "to continuing underdevelopment" by encouraging the Latin American intelligentsia in their mistaken "belief in miraculous deliverance from the grubby realities of material development" (Fredrick B. Pike, *The Politics of the Miraculous in Peru: Haya de la Torre and the Spiritualist*

Tradition [Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1986], 195). The more left-leaning Blake strongly chastizes Frank's elitist messianism and lack of democratic sensibility (173–78; 274–78). Stein and Alarcón, marxists, criticize his failure to fully embrace Communism (William W. Stein and Renato Alarcón, "José Carlos Mariátegui y Waldo Frank: Dos amigos," *Anuario mariateguiano* 1, no. 1 [1989]: 161–84).

35. Michael A. Ogorzaly, *Waldo Frank: Prophet of Hispanic Regeneration* (Lewisburg, Pa.: Bucknell University Press, 1994), 9.
36. Waldo Frank, *Primer mensaje a la América hispana* (Madrid: Revista de Occidente, 1930), 27.
37. José Ortega y Gasset, *La rebelión de las masas* (Madrid: Revista de Occidente, 1959), 56.
38. Waldo Frank, *The Re-Discovery of America and Chart for Rough Water* (New York: Duell, Sloan, and Pearce, 1947), 156.
39. Waldo Frank, "Viva España Libre! . . . ," *The New Masses* (18 August 1936): 12–13.
40. Waldo Frank, *Virgin Spain: The Drama of a Great People,* 2d ed. (New York: Duell, Sloan, and Pearce, 1942), 308.
41. Ramiro de Maeztu, *Defensa de la Hispanidad* (Madrid: Gráfica Universal, 1934).
42. Beatriz Sarlo, "Cultural Studies and Literary Criticism at the Crossroads of Values," *Journal of Latin American Cultural Studies* 8, no. 1 (1999): 115–24.