

CLOSE ENCOUNTERS OF EMPIRE

WRITING THE CULTURAL HISTORY OF U.S.-LATIN AMERICAN RELATIONS



GILBERT M. JOSEPH, CATHERINE C. LEGRAND, AND RICARDO D. SALVATORE, EDITORS

Foreword by Fernando Coronil

Close Encounters of Empire

American Encounters/Global Interactions

A Series Edited by Gilbert M. Joseph and Emily S. Rosenberg



Close Encounters of Empire

Writing the Cultural History

of U.S.–Latin American Relations

Edited by Gilbert M. Joseph, Catherine C. LeGrand,
and Ricardo D. Salvatore

With a Foreword by Fernando Coronil

Duke University Press Durham and London

1998

© 1998 Duke University Press All rights reserved

Printed in the United States of America on acid-free paper ∞

Typeset in Times Roman with Frutiger display by Tseng Information Systems, Inc.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data appear

on the last printed page of this book.

3rd printing, 2006

*This book was published with the assistance of
the Frederick W. Hilles Publications Fund of Yale University.*

Frontispiece:

René d'Harnoncourt, *American Artist in Mexico*, 1932.

Gouache. Courtesy of the d'Harnoncourt family.

Photo: Philadelphia Museum of Art.

American Encounters/Global Interactions

A series edited by Gilbert M. Joseph and Emily S. Rosenberg

This series aims to stimulate critical perspectives and fresh interpretive frameworks for scholarship on the history of the imposing global presence of the United States. Its primary concerns include the deployment and contestation of power, the construction and deconstruction of cultural and political borders, the fluid meanings of intercultural encounters, and the complex interplay between the global and the local. *American Encounters* seeks to strengthen dialogue and collaboration between historians of U.S. international relations and area studies specialists.

The series encourages scholarship based on multiarchival historical research. At the same time, it supports a recognition of the representational character of all stories about the past and promotes critical inquiry into issues of subjectivity and narrative. In the process, *American Encounters* strives to understand the context in which meanings related to nations, cultures, and political economy are continually produced, challenged, and reshaped.

Contents

Foreword *Fernando Coronil* ix

Preface xiii

I: Theoretical Concerns

Close Encounters: Toward a New Cultural History of U.S.–Latin American Relations *Gilbert M. Joseph* 3

The Decentered Center and the Expansionist Periphery: The Paradoxes of Foreign-Local Encounter *Steve J. Stern* 47

The Enterprise of Knowledge: Representational Machines of Informal Empire *Ricardo D. Salvatore* 69

II: Empirical Studies

Landscape and the Imperial Subject: U.S. Images of the Andes, 1859–1930 *Deborah Poole* 107

Love in the Tropics: Marriage, Divorce, and the Construction of Benevolent Colonialism in Puerto Rico, 1898–1910 *Eileen J. Findlay* 139

Mercenaries in the Theater of War: Publicity, Technology, and the Illusion of Power during the Brazilian Naval Revolt of 1893 *Steven C. Topik* 173

The Sandino Rebellion Revisited: Civil War, Imperialism, Popular Nationalism, and State Formation Muddled Up Together in the Segovias of Nicaragua, 1926–1934 *Michael J. Schroeder* 208

The Cult of the Airplane among U.S. Military Men and Dominicans during the U.S. Occupation and the Trujillo Regime *Eric Paul Roorda* 269

Central American Encounters with Rockefeller Public Health, 1914–1921 *Steven Palmer* 311

Living in Macondo: Economy and Culture in a United Fruit Company Banana Enclave in Colombia *Catherine C. LeGrand* 333

From Welfare Capitalism to the Free Market in Chile: Gender, Culture, and Politics in the Copper Mines *Thomas Miller Klubock* 369

Everyday Forms of Transnational Collaboration: U.S. Film Propaganda in Cold War Mexico *Seth Fein* 400

Gringo Chickens with Worms: Food and Nationalism in the Dominican Republic *Lauren Derby* 451

III: Final Reflections

Turning to Culture *Emily S. Rosenberg* 497

Social Fields and Cultural Encounters *William Roseberry* 515

From Reading to Seeing: Doing and Undoing Imperialism in the Visual Arts *María del Carmen Suescun Pozas* 525

Contributors 557

Index 563

Fernando Coronil

Foreword

A pathbreaking study of U.S.–Latin American relations, *Close Encounters of Empire* is also a landmark of postcolonial studies in the Americas. The product of a conference at Yale University, this unusually coherent collection of essays reflects vigorous collective discussions, painstaking scholarship, and skilled editorial work. While the individual cases examine with sophistication a wide range of imperial encounters in the Americas, the introduction and the two concluding interpretive essays relate the studies to each other and discuss their collective achievements. I will exchange the opportunity to comment further on the case studies for the chance to discuss this volume's theoretical contribution to the broader field of postcolonial studies.

The authors of these essays treat postcolonial encounters in the Americas as complex affairs involving multiple agents, elaborate cultural constructs, and unforeseen outcomes. While evidently inspired by recent developments in social theory associated with cultural and feminist studies, as well as with poststructuralism and postcolonialism, the essays also build on a long tradition of Latin American scholarship on colonialism and imperialism. The book's theoretical importance results from the diverse ways in which its authors establish, often implicitly, a dialogue among these diverse bodies of scholarship.

In the introduction Gil Joseph highlights the significance of this dialogue, noting that the collection is distinguished by the pioneering use of postmodern approaches to the analysis of U.S.–Latin American relations. As Joseph observes, while the essays are informed by a postmodern sensitivity to the formation of subaltern subjects, the ambiguities of power, and the multistranded character of historical processes, they do not abandon a more traditional concern with large-scale historical contexts and overarching political relations. Through the interplay of these approaches, the essays treat the “encounter” between the United States and Latin America as a complex interaction among unequal social actors, illuminating in new ways their modes of cooperation, subjection, and resistance under changing historical conditions.

This collection's engagement with modern and postmodern approaches is also underlined by Rosenberg and Roseberry in the two interpretive

essays that close the book. Rosenberg contrasts this volume with studies that take a modernist perspective and emphasizes its affinity with postcolonial theory, postmodern studies of international relations, and culture-centered discussions of U.S. foreign relations. According to her, the recognition of the complexity and ambiguity of power systems has led to studies that reject the positivist conceits of the master narratives of modernism and that opt for the more modest goal of illuminating social reality through partial glimpses, attentiveness to localized context, and sensitivity to multiple stories and protean symbolic systems. For Roseberry, this volume's theoretical significance lies in its ability to draw on new perspectives while building on earlier modes of analysis. Seeking to bridge rather than to reinforce the gap between political economy and cultural studies that underwrites the modern-postmodern divide, Roseberry suggests that we read this book as effecting not so much a shift as a dialogue between these approaches.

Yet Latin America has been largely absent from the internal dialogue that has established the field of postcolonial studies in the metropolitan centers. Readers familiar with this field may be aware that it has been fundamentally defined by work produced about northern European colonialism in Asia and Africa, and that its critique of dominant historiographies (whether imperial, nationalist, or Marxist) has led to a significant reconceptualization of the making and representation of colonial histories (perhaps best exemplified by the scholarship of India's Subaltern Studies Group). However, both postcolonial imperialism and Latin America (as an area of study and as a source of theoretical and empirical work) are fundamentally absent from postcolonial studies' canonical texts. This volume counters both absences.

The inclusion of the Americas expands the historical referents and theoretical scope of postcolonial studies. The Americas encompass a vast territory where, since the end of the fifteenth century, European imperial powers (not only Spain and Portugal but also England, France, Holland, and Germany) have imposed various modalities of colonial control, learned from each other, and transplanted this learning to other regions. It is also the region where the United States has most forcefully practiced new modes of imperial domination as the world's major capitalist power. A lengthy postcolonial history has encouraged Latin American and Caribbean thinkers to confront imperialism's changing forms. From the perspective of the Americas, some of the pitfalls entailed by the *post* of *postcolonialism*, such as the notion that it denotes effective decolonization, are perhaps easier to avoid.

I will treat the encounter between modern and postmodern approaches that informs this collection on postcolonial encounters in the Americas as the opportunity to move beyond the limitations of either approach. The following five propositions, derived from my reading of this book, are but some tentative steps in this direction.

1. *Culture/Political Economy*. While the scholarship on U.S.–Latin American relations has traditionally centered on political economy (largely through works influenced by the dependency perspective), recent studies inspired by postcolonial theory tend to focus on the culture of imperial-subaltern encounters. Yet “political economy” and “culture” are ambiguous theoretical categories that refer both to concrete social domains and to abstract dimensions of any social domain. The traditional focus on political economy entails a neglect not only of domains outside the economy, but also of the cultural dimension of economic practices themselves. In postcolonial studies the current focus on culture has opened new areas of inquiry, yet has tended to neglect the study not only of economic and political relations, but also of the materiality of cultural practices. A recognition that the separation between culture and political economy is itself culturally constructed would help overcome this oversight.

2. *Metanarratives/Ministories*. One consequence of the various “turns” (discursive, linguistic) and “posts” (postmodernism, postcoloniality) has been the tendency to identify political economy with modernist master narratives and cultural studies with postmodern fragmented stories. While one approach typically generates unilinear plots, unified actors, and integrated systems, the other produces multistranded accounts, divided subjects, and fragmented social fields. Yet there is no reason why social analysis should be cast in terms that polarize determinism and contingency, the systemic and the fragmentary. The critique of modernist assumptions should lead to a more critical engagement with history’s complexity, not to a proliferation of disjointed vignettes and stories.

3. *Fluid Subjects/Complex Wholes*. The field of postcolonial studies has focused on the range, inner complexity, and fluidity of the subjects and locations involved in imperial encounters. Yet the analytical inclusion of fluid subjects and unstable terrains must be complemented by the analysis of their articulation within encompassing social fields. These fields of power are internally ordered, and their systemic properties have effects that must be analyzed. Fragmentation, ambiguity, and disjuncture are features of complex systems, rather than their opposite. Lest we miss the forest for the trees, the task remains to understand the complex architecture of parts and whole.

4. *Borders/Bodies*. Imperial encounters entail the transcultural interaction of the domestic and the foreign under changing historical conditions. This process does not involve the movement of discrete entities from one bounded body into another across fixed borders, but rather their reciprocal transformation. The borders between the dominant and the subaltern are multiple—from the physical frontiers that separate them to the “contact zones” where imperial and subaltern actors interact. In imperial-subaltern encounters, bodies and borders are mutually defined and transformed through asymmetrical processes of transculturation.

5. *Imperialism/Subalternity*. Imperial-subaltern encounters occur in social landscapes structured by differing modes of exploiting nature and labor. The social identities formed in these landscapes—constituted by such relations as nationality, class, ethnicity, gender, religion, race, and age—cannot be analyzed without reference to these forms of exploitation. A focus on the complex articulation of these asymmetrical relations avoids reductionist explanations that dismiss culture as a mere epiphenomenon, discursive accounts that disavow the material dimension of domination, and essentialist interpretations that celebrate as resistance any form of subaltern response and adaptation. Studies of specific postcolonial encounters must address the encompassing landscapes of power in which they unfold and the persisting colonizing effects of (post)modern empires.

The Americas have always been a site of unexpected transfigurations. It would be a welcome irony if on the social terrain of the Americas—so saturated by a history of imperialism and by reflections on it—the turn to postmodern discursive approaches converged with or emerged as a material turn, understood as a move toward a fuller recognition of the complex wholeness of social reality. By bringing excluded objects of study into view and refining the way we view them, *Close Encounters of Empire* advances the project of developing a perspective on imperialism capable of confronting its ongoing colonizing effects on territories, peoples, and knowledges. This critical perspective will permit a fuller understanding of the colonial and postcolonial past, as well as more adequate responses to the new forms of subjection and inequality of the ever-changing postcolonial present.

Preface

The idea for this book grew out of a series of discussions among the editors in the spring of 1994. Catherine LeGrand and Ricardo Salvatore were Postdoctoral Fellows in the Program in Agrarian Studies at Yale University, where Gil Joseph directed the Council on Latin American Studies. Each of us had done extensive historical research on problems of Latin American political economy and on the United States' formidable presence in the region. Each of us had also been influenced by the recent cultural and linguistic "turn" in the human sciences. In the wake of the avalanche of cultural history and criticism generated by the five-hundredth anniversary of the so-called Columbian encounter, we found it surprising that little scholarship of a similar nature existed for Latin America's postcolonial (or neocolonial) encounter with the United States during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. To be sure, exciting work was under way across several fields and disciplines, but the cultural history of U.S.–Latin American relations remained to be written almost in its entirety. As we speculated on why the field's development had been stunted, we came to appreciate the almost total lack of communication that existed between Latin Americanists and historians of U.S. foreign relations who worked on inter-American affairs: rarely did members of the two groups of scholars attend the same professional meetings, let alone collaborate on joint projects.

As our discussions came to include a broader range of Latin Americanists (from north and south of the Rio Grande) and U.S. foreign relations historians, the three of us began to plan a research conference that would unite scholars working on the cultural history of inter-American relations across fields, disciplines, and regions. We hoped to take stock of the more innovative work being done and, hopefully, to set a future agenda for research. Following a year-and-a-half planning process, an international conference, "Rethinking the Postcolonial Encounter: Transnational Perspectives on the Foreign Presence in Latin America," was held at Yale in October 1995, sponsored by the University's Council on Latin American Studies. The event brought together fifty-two established and younger scholars of hemispheric relations: historians, anthropologists, sociologists, political scientists, and cultural and literary scholars; a cast that included North Americans, Latin Americans, Europeans, and one Australian. Four days of intense discussion and debate among this diverse,

interdisciplinary cast—one Latin American participant likened the conference's own feisty "encounters" to porcupines making love—expanded and enriched frames of reference and produced a harvest of papers, eight of which have found their way into this volume.

Four-day international conferences are costly affairs. Ours was generously funded by the National Endowment for the Humanities (Conference Grant RX-21583-95), Yale's Office of the Provost, and the Kempf Memorial Fund at Yale. Special thanks go to Associate Provost Arline McCord, for her encouragement of the event from the earliest stages of planning. We are also grateful to Heather Salome, then Senior Administrator of the Council on Latin American Studies, and her assistants, Jonathan Amith, Steve Bachelor, and Delia Patricia Mathews, for ably and cheerfully managing the logistical details of the conference. We also thank the New Haven Colony Historical Society for providing its facilities and services for the working sessions.

Of course, we are particularly indebted to those colleagues whose ideas and energy ensured the success of the 1995 conference, which laid the groundwork for the present volume. Besides the writers whose work appears in these pages, we also wish to thank the following people who contributed research findings and commentaries in New Haven: Ana María Alonso, Warwick Anderson, William Beezley, Jefferson Boyer, Jürgen Buchenau, Avi Chomsky, Marcos Cueto, Emília Viotti da Costa, Julie Franks, Alejandra García Quintanilla, Paul Gootenberg, Donna Guy, John Hart, Timothy Henderson, Robert Holden, Gladys Jiménez-Muñoz, Friedrich Katz, Alan Knight, Agnes Lugo Ortiz, Francine Masiello, Louis Pérez, Daniel Nugent, Gerardo Rénique, Karen Robert, Cristina Rojas de Ferro, Jeffrey Rubin, Kelvin Santiago-Valles, William Schell, Stuart Schwartz, James Scott, Patricia Seed, Doris Sommer, Alexandra Stern, Lynn Stoner, William Taylor, Mauricio Tenorio, and George Yúdice.

The present volume is the product of several years of collaboration among the editors, contributors, and individuals mentioned above. Following the 1995 conference, contributors spent the next year revising their papers. William Roseberry and Emily Rosenberg were each invited to submit shorter concluding reflections; Fernando Coronil was asked to write a foreword; and María Suescun Pozas was asked to do a think piece on the visual arts. Joseph's introductory essay and the contributions by LeGrand, Eileen Findlay, Steven Topik, and Lauren Derby, while written more recently, owe a great deal to the stimulating deliberations in New Haven.

Four final acknowledgments are in order. We are grateful to Yale's Center for International and Area Studies, particularly its two most recent

directors, Gaddis Smith and Gustav Ranis, for providing funds that supported much of the editorial and clerical costs attending preparation of the book's manuscript. The Social Science and Humanities Research Council of Canada contributed additional funding. We are indebted to Bill Beezley and Allen Wells for their meticulous readings of the manuscript. Finally, we express our gratitude to Valerie Millholland, our editor at Duke University Press, for her constant encouragement and ability to do the special things that mean so much to editors and authors.

GILBERT M. JOSEPH, CATHERINE C. LEGRAND,
AND RICARDO D. SALVATORE

I: Theoretical Concerns

Gilbert M. Joseph

Close Encounters

Toward a New Cultural History of U.S.–Latin American Relations

It is a commonplace that Latin American history has been powerfully influenced by foreigners and foreign powers—not least by North Americans and the United States. Not for nothing do Mexicans refer to their neighbor as the “Northern Colossus” and visit the government’s “National Museum of Interventions” (which showcases invasions of the *patria* by European powers as well as the United States). Nor is it surprising that throughout the hemisphere Latin Americans joke sardonically that “When the United States sneezes [undergoes a recession], *we* get pneumonia [experience full-blown depression].” Or, that the images Cubans, Chileans, and Central Americans nurture of North American wealth and corporate power or CIA plots are invariably dark and larger than life—images codified by some of the hemisphere’s most influential writers: José Martí, José Enrique Rodó, Pablo Neruda, Miguel Angel Asturias, Carlos Fuentes, and Gabriel García Márquez, to name but a few.¹

Of course, there are also more benign legacies, heroes, and mythologies. Fidel Castro quoted Tom Paine and Thomas Jefferson long before he invoked Lenin, and for a time played baseball as passionately as politics. Mexican journalists report the strong influence of the U.S. New Left on the Zapatista leader of Chiapas, Subcomandante Marcos.² No world leader has enjoyed as enduring and popular a cult in Latin America as John F. Kennedy. The intimidating Northern Colossus is also “El Norte”—“el otro lado” (the other side)—a sanctuary for Latino immigrants and refugees; a source of insurgent support (e.g., Cuba in the 1890s, 1950s, and since 1959; and Mexico in the 1910s); and a mecca for tourists and consumers.³ In short, the U.S. (and broader foreign) presence is varied and complex, and it has cast a long shadow.⁴

In seeking to understand the influence that North Americans and other foreigners have had on the region in the post- (or, as some prefer, neo-) colonial period, Latin Americanists first studied foreign investment and commercial affairs, diplomacy, and military interventions—and relied disproportionately on U.S. sources. Not surprisingly, their analyses re-

flected prevailing notions regarding the determining influence of climate, the struggle between “civilization and barbarism,” the “challenge” posed by “modernization,” the specter of “communist subversion,” the deforming legacy of imperialism, and so forth.⁵ In the 1960s and 1970s, “dependency theory” held center stage among progressive intelligentsias north and south of the Rio Grande: the structural subordination of Latin America as a periphery within the capitalist world system was held responsible for the “development of underdevelopment,” understood primarily in economic terms. Like its neoclassical predecessor, “modernization/diffusionist theory,” the predominantly neo-Marxian dependency school emphasized the power and influence of the “developed” world in shaping Latin America, but—as we shall see presently—the two paradigms were diametrically opposed in their interpretation of whether the results were positive or negative.

The Postmodern Challenge

Today, with theories of imperialism and dependency under attack and the once-discredited diffusionist model recycled (yet again) in “neoliberal” form by the managers of the “New World Order,”⁶ Latin Americanists across a variety of disciplines and a new generation of historians of U.S. foreign relations (once known as “diplomatic historians”) are challenged to study the region’s engagement with the United States in innovative ways. New poststructural concerns with the intersection of culture and power, with historical agency, and with the social construction of political life are producing new questions about the nature and outcomes of foreign-local encounters.⁷ Turning away from dichotomous political-economic models that see only domination and resistance, exploiters and victims, Latin Americanists (like their counterparts in African, Asian, and European studies)⁸ are suggesting alternate ways of conceptualizing the role that U.S. and other foreign actors and agencies have played in the region during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.⁹ At the same time, they are integrating gendered, ethnic, and linguistic analysis in their research designs; challenging the conventional separation of “public” and “private” spheres (and thereby expanding notions of the political); unsettling such seemingly fixed categories as “the state,” “the nation,” “development,” “modernity,” and “nature”;¹⁰ and in the process rethinking the canon of such traditional genres as diplomatic, business, and military history, and international relations theory.¹¹

This volume represents the first systematic attempt to take stock of this exciting watershed and, in the process, to theorize a new interpretive framework for studying the United States' formidable presence in Latin America.¹² Contributors explore a series of power-laden "encounters"—typically, close encounters—through which foreign people, ideas, commodities, and institutions have been received, contested, and appropriated in nineteenth- and twentieth-century Latin America. We should be clear at the outset: our use of the term *encounter* in conceptualizing the range of networks, exchanges, borrowings, behaviors, discourses, and meanings whereby the external became internalized in Latin America should not be construed as a euphemizing device, to defang historical analysis of imperialism. Sadly, in much of the literature on the 1992 Columbian quincentenary, the term performed just this sanitizing function.¹³ Equally, it is not our intention to reify "Imperialism," validating Leninist identifications of it as the "highest stage of capitalism," or imposing other teleological conditions for its study.¹⁴

Rather, we are concerned in this volume with the deployment and contestation of power, with scrutinizing what Mary Louise Pratt refers to as the "contact zones" of the American empire.¹⁵ As these essays vividly demonstrate, U.S. power has been brought to bear unevenly in the region by diverse agents, in a variety of sites and conjunctures, and through diverse transnational arrangements. Forms of power have thus been multiple and complex: simultaneously arranged through nation-states and more informal regional relationships; via business and communications networks and culture industries; through scientific foundations and philanthropic agencies; via imported technologies; and through constructions of nationality, race, ethnicity, gender, and sexuality. Contact zones are not geographic places with stable significations; they may represent attempts at hegemony, but are simultaneously sites of multivocality; of negotiation, borrowing, and exchange; and of redeployment and reversal.

We feel no obligation to rehearse the attenuated debate over whether or not the United States has been an imperial power—a debate that continues to preoccupy U.S. diplomatic historians and American studies scholars. To argue in the manner of George Kennan and subsequent generations of "realists" (and latter-day "postrevisionists") that if the United States *briefly* had an empire in the aftermath of the Spanish-American War, it promptly gave it away; that, therefore, imperialism has always been inconsequential to U.S. history;¹⁶ that, unlike the great powers of Europe, the historical experience of the United States has been characterized by "discovery" not "imperium," "global power" not "imperialism," "uni-

polarity” not “hegemony” is to perpetuate false notions of “American exceptionalism” and to engage psychologically in denial and projection.¹⁷ Such arguments also ignore structures, practices, and discourses of domination and possession that run throughout U.S. history.¹⁸ A quarter century ago, as the United States’ defeat in Vietnam became apparent, the notion that the United States was an imperial power gained wide acceptance; leading politicians like Senator J. William Fulbright openly described the nation’s foreign policy as “imperialist.”¹⁹ By contrast, today, amid the continuing celebration of the defeat of the Stalinist regimes of Eastern Europe, “you need an electron microscope to find ‘imperialism’ used to describe the U.S. role in the world.”²⁰

A provocative recent collection, *The Cultures of United States Imperialism*, edited by American studies scholars Amy Kaplan and Donald Pease, dissects this “ongoing pattern of denial” among U.S. policymakers and academics and seeks to “name” the empire again.²¹ The volume’s contributors argue compellingly that the politics of U.S. continental and international expansion, conflict, and resistance have shaped the history of American culture just as much as the cultures of those the United States has dominated. The book makes a powerful case for restoring empire to the study of American culture(s) and for incorporating the United States into contemporary discussions of “postcoloniality.”

Cultures of United States Imperialism also begins to fill the lacuna that most preoccupies contributors to this volume: the absence of cultural analysis from the overseas history of U.S. expansion and hegemony. The realist school’s overriding emphasis on high politics, the balance of power, and national security interests had not gone unchallenged: beginning in the mid-1950s, William Appleman Williams and a subsequent generation of New Left, “revisionist” diplomatic historians called into question realism’s paradigm of denial, focusing almost exclusively on the economic determinants of empire. In doing so, however, they neglected the role of culture in the imperial expansion of “America’s frontier.”²² Kaplan writes:

Revisionist emphasis on economic causality may have stemmed in part from the effort to endow imperialism with reality and solidity against the subjective explanations [“moral idealism,” “mass hysteria” generated by the yellow press] given by those “realists” who relegated empire to a minor detour in the march of American history. The economic approach, however, embodied its own contradictions, which led to multiple debates among historians . . . about whether the fabled markets . . . were mere “illusions,” as opposed to having “real” economic value. If economics is privileged as the site of the “real,” then cultural phenomena

such as the belief in markets, or racist discourse, or the ideology of “benevolent assimilation” can only be viewed as “illusions” that have little impact on a separate and narrowly defined political sphere.²³

To combat such dichotomized, economic thinking (which Williams himself would temper in a later volume on “empire as a way of life”),²⁴ the contributors to *Cultures of United States Imperialism* wrote about “those areas of culture traditionally ignored as long as imperialism was treated as a matter of foreign policy conducted by diplomatic elites or as a matter of economic necessity driven by market forces.”²⁵ Nevertheless, given their predominant orientation as American studies scholars, and literary and cultural critics, the volume’s contributors focused overwhelmingly on questions of representation and disproportionately on how U.S. imperialism had influenced or consolidated North American rather than foreign cultures. And although the editors wisely caution against theoretically segregating material and cultural/discursive analysis, the former is largely conspicuous by its absence in this otherwise absorbing volume.

While our project has much to say about the “representational machines” of empire—the technologies and discourses that conveyed empire to audiences back home (see particularly the essays by Salvatore and Poole)—it is more concerned with representation as an integral dimension of imperial encounters “on the ground.” Particular attention is given in these essays to a materially grounded, processual analysis of U.S. interaction with Latin American polities, societies, and cultures. The manner in which international relations reciprocally shaped a dominant imperial culture at home, although implicit in several of the essays, is not a central concern here; even less so are the modes by which imperial relations have been contested within the United States. For these matters readers can profitably consult *Cultures of United States Imperialism*.

If terms such as *encounter* or *engagement*, which appear in many of the contributions, are not meant to affirm the neutral notion of social gatherings that much recent scholarly writing has chosen to emphasize, what do they connote? Certainly they designate the connectedness of specific material and discursive interactions in the contact zones of empire; moreover, they are multivalent. On the one hand, they index attempts by people of different “cultures” to enter into relationships that need not deny or obliterate the subjectivity of the other party: efforts to understand, empathize with, approach the other; gestures to establish some type of bond, commitment, or contract. On the other hand, *encounter* and *engagement* also connote contestation and conflict, even military confrontation (not

for nothing are these terms synonymous with battles in military parlance). Indeed, the derivation of *encounter* from the Latin is itself instructive: the word fuses *in* (“in”) with *contra* (“against”).

Thus, these terms designate processes and practices through which the other is rendered proximate or distant, friend or adversary (or some more ambiguous, ambivalent status), practices that entail mutual constructions and misunderstandings—the recourse to “othering” and “orientalizing” that is inherent in power-laden contexts.²⁶ Our emphasis on close encounters in Latin American contact zones—or, as Bill Roseberry prefers in his contribution, diverse “social fields”—suggests interactions that are usually fraught with inequality and conflict, if not coercion, but *also* with interactive, improvisational possibilities. Such a perspective, according to Pratt, treats imperial relations “not in terms of separateness and apartheid, but in terms of copresence, interaction, interlocking understandings and practices.”²⁷

It should be clear that, without wanting to be canonic in our understanding of “culture,” this volume’s contributors work within a broad Gramscian tradition, examining the links between culture and power. If pressed for a portmanteau concept, we might define culture as the symbols and meanings embedded in the daily practices of elite and subaltern (or foreign and local) groups, but with the proviso that such a definition is not intended to rigidly specify what the contents of those symbols and meanings are—a static, reifying exercise at best. Rather, our definition would underscore their processual nature, and insist that both elite/foreign and popular/local understandings are constantly being refashioned. At once “socially constituted (it is a product of present and past activity) and socially constituting (it is part of the meaningful context in which activity takes place),”²⁸ culture—popular or elite, local or foreign—never represents an autonomous, authentic, and bounded domain. Instead, popular and elite (or local and foreign) cultures are produced in relation to each other through a dialectic of engagement that takes place in contexts of unequal power and entails reciprocal borrowings, expropriations, and transformations. Throughout this volume, the reader will encounter cultural practices and institutions such as music, art, literature, folklore, mass media, leisure pastimes, and spectacle; she will also find herself immersed in the broader cultural realm of aspirations, beliefs, values, attitudes, tastes, and habits. But if the manifestations of inter-American culture are many and diverse, their history is always interwoven with political intentions and consequences.²⁹

This book's contributors include historians and anthropologists from the United States, Canada, and Latin America. An effort has been made to introduce senior scholars in the fields of Latin American studies and the history of U.S. foreign relations to each other, as well as to members of a newer generation in these fields. Moreover, in order to facilitate discussion between Latin Americanists and scholars working on similar problems elsewhere, the book is structured in the form of a dialogue between more general theoretical and comparative statements (in the introductory and concluding sections) and Latin American case studies based on recent research (in the volume's extensive middle section).

No single volume can adequately cover the waterfront—in this case, a veritable universe of multiform imperial engagements that have occupied the Americas over two centuries. We have sought to feature instructive and absorbing cases representing mainland and circum-Caribbean areas, and to include Brazil as well as Spanish America. If the Caribbean basin and Mexico receive proportionately greater attention, it is because, owing to propinquity, they remained the principal theaters of North American geopolitical and economic concern, and were most thoroughly inscribed with imperial power and influence. Not surprisingly, these areas have generated some of the most innovative scholarship, particularly work that contributes to a new cultural history of U.S.–Latin American relations.

The reader will also note that the editors have chosen to emphasize the period roughly before 1945, although several of the essays extend their chronological focus beyond World War II, some right up to the present (e.g., the contributions by Joseph, Stern, LeGrand, Klubock, Fein, Derby, Rosenberg, Roseberry, and Suescun Pozas). Clearly, the globalization of the planet, stunningly reflected in the internationalization of capital, labor, commodities, and cultural flows that has accelerated in recent decades, merits numerous volumes of its own. Nevertheless, we believe that the conceptual framework elaborated here will usefully inform such a sequel.

In this introductory essay, I first “unpack” the most influential political-economic models that Latin Americanist scholars and policymakers have employed over the last several decades to make sense of inter-American relations. To what extent do such paradigms usefully address the historical dynamics of foreign involvement in Latin America? In what respects are they deficient? I then go on to suggest how the initiative represented in this volume expands our understanding of the foreign-local encounter in Latin America.³⁰

Confronting and Unpacking Historical Paradigms

Confrontation with major paradigms of world history has distinguished the field of Latin American history during the last quarter century or so.³¹ Starting in the late 1960s and early 1970s, a dissident generation of social scientists began to challenge prevailing diffusionist models of development with various renditions of dependency and world-systems theory.³² It is instructive to deconstruct these paradigms and examine the assumptions they share as well as their points of disagreement. After all, the new interdisciplinary scholarship has questioned many of these assumptions in rethinking foreign-local encounters in Latin America.

The once and future diffusionist model is based on a persistent belief that “development”—or, interchangeably, “modernization”—comes about as a result of the penetration of technology, capital, trade, democratic political institutions, and attitudes from the “developed” into the “developing” countries of the world.³³ Its proponents further assume that developing countries are themselves “dual societies” divided into a “lagging” rural sector and a “modernizing” capitalist urban sector. Just as the modernization of a developing country comes about through the diffusion of capital and ideas from developed nations, so the modernization of the lagging rural areas of the developing country comes about through the penetration of capital and ideas from its own dynamic urban centers (often referred to as “growth poles”). Thus, agents and agencies of development from the modern capitalist countries, working closely with the growing “middle class” in the receiving society, incrementally facilitate a closing of the gap, not only between developed and developing countries, but also between modern and lagging sectors of the developing nation itself.³⁴

Early modernization theory, epitomized by W. W. Rostow’s influential book *The Stages of Economic Growth* (1960), emphasized the cultural and psychological obstacles to growth (e.g., an ingrained fatalism), prescribing that underdeveloped countries needed only to follow the steps traversed by developed nations. The early models were additive: essentially, they postulated that merely by adding technology and capital, underdeveloped societies would progress. Later diffusionists, such as S. N. Eisenstadt, were less sanguine about surefire, unilinear solutions. They placed far greater emphasis on internal *structural* obstacles to change, particularly the syndromes of “internal colonialism” (the dominance of primate cities over poor hinterlands) and “the vicious cycle of poverty.” Nevertheless, like the early theorists, they maintained an abiding belief in foreign aid and investment, open trade, export production, and technology transfer.³⁵

Leftist critics of “modernization” have proposed a variety of “dissident paradigms”—new formulations of imperialism, dependency theory, and world-systems theory—which essentially stand diffusionism on its head. Although a nuanced analysis of these various alternative paradigms of development cannot be elaborated here,³⁶ two broad initial observations are in order. On one level, these dissident approaches have collectively administered a telling blow to the doctrine of modernization: “economic growth,” “transnational integration,” and “democratization” have repeatedly been accompanied by national disintegration; the growth of an exploited, marginal mass has superseded the creation or maintenance of a dynamic and prosperous middle class.³⁷ On a more fundamental, epistemological level, however, these dissident paradigms, despite their powerful, often compelling linkage of Latin American inequities to world-scale political-economic structures and forces, have frequently replicated the same dichotomized, bounded view of foreign-local engagement and the same penchant for teleology that undermined diffusionism.³⁸

New theorists of “imperialism,” for example, focus on the U.S. (or European) center’s penetration of the Latin American periphery. Imperialism’s main branches are held to be political, military, and economic; secondarily it involved the inexorable transfer—indeed, virtual imposition—of a kind of cultural compost, the so-called American way of life. Concerned mainly with the question of uneven power relations between nation-states and with the tensions created by exports of capital to social formations that were in a less “advanced” state of development, this view has presented the growing and multifaceted connection between the United States and Latin America as a relationship between two distinct political entities and two economies. American businessmen, diplomats, and military personnel abroad are typically portrayed as instruments of an alliance between capital and the state to conquer markets, tap cheap sources of raw materials, and consolidate an asymmetrical relationship of power.³⁹

In similar fashion, dependency and world-systems models take off from a series of inequalities located in international trade and finance. They then proceed to map out a complex network of relationships by means of which local governments, ruling elites, political parties, and institutions in civil society have become involved in the reproduction of a structural condition—“dependency”—that prevented the “peripheral” countries of the region from achieving the levels of development of the northern “metropolis” or “core.” While less tied to notions of the metropolis’s expansion or “spillover” into the periphery than theories of imperialism (or

“revisionist” U.S. diplomatic historians), dependency formulations have retained the central idea of “penetration”; this time, however, the vehicle of penetration was an ensemble of U.S. capital, technology, and culture.⁴⁰ The rationale of the capitalist system remained the same: the reproduction of a highly skewed pattern of accumulation that rewarded the productivity of the North via the exploitation and impoverishment of the South. Now, however, local actors were implicated in the relationship from the start: accomplices, or “compradors,” in an “infrastructure of dependence” that drained resources and creativity, reduced the sphere of liberty, and reproduced the syndrome of poverty.⁴¹

Thus, the master narrative of “dependency,” like that of “imperialism,” has presupposed a bipolar relationship that subsumed difference (regional, class, racial/ethnic, gender, generational) into the service of a greater machinery that set limits, extracted surpluses, established hierarchies, and shaped identities. Both narratives have depicted the United States (or the “core” nations of the world-system) at the controls of a great “neocolonial” enterprise, managing a stream of flows unified by the logic of profits, power, and a single hegemonic culture. From the center flowed commodities; capital; technology; cultural artifacts; and military power, equipment, and expertise—in order to reproduce more of the same. In the periphery, these narratives often suggested, there were only forces and agents that abetted or constrained these flows. Nations were frequently personified and gendered: each had its own national interest and manly persona, and acted in compliance with it or betrayed it, depending on the degree to which dependency had advanced. Of course, by imagining national entities motivated almost exclusively by economic interest, *dependentistas* challenged the self-loathing notion, first preached by nineteenth-century elites, that the “national character” was culturally incapable of economic modernization: too indolent, improvident, and unsavvy to be a serious contender in the race for “progress.”⁴² Nevertheless, this one-dimensional perspective of “comprador elites” had the effect of redefining locals as foreigners, and preempted the examination of other relations, shared assumptions, and emotional and other affinities between foreign agents and local elites.⁴³

The politics of resistance to imperialism and dependency was similarly encoded in the analysis: the only other option to collaboration with the capitalist system was rejection of it. For many, the only alternative to liberal modernizing reform, the only pathway to an economically balanced, socially just form of development, was socialist revolution.⁴⁴ The demonology of the imperialist other was extended not only to North American

corporations, policymakers, and military agents, but also to cultural brokers and institutions of higher learning. It was from U.S. universities, after all, that the new “modernizing” (read *colonizing*) impulse seemed to have emerged; therefore, in the mid-1960s, university professors, librarians, and foundation workers were charged with constituting the new imperialist front. Walt Rostow himself was publicly attacked, charged with being a CIA agent.⁴⁵ In a 1965 conference in Mexico, organized by Andre Gunder Frank and Arturo Bonilla, one-hundred professional economists from Latin America pledged allegiance to a new program that would revamp the research and teaching agendas of economics. The signatories denounced the subordination of the region’s economists to advances in “the Anglo-Saxon countries” and pledged to base their inquiry not on “an alien reality,” but “on the historical experience and present-day reality of Latin America.”⁴⁶ (How times have changed!)

Ironically, while many exponents of these dissident paradigms advocated revolutionary change, they conceived of two types of neocolonial subjects, neither of which was empowered to resist. For if local elites were judged to be implicated in the dependent relationship, willing members of a comprador class, then impoverished peasants and urban masses were viewed as displaced subjects, less a part of history than its victims. They waited on the sidelines for the transformative social project (and vanguard) that would initiate them into the adventure of development.

Finally, the economism of dissident paradigms relegated culture to a subsidiary role.⁴⁷ Since the comprador bourgeoisie lacked a true consciousness, their interests and tastes were essentially those of metropolitan capital, not their own. In their criticism of local elites, dependentistas constructed mediating agents who lacked real agency. It is not surprising, therefore, that the imposition of the “American way of life” became an instrumentalist corollary of the exportation of certain commodities, culture industries, forms of social relations, and technologies (e.g., Coca-Cola, Donald Duck and Disney’s Magic Kingdom, radio and television, factory and *maquila* systems, “mall culture,” and so forth).⁴⁸

Writing the History of Foreign-Local Encounter

The contributors to this volume call into question several of the monochromatic assumptions of the dissident paradigms: the centripetal nature of imperialism and dependency, which risks conceiving of Latin America solely as “peripheral societies,” intelligible only in terms of the impact

that center nations have on them;⁴⁹ the idea of penetration; the reflexive indictments of complicity; the bipolarity of the North-South relationship; and the subsidiary role accorded to culture. Whereas theories of dependency, imperialism, and the world-system—like diffusionism—promote dichotomies that centralize and reify political-economic structures and processes, and ignore culturally embedded human subjects, we strive to “decenter” analysis, break down reifications, and restore agency to the historical narrative.

Nevertheless, our purpose in this volume is not to reject these dissident paradigms out of hand, substituting cultural analysis for structural analysis. To do so would be to indulge in the same dichotomizing we have been critical of—a process that unfortunately has witnessed the ranking of different areas of knowledge in the academy and also has underwritten the kind of mind/body, reason/nature, masculine/feminine, civilization/barbarism distinctions woven into legitimizing discourses of empire.⁵⁰ In this sense, our intention is not so much to elaborate a new paradigm as to acknowledge a heterogeneity and complementarity of approaches. By endorsing “crosstalk” between political economists and cultural critics, we might be able to supplement historical structuralism’s attention to the blending of social theory and power with poststructuralism’s abiding concern with questions of contingency, representation, and difference.⁵¹

In entertaining such a synthesis, it is useful to keep in mind that the fundamental suggestion to explore the diverse historical combinations whereby the external has been internalized in Latin America comes from Fernando Henrique Cardoso and Enzo Faletto’s classic dependency text, *Dependencia y desarrollo*.⁵² That dependency theorists have rarely embraced their empirical agenda, rarely specified through fine-grained research either the complex alliances of dependency or the culturally embedded social fields in which they were situated, does not invalidate Cardoso and Faletto’s original insight. Indeed, in *Dependencia y desarrollo* and a select group of dependentista historical monographs, we gain real insight into how foreign influences and powers were “imbricated in the formation of *local* class relations,” and how “rather than acting like puppets on a string [manipulated by omnipotent foreigners] . . . these local classes pursued particular interests . . . [and] constructed local political institutions and webs of power.”⁵³

At the same time, even more nuanced dependency formulations have epistemological deficiencies. Cultural critics point out, for example, that

even as dependentistas criticized “alien” social science models and demanded solutions based on an “authentic Latin American reality,” they were blind to their own textuality. In other words, they never questioned the received “evidence” they pressed into service from popular national history texts, never confronted these “facts” with other interpretations or alternative periodizations. Much less did they problematize the “making” of national history itself; indeed, in the 1960s and early 1970s, Latin American historiography had not yet experienced the shocks of “history from the bottom up,” microhistory, gender studies, cultural studies, and deconstruction. For Cardoso and Faletto, Latin America’s history was essentially “the history of capitalist accumulation,” a “history of struggles, of political movements, of the affirmation of ideologies, and of the establishment of forms of domination and reactions against them.”⁵⁴

The contributors to the present volume have all been deeply influenced by dependency theory and world-systems approaches; indeed, in many cases the essays build on and refine these perspectives, rather than jettison them (see particularly the chapters by Stern, Schroeder, Klubock, Fein, and Roseberry). How, then, is this accomplished? How do we at once validate the unequal nature of Latin America’s encounter with the United States and write a history that is culturally sensitive, multivocal, and interactive? We might first deconstruct this multiform engagement into its various components: for example, its business, philanthropic, textual, and aesthetic practices; its multiple agents and mediators (who invariably had multiple identities); its institutional and ideological bases of support. We can then begin to reinterpret the foreign-local encounter in a manner that takes into account, among other things, political and cultural processes of resistance, adaptation, and negotiation; the role of the state; the construction and transformation of identities; and the contingent nature (“intertextuality”) of evidence. These essays examine a variety of sites or contact zones where ideologies, technologies, capital flows, state forms, social identities, and material culture meet, and where multiple messages are conveyed. Viewed as a series of communicative exchanges in which “insiders” and “outsiders” engage, act on, and represent each other, the relationships between Latin Americans and North Americans become multifaceted and multivocal.⁵⁵

Such a perspective allows us to distinguish, say, the experiences of U.S. diplomats with local dictators from those of North American marines in contact with local *caciques*, merchants, and prostitutes (see Roorda’s and Schroeder’s essays in this volume); to differentiate the assumptions

and goals of U.S. labor organizers from those of the executives of multinational corporations or representatives of philanthropic organizations (see Palmer's essay).⁵⁶ It also challenges us to rethink facile juxtapositions of "us" and "them," of "foreign" and "local." For example, a recent study of the North American colony at the turn of the century in Mexico argues persuasively that as Mexicans were "Americanized," so too were Americans "Mexicanized." In the process they became "integral outsiders" whose identities and interests often mirrored those of their Mexican counterparts of the same class, and frequently put them at odds with Washington's geopolitics.⁵⁷ In his recent novel *Four Hands*, Mexican writer Paco Ignacio Taibo II similarly underscores the permeability of linguistic and national borders. He imaginatively recreates the labyrinth of networks and associations that bound U.S. and Latin American leftists together throughout this century, enabling them to fight injustice and endure decades of lost causes. In this context we also think of Mauricio Tenorio-Trillo's recent essays on "los Coyoacanes y los Nuevayores": the community of nomadic, counterhegemonic intellectuals that operated with equal facility in Mexico City and New York during the 1920s and 1930s—a set that included Diego Rivera, Frida Kahlo, Tina Modotti, Edward Weston, Bertram and Ella Wolfe, Frank Tannenbaum, and Joseph Freeman, among others.⁵⁸ Sociologist Christian Smith's recent anatomy of the transnational interfaith community that established "Witness for Peace" and the sanctuary movement during the height of the Nicaraguan Contra War and the insurrection in El Salvador in the 1980s raises similar issues from the perspective of religious workers and "citizen diplomacy."⁵⁹

This blurring of boundaries, of who or what is "local" and "foreign," "inside" or "outside," characterizes contemporary critical theory across a variety of fields; it also distinguishes most of the contributions in this volume. Far from representing pristine, autonomous cultures moving directly into contact, like billiard balls striking each other on a felt-covered table—and therefore easily identifiable as "internal" and "external"—ideas, institutions, and other cultural and economic forms are more often the messy sediments of previous exchanges. As such, they might more meaningfully be viewed as *transcultural* products that mutually constitute, at any point in time, the "local" and the "foreign."⁶⁰ In this regard, anthropologist Sherry Ortner writes, "Pieces of reality, however much borrowed from or imposed by others, are woven together through the logic of a group's own locally and historically evolved bricolage."⁶¹ Cultural geographer Doreen Massey provides an instructive illustration:

While [it] is in some sense true [that a Kentucky Fried Chicken franchise in Paris does not qualify as part of a French national identity] it is also important to remember that the national identity of which Kentucky Fried Chicken is not part was itself formed over centuries by layer upon layer of interconnections with the world beyond what was to become France. Some of the elements which are now as obviously French as Kentucky Fried Chicken is not must once have seemed just as “alien,” similarly imported from the global beyond.⁶²

In similar fashion, these essays point up the shaping power that local milieus exercised on foreign actors, ideas, institutions, and commodities. Time and again, “foreign influences are introduced within preexisting social and cultural relations that reconfigure and localize or situate the foreign.”⁶³ Catherine LeGrand, for example, forces us to rethink just how foreign and “closed” the United Fruit Company’s banana enclave was in Santa Marta, Colombia (the export zone treated in García Márquez’s *One Hundred Years of Solitude*). In no way did the advent of the *bananera* signify a complete break with the past: the enclave’s boundaries were porous; the company had to function within a context of local social networks, practices, and meanings. LeGrand obliges us to think of enclaves as dynamic places with their own historical traditions—albeit traditions that undergo reconstruction during and after “the foreign time.”

Seth Fein conflates conventional notions of “cultural imperialism” and “cultural nationalism” in Cold War Mexico. He provides an analysis of the day-to-day collaboration between U.S. and Mexican cultural workers, specifically film crews doing rural extension work with Disney and other short films on proper citizenship and modern hygiene. The collaboration was so well integrated that it becomes difficult to determine where one state project began and the other ended.

Lauren Derby raises a number of ironies in her analysis of the uproar provoked in recent years in the Dominican Republic by so-called gringo chickens. This was the local term for poultry grown in high-yield factories by domestic entrepreneurs. Rumors circulated that these chickens were riddled with worms, caused AIDS, robbed men of their potency or turned them into homosexuals, and brought infertility to women. Derby suggests that the gringo chicken became a lightning rod for controversy because it symbolized the ambivalence of national identity on the island. It mediated the nexus between foreign and homegrown, between cash and patio crops, money and morality, the United States and the Dominican Republic. Originally from North America, the gringo chicken is white and eats imported feed; nevertheless, it lives on the island and is raised by Domini-

can producers. In effect, the controversial bird crystallizes a dilemma every *dominicano* faces today: namely, what is “Dominican” in a context in which the national has been so interpenetrated by the foreign over the last several hundred years? Derby asks: “Where does national identity reside when U.S. firms own and control great expanses of land, beach, and property on the island and, moreover, when almost as many Dominicans live in New York City as in their own capital?”

Thus, the essays in this volume showcase historical subjects and experiences either neglected or treated in truncated fashion in diffusionist and dependency formulations. They reveal that in addition to the formidable flows of financial capital, direct investment, commodity trade, technology transfer, and military power and assistance, other currents and individuals—acting (and being acted on) as cultural mediators rather than crude instruments—shaped a dynamic, multistranded encounter between Latin Americans and North Americans. The power relations attending such mediations may have been asymmetrical, but communication typically flowed both ways and often had unintended, paradoxical consequences.⁶⁴

Steven Palmer’s essay on the Rockefeller Foundation’s anti-hookworm mission in Costa Rica provides a rich example. Whatever imperial motives the foundation’s directors may have harbored, the Rockefeller mission ultimately strengthened and expanded the reach of the Costa Rican state and provided resources and methods that fomented a sense of nationalism among the rural populace. In a time of fiscal crisis, the personnel and funds of empire were redirected by some of Costa Rica’s leading anti-imperialist intellectuals to give a healthy boost to local initiatives in public health and public education, and to overwhelm oligarchical opposition to state-led reform.⁶⁵

The volume’s contributors also offer recent empirical research that examines the imperial aesthetic of explorers and visual artists (Poole); the cult of the airplane and other technological “spectacles” promoted by imperial impresarios and private diplomats without portfolio (Roorda and Topik); the intercultural mediations of filmmakers; and the introduction of “the movies” and other new patterns of leisure and consumption (Fein, Klubock, and Derby).⁶⁶ Each of these “flows” presented a distinct theater of interaction, a particular medium of communication, a variety of actors stating diverse sets of claims.⁶⁷ Mutual constructions (“othering”), borrowings, misunderstandings, and oppositions emerged from these interactions and were recorded under specific forms of representation.

Understanding these communications (and the gendered, racial, and class relations of power embedded in them) is a precondition for a recon-

ceptualization of the foreign-local encounter.⁶⁸ It is a task of interpretation that requires close readings and attention to both the details of engagement and the contingent textualities and visual regimes that convey them to us. Such an intellectual project obviously also entails a search for new sources as well as a reconsideration of more standard ones. In this spirit, the book's contributors have drawn on oral histories, folk traditions, travel accounts, works of literature and art, political cartoons, popular music and humor, photographic albums, recipe books, film archives, radio and television programs, and public monuments and architecture—in addition to institutional minutes and reports, criminal court cases, official and personal correspondence, and the mainstream and alternative press.

Much more, of course, remains to be done. Latin Americanists might benefit from recent attempts by Asianists to understand how local elites and subaltern groups internalize foreign influences.⁶⁹ Changes in cultural orientation and habits of consumption tell us a great deal about the cultural history of these groups' relationships to Europe and the United States. For example, what constituted the "Grand Tour" for Latino elites? When did New York, Washington, Los Angeles, and Miami begin to replace the great centers of Europe on their sons' and daughters' itineraries? What languages did elites insist their children learn from their tutors, and in what order—and when did that order change? What comparable shifts occurred in patterns of foreign schooling? Did a local education ever confer the same cultural capital? Did a "national pilgrimage" ever come to compete with an international one as a mark of civilization and cultural consumption? What art did local elites choose to hang on their walls; which foreign novels and works of poetry did they prefer (and demand to have translated by their publishing houses)? Indeed, each elite home was a kind of archaeological site in which things were acquired and displayed—such as tapestries, silver, china, furniture, and items of dress. In excavating these sites, we can track the cultural commitments, affiliations, and identities of elites, documenting foreign "cultural occupation" of "sovereign" national landscapes with far greater precision.

Similar "cultural digs" might be undertaken for middle-class intelligentsias, working classes, and peasantries. James Scott reports that the Malay village household is a rich archaeological site: one important index is the dramatic changes that have taken place over the last quarter century in the style of calendars that hang on each family's walls. Through labor and religious migrations, wars, and economic dislocations, Asian peasants may have become more mobile and cosmopolitan than elites. Their map of the world can be reconstructed through the calendars, photos, mimeo-

graphed prayer sheets, cassette tapes, items of clothing, modest bits of household crockery, and architectural styles that they bring back from their foreign travels and fashion into their cultural repertoires.⁷⁰ Given Latin America's similar structural position in the world economy, particularly its recent record of hemispheric migration, and given similar efforts by Latin American states to make such household changes "legible" — through refined property surveys, censuses, and tax lists — Scott's insights merit serious investigation by Latin Americanists.⁷¹

One useful window onto Latino migrants' encounter with El Norte over several generations is the Mexican genre of humble religious paintings known as *retablos* or *ex-votos*. Painted on small sheets of tin, these brightly colored offerings represent the fulfillment of promises to a holy image of Christ, the Virgin, or a Mexican saint who has interceded on a particular migrant's behalf at a critical or threatening moment. Retablos document the joys, successes, privations, sorrows, and devotions that are emblematic of a new transnational culture born of international movement. Frequently they are displayed in the church sanctuary taped or pinned to photographs, medical paraphernalia, diplomas, examination results, drivers' licenses, and copies of immigration credentials recently obtained in the United States.⁷²

Of course, the cultural venturesomeness of North American and other foreign travelers might also profitably be investigated in the realm of material culture. The "enormous vogue of things Mexican" among U.S. artists, intellectuals, and activists in the 1920s and 1930s, for example, played itself out on one level in a "discovery" of aspects of Mexico's "authentic" popular culture. Rustic and indigenous songs and dances, folk cuisine and handicrafts, the idiosyncratic murals painted on cantina walls, "primitive" retablos, children's art, and the evocative woodcuts of Mexican revolutionary artisan José Guadalupe Posada generated a powerful, romantic appeal among waves of "revolutionary tourists" disaffected with the excesses of U.S. capitalist society and modernity itself.⁷³ The new Mexican revolutionary state did what it could to promote these imperial desires, eager to perpetuate notions of a primordial, authentic, Mexican rural culture of which it was the legitimate custodian and beneficiary.⁷⁴

Seeking to understand the foreign-local encounter in the manner undertaken in this volume entails the risk of multiplying endlessly the types of agents/authors and practices involved, the kinds of statements uttered, and the forms of engagement (e.g., borrowing, negotiation, "offstage" resistance, lip service, overt confrontation, and so forth). (Suggestions for mitigating this problem will be discussed presently.)⁷⁵ The benefits of such an

approach, on the other hand, are to reposition “culture” (*integrated with political economy*) at the center of the foreign-local encounter, to improve our understanding of the workings of ideology and discourse in relation to power, and to produce a more diversified narrative of Latin American responses to the formidable structures and agencies of North American power. By examining the textual, visual, ritual, even theatrical dimensions of these engagements (see particularly the chapters by Poole, Topik, Roorda, LeGrand, and Derby),⁷⁶ we will be able to transcend the compartmentalized, structuralist views of inter-American relations often provided by scholars and policymakers.⁷⁷ Within the statements that narrate the multiple encounters of North Americans with their southern neighbors, we are likely to find arguments that connect the economic, political, social, and cultural imperatives of a given relation of power. Read with different underlying assumptions by different groups of “outsiders” and “insiders,” these statements figure importantly as raw materials in the construction of relations of domination, resistance, collaboration, and negotiation. They also figure in the creation of antagonistic, symbiotic, or merely incongruous hybrid identities.⁷⁸

A project such as ours faces at least three major challenges. First, there is the obvious need to locate these discrete encounters within a broader historical context of hemispheric and international affairs, state formation, and societal transformation.⁷⁹ Much as we might object to conceptualizing the foreign presence according to procrustean or teleological structural models, we must recognize that interactions between “outsiders” and “insiders” took place within boundaries shaped by the international system, capitalist expansion, and related sociopolitical phenomena (e.g., racial discrimination, sexual oppression, and authoritarian rule—or more hegemonic forms of the state).⁸⁰ In turn, such encounters shaped or reinforced larger structures and relationships. (A particularly good illustration of this is Fein’s pioneering essay on how mobile film units—representing both the United States Information Service and the Mexican PRI—participated in everyday forms of interstate formation during the Cold War.) Attentiveness to the production of subjectivities and ideologies within the micro contexts *and* macro constructs postulated by social science theorists—such as the factory system, “Fordism,” the rise of the multinational corporation and “mass consumer society,” and, more recently, the restructuring of economic conditions based on high technology in electronics and information (“post-Fordism”)⁸¹—should provide the basis for more nuanced periodizations of the history of U.S.–Latin American relations.⁸²

Second, even as we historicize and decenter the foreign-local encounter,

we must also trace out the broader patternings of power. What were the unifying elements in the vast array of statements about “us” and the “other”; about “America’s mission” on the one hand, and the duty of Latin Americans to defend “Nuestra América” on the other? In particular, we might inquire into the seeming “necessity” for North Americans, alternately, to intervene, survey, display, civilize, contain, reform, democratize, and integrate Latin America. Finding the common denominators encoded in the discourse of (and about) diplomats and “money doctors”;⁸³ soldiers and mercenaries;⁸⁴ businessmen;⁸⁵ advertisers and tourist promoters;⁸⁶ prison reformers;⁸⁷ architects and urban and rural planners;⁸⁸ world’s fair organizers;⁸⁹ geographers; anthropologists; eugenicists, scientists, and physicians;⁹⁰ foundation directors and philanthropists;⁹¹ missionaries;⁹² journalists;⁹³ and travelers and adventurers⁹⁴—the guiding cultural/ideological assumptions or imperatives—will refine our understanding of a critical substrate of “imperialism” and “dependency”: the arrangement of ways of perceiving, visualizing, speaking to, and disciplining the other that lies at the core of all these asymmetrical relationships.⁹⁵

Third, we need to connect these “cultural imperatives” with the process of social conflict generated by foreign-local encounters. Among other things, we need to know to what extent the resistance and intellectual and social renovation that emerged from these encounters served to transform or reinforce prevailing ideologies, strategies, and identities.⁹⁶ In a real sense, our project seeks a better cultural understanding of the contested processes of “development” and “modernity.” These processes are most often studied from the top down, by focusing on development and globalizing policies orchestrated in concert by foreign and domestic elites.⁹⁷ This volume also explores the historical capacity of popular political cultures to articulate challenges and frame alternative proposals to official modernizing schemes.⁹⁸ These challenges could resonate throughout the world system, not least locally in the construction of new, often empowering, collective identities, as the chapters by Findlay, Schroeder, LeGrand, Klubock, and Derby demonstrate. Here and elsewhere in this volume, a reassessment of U.S. power and presence in Latin America obliges us to endorse Gabriel García Márquez’s plea in his Nobel acceptance speech for a recognition of the region’s “outsized reality.”⁹⁹

Notes

Special thanks go to my coeditors, Catherine LeGrand and Ricardo Salvatore, and to Allen Wells, Seth Fein, Michael Hunt, Emily Rosenberg, Jürgen Buchenau, William Schell, Patricia Pessar, Eric Van Young, Eric Zolov, and Agustín Laó-Montos, for bibliographic suggestions, insights, and criticisms that substantially improved this text. I am also grateful to the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, whose fellowship supported the research and writing of this essay.

1. José Martí, *Inside the Monster: Writings on the United States and American Imperialism*, trans. Elinor Randall (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1975); idem, *Our America: Writings on Latin America and the Struggle for Cuban Independence*, trans. Elinor Randall (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1977); José Enrique Rodó, *Ariel*, trans. Margaret Sayers Peden (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1988); Pablo Neruda, *Canto general* (General song), trans. Jack Schmidt (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1991), esp. the selections “La United Fruit Co.” and “Los abogados del dólar” (The dollar’s lawyers); Miguel Angel Asturias’s “banana trilogy” (published in English by New York’s Delacorte Press; all volumes translated by Gregory Rabassa): *The Green Pope* (1971), *Strong Wind* (1968), and *The Eyes of the Interred* (1973); Carlos Fuentes, *The Death of Artemio Cruz*, trans. Alfred MacAdam (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1991); and Gabriel García Márquez, *One Hundred Years of Solitude*, trans. Gregory Rabassa (New York: Harper and Row, 1970). For a provocative discussion of García Márquez’s portrayal of the North American banana enclave in coastal Colombia, see LeGrand’s essay in this volume.

2. For example, Fidel invoked Jefferson, Thomas Paine, and the Founding Fathers in his now classic trial defense speech in 1953, *History Will Absolve Me*, bilingual ed. (New York: Center for Cuban Studies, n.d.), 63–64; Alma Guillermoprieto, “Mexico: The Watershed Years” (lecture presented at Yale University, New Haven, Conn., 20 Nov. 1996).

3. Witness, for example, Anna Thomas and Gregory Nava’s film “El Norte” (1983), which employs touches of magical realism to poignantly evoke the allure of the United States for two refugees fleeing the horrors of military repression in highland Guatemala. Also see Patricia R. Pessar, *A Visa for a Dream: Dominicans in the United States* (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1995). For an absorbing discussion of the tensions and contradictions generated in one U.S. city by these multiple realities and representations, see Alejandro Portes and Alex Stepick, *City on the Edge: The Transformation of Miami* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1993).

4. For a celebrated view of Latino ambivalence toward the United States, see Carlos Rangel, *Latin Americans: Their Love-Hate Relationship with the United States* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1977); cf. “U.S.-Mexico Wrangle: Closeness Breeds Friction,” *New York Times*, 5 May 1997, 1.

5. See, e.g., Mark T. Gilderhus, “Presidential Address. Founding Father:

Samuel Flagg Bemis and the Study of U.S.-Latin American Relations," *Diplomatic History* 21 (winter 1997): 1-13. The literature is vast: this introductory essay is necessarily rather selective and focuses on trends since the mid-1960s. For three useful, comprehensive surveys that approach the field from extremely different methodological (and ideological) positions and examine (mostly North American) scholarship and attitudes since the nineteenth century, see Fredrick B. Pike, *The United States and Latin America: Myths and Stereotypes of Civilization and Nature* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1992); Mark T. Berger, *Under Northern Eyes: Latin American Studies and U.S. Hegemony in the Americas, 1898-1990* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995); and James William Park, *Latin American Underdevelopment: A History of Perspectives in the United States, 1870-1965* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1995). Also see John J. Johnson, *Latin America in Caricature* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1980), for an exploration of more than a century (1860s to 1980) of hemispheric relations through political cartoons from leading U.S. periodicals; and George Black, *The Good Neighbor: How the United States Wrote the History of Central America and the Caribbean* (New York: Pantheon, 1988), another treasure trove of cartoon (and photographic) images that effectively punctuate the author's sardonic critique of U.S. imperialism. Two serviceable historiographical essays on U.S. relations with Latin America by diplomatic historians are Richard V. Salisbury, "Good Neighbors? The United States and Latin America in the Twentieth Century," in *American Foreign Relations: A Historiographical Review*, ed. Gerald K. Haines and J. Samuel Walker (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1981); and Mark T. Gilderhus, "An Emerging Synthesis? U.S.-Latin American Relations since the Second World War," in *America in the World: The Historiography of American Foreign Relations since 1941*, ed. Michael J. Hogan (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 424-61.

6. See, e.g., the special issue on "Liberalism's Revival and Latin American Studies" in *Latin American Perspectives*, 24, no. 1 (January 1997); and Michael Monteón, "'Oh, Mama, Is This the End?' Chilean History and the Dependency Perspective: A Reflection on the Current Literature" (paper presented at the University of California Latin American History Conference, Riverside, Feb. 1997). For the onslaught against dependency theory within the academy, see Stephen H. Haber's introductory chapter in *How Latin America Fell Behind: Essays on the Economic Histories of Brazil and Mexico*, ed. Stephen H. Haber (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1997), and his more strident review essay, "The Worst of Both Worlds: The New Cultural History of Mexico," *Mexican Studies* 13, no. 2 (summer 1997): 363-83.

7. Amid the confusion of "exploded paradigms" and the rejection of "metanarratives" and "foundationalist discourses," some scholars have wondered whether we have taken refuge in less theoretically adorned history. Does this reflect a receding faith in social science methodology or merely a shift in attention to more culturally relevant themes and methods—or a bit of both? Recent studies that

wrestle provocatively with these questions are Robert F. Berkhofer, *Beyond the Great Story: History as Text and Discourse* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, Belknap Press, 1995); Jay O'Brien and William Roseberry, eds., *Golden Ages, Dark Ages: Imagining the Past in Anthropology and History* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1991); and Frederick Cooper et al., *Confronting Historical Paradigms: Peasants, Labor, and the Capitalist World System in Africa and Latin America* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1993); also see Florencia E. Mallon, "The Promise and Dilemma of Subaltern Studies: Perspectives from Latin American History," *American Historical Review* 99 (Dec. 1995): 1491-515.

8. See, e.g., Frederick Cooper and Ann Stoler, eds., "Tensions of Empire," special issue of *American Ethnologist* 16 (1989); Cooper et al., *Confronting Historical Paradigms*; Hans Rogger, "Amerikanizm and the Economic Development of Russia," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 23 (July 1981): 382-420; Reinhold Wagnleitner, "The Irony of American Culture Abroad: Austria and the Cold War," in *Recasting America: Culture and Politics in the Age of the Cold War*, ed. Lary May (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989), 285-301; Wagnleitner, *The Coca-Colonization of the Cold War: The United States Cultural Mission in Austria after the Second World War* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1994); Richard Kuisel, *Seducing the French: The Dilemma of Americanization* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1993); and Rob Kroes, *If You've Seen One You've Seen the Mall: Europeans and American Mass Culture* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1996).

9. Among the pioneering works that have influenced contributors to this volume, see Mary Louise Pratt, *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation* (New York: Routledge, 1992); Amy Kaplan and Donald E. Pease, eds., *Cultures of United States Imperialism* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1993); Daniel Nugent, ed., *Rural Revolt in Mexico and U.S. Intervention*, rev. ed. (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1998); and the essays by Emily S. Rosenberg ("Walking the Borders") and Michael Hunt ("Ideology") in *Explaining the History of American Foreign Relations*, ed. Michael J. Hogan and Thomas G. Paterson (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991), much of which was originally published as "A Round Table: Explaining the History of American Foreign Relations," *Journal of American History* 77, no. 1 (June 1990): 93-180.

10. See, e.g., Gilbert M. Joseph and Daniel Nugent, eds., *Everyday Forms of State Formation: Revolution and the Negotiation of Rule in Modern Mexico* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1994); Fernando Coronil, *The Magical State: Nature, Money, and Modernity in Venezuela* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997); Enrique Dussel, "Eurocentrism and Modernity (Introduction to the Frankfurt Lectures)," *boundary 2* 20, no. 3 (1993): 65-76; and Arturo Escobar, *Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1995).

11. In addition to the essays in this volume and the works cited in nn. 7-10, see,

e.g., Charles S. Maier, "Marking Time: The Historiography of International Relations," in *The Past before Us: Contemporary Historical Writing in the United States*, ed. Michael Kammen (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1980), 355–87; Charles R. Lilley and Michael Hunt, "On Social History, the State, and Foreign Relations: Commentary on the Cosmopolitan Connection," *Diplomatic History* 11 (summer 1987): 246–50; Sally Marks, "The World According to Washington," *Diplomatic History* 11 (summer 1987): 265–82; Akira Iriye, "The Internationalization of History," *American Historical Review* 94 (Feb. 1989): 1–10; Cynthia Enloe, *Bananas, Beaches, and Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Politics* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1989); Rosemary Foot, "Where Are the Women? The Gender Dimension in the Study of International Relations," *Diplomatic History* 14 (fall 1990): 615–22; Michael Hunt, "Internationalizing U.S. Diplomatic History: A Practical Agenda," *Diplomatic History* 15 (winter 1991): 1–12; idem, "The Long Crisis in Diplomatic History: Coming to Closure," *Diplomatic History* 16 (winter 1992): 115–40; "Culture, Gender, and Foreign Policy: A Symposium," *Diplomatic History* 18 (winter 1994): 47–124 (esp. Emily Rosenberg's essay, "'Foreign Affairs' after World War II: Connecting Sexual and International Politics," 59–70, and Amy Kaplan's commentary, "Domesticating Foreign Policy," 97–105); Jürgen Buchenau, *In the Shadow of the Giant: The Making of Mexico's Central American Policy, 1876–1930* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1996); Kyle Longley, "Internationalizing the Teaching of United States Foreign Relations," *Perspectives* (American Historical Association Newsletter) 34 (Nov. 1996): 24–26, 30, 34; Lester D. Langley and Thomas Schoonover, *The Banana Men: American Mercenaries and Entrepreneurs in Central America, 1880–1930* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1995); Thomas F. O'Brien, *The Revolutionary Mission: American Enterprise in Latin America, 1900–1945* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996); Thomas Schoonover, "'The Big and the Small of It': Perspective in Latin American–U.S. Business Relations," *Diplomatic History*, forthcoming; James G. Crawford, "Cross-Cultural Encounter and Entanglement: U.S. Soldiers in Philippine Society, 1898–1902" (paper presented at the Latin American Studies Association Meeting, Atlanta, 1994); Jeffrey Stark, "Against Parsimony: Post-positivist International Relations Theory and the Redefinition of Security," manuscript (published in Portuguese in *Contexto Internacional* [Rio de Janeiro] 15, no. 1 [Jan.–June 1993]); Jim George, *Discourses of Global Politics: A Critical (Re)Introduction to International Relations* (Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner, 1994); Christine Sylvester, *Feminist Theory and International Relations in a Postmodern Era* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994); the special section edited by Craig N. Murphy and Cristina Rojas de Ferro on "The Power of Representation in International Political Economy," in *Review of International Political Economy* 2 (winter 1995): 63–183; and Roxanne Lynn Doty, *Imperial Encounters: The Politics of Representation in North-South Relations* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996). Also

see four papers presented at the Oct. 1995 Yale conference "Rethinking the Postcolonial Encounter": Louis A. Pérez, "The Invention of Identity: A Century of the Cuban–North American Encounter" (which provides the outline of a multi-volume project in progress); K. Lynn Stoner, "Beauty, National Identity, and the Cuban Representation of Self, 1910–1920"; Donna J. Guy, "The Pan American Child Congresses, 1916–1963: Forging Multiple Pan Americanisms, Genders, and Relations between Family and the State in Latin America"; and Francine Masiello, "Gender Traffic: Women, Culture, and Identity Politics in This Neoliberal Age." Finally, see Lester D. Langley, *America and the Americas: The United States in the Western Hemisphere* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1989), which inaugurated a series of volumes dedicated to providing a new, culturally informed history of inter-American relations: e.g., Brenda Gayle Plummer, *Haiti and the United States: The Psychological Moment* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1992). For demurrers to the new scholarly trends, see Stephen G. Rabe, "Marching Ahead (Slowly): The Historiography of Inter-American Relations," *Diplomatic History* 13 (summer 1989): 297–316; Alexander DeConde, "Essay and Reflection: On the Nature of International History," *International History Review* 10 (May 1988): 282–301; and the symposium on diplomatic history and international relations theory, in *International Security* 22, no. 1 (summer 1997): 5–85.

12. The Yale conference, "Rethinking the Postcolonial Encounter: Transnational Perspectives on the Foreign Presence in Latin America," which inspired the present volume, included several papers on British and German involvement in the region. Nevertheless, owing to space limitations and a desire to achieve greater coherence, this volume focuses explicitly on the United States's presence in Latin America. Two broadly conceived essays from the October 1995 conference that provide a useful comparative dimension are Friedrich Katz, "Germany and Latin America until 1945," and Alan Knight, "British Imperialism in Latin America."

13. Marvin Lunenfeld, *1492: Discovery, Invasion, Encounter: Sources and Interpretations* (Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath and Company, 1991), esp. xv–xvii.

14. Cf. the lively forum of commentary and debate (mostly among "new diplomatic historians") on "Imperialism: A Useful Category of Analysis?" in the *Radical History Review* 57 (fall 1993): 1–84. The contributions by Marilyn B. Young (33–37), Linda Carty (38–45), Prasnegit Duara (60–64), and Emily Rosenberg (82–84) most closely approximate the nonreductionist, culturally informed perspective on imperialism represented in this volume.

15. Pratt, *Imperial Eyes*, esp. 6–7, and "Arts of the Contact Zone," *Profession* 91 (1991): 33–39.

16. Thus, Samuel Flagg Bemis, the dean of an earlier generation of realist diplomatic historians, devoted a chapter of his popular textbook, *A Diplomatic History of the United States*, 5th ed. (1936; New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1965), 463–75, to "The Great Aberration of 1898." For Bemis, imperialism represented nothing more than "adolescent irresponsibility" (475); "historically ill-fitting,"

it would be “purged” long before the era of the Good Neighbor policy (Bemis, *The Latin-American Policy of the United States: An Historical Interpretation* [1943; New York: Norton, 1967], 356).

17. The classic “realist” statement is found in George F. Kennan, *American Diplomacy, 1900–1950* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951); for further discussion of “realism”/“postrevisionism” and its legacy, see Norman A. Graebner, *America as a World Power: A Realist Appraisal from Wilson to Reagan* (Wilmington, Del.: Scholarly Resources, 1984); Hogan and Paterson, *Explaining the History of American Foreign Relations*, esp. Stephen Pelz’s and Melvyn Leffler’s respective essays on “Balance of Power” and “National Security”; Hogan, *America in the World*, esp. the essays and commentaries by Hogan, Leffler, Bruce Cumings, and Michael Hunt in pt. 1; Seth Fein, “Hollywood and United States–Mexico Relations in the Golden Age of Mexican Cinema” (Ph.D. diss., University of Texas at Austin, 1996), chap. 1; and Emily Rosenberg’s contribution to this volume. For the cultural studies critique quoted here, see Amy Kaplan, “‘Left Alone with America’: The Absence of Empire in the Study of American Culture,” in Kaplan and Pease, *Cultures of United States Imperialism*, 3–21 (quotations, 13). On the enduring grip of “American exceptionalism,” see Ian Tyrell, “American Exceptionalism in an Age of International History,” *American Historical Review* 96 (Oct. 1991): 1031–55; for strategies to overcome it in the classroom, see Carl J. Guarneri, “Out of Its Shell: Internationalizing the Teaching of United States History,” *Perspectives* 35 (Feb. 1997): 1, 5–8.

18. E. J. Hobsbawm, for example, observes that while “colonial possessions have not been a significant element in [U.S. imperialism], . . . unlike the British who abandoned political and military interventions in the ‘informal’ empire (e.g., Latin America in the nineteenth century), the U.S. since the nineteenth century has combined ‘informal’ hegemony with political control or at least the exclusion of rivals, and when necessary a military presence: first in the Caribbean area, then in the Pacific, and after 1945 worldwide” (Hobsbawm, “Addressing the Questions,” *Radical History Review* 57 [fall 1993]: 73–75 [quotation, 73]). Cf. Peter H. Smith, *Talons of the Eagle: Dynamics of U.S.–Latin American Relations* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), esp. 7–9; and Marilyn B. Young, “Ne Plus Ultra Imperialism,” *Radical History Review* 57 (fall 1993): 33–37, which repeats the rhetorical question first posed by William Appleman Williams in 1980: “Can you even imagine America as not an empire?” (36).

19. For example, see Robert W. Tucker, *Nation or Empire? The Debate over American Foreign Policy* (Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1968).

20. Bruce Cumings, “Global Realm with No Limit, Global Realm with No Name,” *Radical History Review* 57 (fall 1993): 46–59 (quotation, 47).

21. Kaplan, “Left Alone with America,” 11; cf. Donald E. Pease, “New Perspectives on U.S. Culture and Imperialism,” in the same volume, 22–37; Cumings, “Global Realm with No Limit,” and idem, “Revising Postrevisionism, or, The Poverty of Theory in Diplomatic History,” in Hogan, *America in the World*, 20–

62. For striking recent examples of such academic denial, see John Lewis Gaddis, *The Long Peace: Inquiries into the History of the Cold War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987); and Tony Smith, *America's Mission: The United States and the Worldwide Struggle for Democracy in the Twentieth Century* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press/Twentieth Century Fund, 1994). Cf. Gaddis's earlier receptivity to the notion of "U.S. imperialism," in the atmosphere that followed the Vietnam War: see "The Emerging Post-revisionist Synthesis on the Origins of the Cold War," *Diplomatic History* 7 (summer 1983): 171–90. In a more recent statement, his 1992 presidential address to the Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations, Gaddis granted that the United States had practiced hegemony and empire during the Cold War, but contrasted America's "open and relaxed form of hegemony" and "empire of invitation" with the Soviet Union's closed and repressive imperialism ("The Tragedy of Cold War History," *Diplomatic History* 17 [winter 1993]: 1–16 [quotations, 3–4]).

22. The classic statements of "revisionism" are William Appleman Williams, "The Frontier Thesis and American Foreign Policy," *Pacific Historical Review* 24 (Nov. 1955): 379–95; and idem, *The Tragedy of American Diplomacy*, 2d rev. and enlarged ed. (1959; New York: Dell, 1972). For a discussion of the long-running debates between revisionists and their realist and postrevisionist critics, see Paul M. Buhle and Edward Rice-Maximin, *William Appleman Williams: The Tragedy of Empire* (New York: Routledge, 1995); and Cumings, "Revising Post-revisionism." For one revisionist's swipe at cultural studies, see Bruce Kuklick, "Confessions of an Intransigent Revisionist about Cultural Studies," *Diplomatic History* 18 (winter 1994): 121–24.

23. Kaplan, "'Left Alone with America,'" 13–14.

24. William Appleman Williams, *Empire as a Way of Life: An Essay on the Causes and Character of America's Present Predicament along with a Few Thoughts about an Alternative* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980).

25. Kaplan, "'Left Alone with America,'" 14. It should be noted that in the late 1970s and 1980s, diplomatic historians began to contribute works on the cultural dimensions of U.S. foreign relations: e.g., see Emily S. Rosenberg, *Spreading the American Dream: American Economic and Cultural Expansion, 1890–1945* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1982); Frank A. Ninkovich, *The Diplomacy of Ideas: U.S. Foreign Policy and Cultural Relations, 1938–1950* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981); Frank Costigliola, *Awkward Dominion: American Political, Economic, and Cultural Relations with Europe, 1919–1933* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1984); J. Manuel Espinosa, *Inter-American Beginnings of U.S. Cultural Diplomacy, 1936–1948* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of State, 1976); Gerald K. Haines, "Under the Eagle's Wing: The Franklin Roosevelt Administration Forges an American Hemisphere," *Diplomatic History* 1 (fall 1977): 373–88; and idem, *The Americanization of Brazil: A Study of U.S. Cold War Diplomacy in the Third World, 1945–1954* (Wilmington, Del.: Scholarly Resources, 1989); cf. the agenda advanced in Kinley Brauer, "The Great American Desert

Revisited: Recent Literature and Prospects for the Study of American Foreign Relations, 1815–61,” *Diplomatic History* 13 (summer 1989): 395–417. Nevertheless, although these writers expanded the scholarly agenda by focusing on the distribution of U.S. ideas, images, propaganda, and forms of entertainment, they tended to treat culture as a form of foreign policy, and to examine the manner in which diplomacy abetted the commercial and ideological penetration of American culture abroad. Such studies “presupposed the Americanization of the world (i.e., American culture simply by its presence in another country had an impact). They neither examined the quality of impact nor its limits and unintended consequences. These shortcomings were implicit in the focus of this type of work on U.S. policy rather than the reception—in political and economic or sociocultural terms—in the host nations and societies. . . . [Such studies] tended to focus only on the U.S. government’s role in promoting distribution rather than [on] the media [themselves]; they ignored questions of . . . representation. . . . Such studies broadened the range of issues studied by diplomatic history more than they deepened its conceptualization.” Fein, “Hollywood and United States–Mexico Relations,” 7; cf. Claudio González-Chiaramonte, “American Cultural Diplomacy, Argentine Nationalism, and the Quest for a New Inter-American Community of Scholars” (paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Historical Association, New York, 1997).

26. The classic text on such practices is Edward W. Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Viking Books, 1978); see Nicholas Thomas, *Colonialism’s Culture: Anthropology, Travel, and Government* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1994), for a review of the prodigious discussion Said’s book triggered. For valuable treatments of “othering” in different regional contexts, see Kelvin Santiago-Valles, *“Subject People” and Colonial Discourses: Economic Transformation and Social Disorder in Puerto Rico, 1898–1947* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1994); Richard Drinnon, *Facing West: The Metaphysics of Indian Hating and Empire-Building* (New York: New American Library, 1980); John Dower, *War without Mercy: Race and Power in the Pacific War* (New York: Pantheon, 1986); Henry Louis Gates Jr., ed., *“Race,” Writing, and Difference* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986); Catherine A. Lutz and Jane L. Collins, *Reading National Geographic* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993); and Matthew Jacobson, *Barbarian Virtues: The United States Confronts Foreign Powers and Peoples, 1876–1914* (New York: Hill and Wang, forthcoming).

27. Pratt, *Imperial Eyes*, 7; cf. anthropologists Martha Kaplan and John Kelly’s notion of colonial “zones of transcourse,” where contending discourses operate within a “dialogic space.” “Rethinking Resistance: Dialogics of ‘Disaffection’ in Colonial Fiji,” *American Ethnologist* 21 (Feb. 1994): 123–51; also see Benjamin Orlove, “Mapping Reeds and Reading Maps: The Politics of Representation in Lake Titicaca,” *American Ethnologist* 18 (Feb. 1991): 3–38. All of these studies effectively shed light on the complex mixture of cultural dynamics in situations of power, particularly in imperial and colonial contexts.

28. William Roseberry, *Anthropologies and Histories: Essays in Culture, History, and Political Economy* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1989), 42.

29. Cf. the similar formulations of culture in Gilbert M. Joseph and Daniel Nugent, "Popular Culture and State Formation in Revolutionary Mexico," in Joseph and Nugent, *Everyday Forms of State Formation*, 3–23; Néstor García Canclini, "Culture and Power: The State of Research," *Media, Culture, and Society* 10 (1988): 467–97; Stuart Hall, "Notes on Deconstructing 'The Popular,'" in *People's History and Socialist Theory*, ed. Raphael Samuel (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1981), 227–40; and David A. Whisnant, *Rascally Signs in Sacred Places: The Politics of Culture in Nicaragua* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1995), esp. chap. 1.

30. The reader will note that many of the contributors to this volume are leery of using terms such as *postcolonial*, *postcoloniality*, or *postcolonial encounter*. This is not because they object to the decentering of history; the emphasis on hybrid, transnational identities; or the critique of teleological models and linear time that postcolonial theory espouses. On the contrary, many of the essays reflect just these sensibilities. Nevertheless, they also appreciate the pitfalls attending the use of such terms to indicate anything more than the period following Spanish or Portuguese imperial rule. References to "the postcolonial," in Anne McClintock's words, "may too readily license a panoptic tendency to view the globe through generic abstractions void of . . . nuance." Moreover, "the historical rupture suggested by the prefix post- belies both the continuities and discontinuities of power that have shaped the legacies of the formal European . . . empires." Important political and ideological differences *between* and *within* societies are elided, subordinated to their temporal distance from European colonialism. (Regarding these differences, see Stern's essay in this volume.) Finally, such terms are prematurely celebratory: when we consider the manner in which the region now confronts the colonizing of its markets, media, and cultures under the New World Order—see the chapters by Klubock and Derby—there may be little "post" about colonialism! For all these reasons, most contributors use the more neutral designation *foreign-local encounter*. For useful discussions of the relevance of these terms, see McClintock, *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender, and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest* (New York: Routledge, 1995), 8–17 (quotations, 11–12); J. Jorge Klor de Alva, "The Postcolonization of the (Latin) American Experience: A Reconsideration of 'Colonialism,' 'Postcolonialism,' and 'Mestizaje,'" in *After Colonialism: Imperial Histories and Postcolonial Displacements*, ed. Gyan Prakash (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1995); Mark Thurner, "Historicizing 'the Postcolonial' from Nineteenth-Century Peru," *Journal of Historical Sociology* 9 (Mar. 1996): 1–18; idem, *From Two Republics to One Divided: Contradictions of Postcolonial Nationmaking in Andean Peru* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1997); and John McClure and Amir Mufti, eds., "Postcolonialism and the Third World," special double issue of *Social Text* 10, nos. 2–3 (1992). For a similar interrogation of "postimperialism," see Young, "Ne Plus Ultra Imperialism," esp.

35; and Linda Carty, "Imperialism: Historical Periodization or Present-Day Phenomenon," *Radical History Review* 57 (fall 1993): 38–45.

31. This section, particularly the critique of dependency thought, owes much to discussions with coeditor Ricardo Salvatore.

32. See, particularly, Peter Klarén and Thomas Bossert, eds., *Promise of Development: Theories of Change in Latin America* (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1986); Cristóbal Kay, *Latin American Theories of Development and Underdevelopment* (London: Routledge, 1989); Cooper et al., *Confronting Historical Paradigms*, esp. the introductory and concluding essays by Steve Stern and Florencia Mallon, respectively; and Stern's and Roseberry's chapters in this volume.

33. Regarding the model's persistence, it is instructive to compare the fundamental similarity of such recent political-economic initiatives as the Alliance for Progress (1960s), the Caribbean Basin Initiative (1980s), and the current North American Free Trade Agreement—which itself has prompted comparisons with Mexico's first great moment of export-led growth during the long regime of Porfirio Díaz (1876–1911). In a recent, award-winning book, anthropologist Arturo Escobar examines the persistence and naturalization of the model and the powerful mechanisms of control that the "development apparatus" has generated. See Escobar, *Encountering Development*; for an equally stimulating deconstruction of the model on the ground in southern Africa, see James Ferguson, *The Anti-Politics Machine: "Development," Depoliticization, and Bureaucratic Power in Lesotho* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990). For an iconoclastic Marxian critique of such statements of "non-development" that also provides a useful archaeology and genealogy of development from the early nineteenth century on, see M. P. Cowen and R. W. Shenton, *Doctrines of Development* (New York: Routledge, 1996).

34. For classic statements of the diffusionist model, see W. A. Lewis, *The Theory of Economic Growth* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1955); W. W. Rostow, *The Stages of Economic Growth* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1960); and Cyril Black, *The Dynamics of Modernization* (New York: Harper and Row, 1966). For influential Latin American applications, see Seymour Martin Lipset and Aldo Solari, eds., *Elites in Latin America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1967); Jacques Lambert, *Latin America: Social Structure and Political Institutions* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1967); Richard Graham, *Britain and the Onset of Modernization in Brazil* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968); Charles Cumberland, *Mexico: The Struggle for Modernity* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1968); Lawrence Harrison, *Underdevelopment Is a State of Mind: The Latin American Case* (Cambridge, Mass.: Center for International Affairs/University Press of America, 1985); and idem, *The Pan American Dream: Do Latin America's Cultural Values Discourage True Partnership with the United States and Canada?* (New York: Basic Books, 1997). For overviews of the model, see Robert A. Packenham, *Liberal America and the Third World: Political Development Ideas in Foreign Aid and Social Science* (Princeton,

N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1973); and Berger's far more critical account in *Under Northern Eyes*, chaps. 2–3.

35. See, e.g., S. N. Eisenstadt, "Social Change and Development," in *Readings in Social Evolution and Development*, ed. Eisenstadt (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1973); idem, *Tradition, Change, and Modernity* (New York: Wiley, 1973); and idem, "Functional Analysis in Anthropology and Sociology: An Interpretive Essay," *Annual Review of Anthropology* 19 (1990): 243–60; cf. the discussion of "later modernization theory" in Ted C. Lewellen, *Dependency and Development: An Introduction to the Third World* (Westport, Conn.: Bergin and Harvey, 1995), 54–59, 67–69. For a recent, nuanced application by a Latin Americanist of modernization concepts, one that eschews Rostow's imitative "stages of growth" theory, see Jonathan Brown, *Oil and Revolution in Mexico* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1993).

36. Although I generalize broadly about these dissident paradigms to distinguish them from the more culturally oriented approaches represented in this volume, it is important to note that many of the contributors—myself included—cut their teeth on dependency and world-system perspectives, and their current work developed in dialogue and debate with them. For detailed discussions of these paradigms that examine competing currents within and reverberations among them, see Charles Bergquist, ed., *Alternative Approaches to the Problem of Development: A Selected and Annotated Bibliography* (Durham, N.C.: Carolina Academic Press, 1979); John Taylor, *From Modernization to Modes of Production* (New York: Macmillan, 1979); Vincent A. Mahler, *Dependency Approaches to International Political Economy: A Cross-National Study* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1980); Magnus Blomstrom and Bjorn Hettne, *Development Theory in Transition, the Dependency Debate, and Beyond: Third World Responses* (London: Zed Books, 1984); William B. Taylor, "Between Global Process and Local Knowledge: An Inquiry into Early Latin American Social History, 1500–1900," in *Reliving the Past: The Worlds of Social History*, ed. Olivier Zunz (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1985), 115–90; Klarén and Bossert, *Promise of Development*; Steve J. Stern, "Feudalism, Capitalism, and the World-System in the Perspective of Latin America and the Caribbean," *American Historical Review* 93 (Oct. 1988): 829–72; Kay, *Latin American Theories of Development*; Thomas J. McCormick's chapter on "World Systems" in Hogan and Paterson, *Explaining the History of American Foreign Relations*; Robert A. Packenham's biting, anti-Marxist critique, *The Dependency Movement: Scholarship and Politics in Development Studies* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992); Cooper et al., *Confronting Historical Paradigms*; Lewellen, *Dependency and Development*; Patrick Wolfe, "History and Imperialism: A Century of Theory, from Marx to Postcolonialism," *American Historical Review* 102, no. 2 (April 1997): 388–420, esp. 393–99; and Monteón, "'Oh, Mama, Is This the End?'" Particularly good antidotes to the reification of dependency theory and political-economy approaches are found in Fein, "Hollywood and United States–Mexico Relations,"

chap. 1; Coronil, *The Magical State*, esp. chap. 2; and Roseberry's essay in this volume.

37. Such assessments have been legion: see, e.g., Mahler, *Dependency Approaches*, esp. 114, 167; José Nun, "Democracy and Modernization, Thirty Years After" (paper presented at the plenary session on "Democratic Theory Today: Empirical and Theoretical Issues," Fifteenth World Congress of the International Political Science Association, Buenos Aires, 1991); Saskia Sassen, *The Global City* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1991); Arturo Escobar and Sonia Alvarez, eds., *The Making of Social Movements in Latin America: Identity, Strategy, and Democracy* (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1992); Nancy Scheper-Hughes, *Death without Weeping: The Violence of Everyday Life in Brazil* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1992); Stark, "Against Parsimony"; David Slater, ed., "Social Movements and Political Change in Latin America": Special Issues of *Latin American Perspectives* 21, nos. 2-3 (1994); Jorge A. Lawton, ed., *Privatization amidst Poverty* (Coral Gables, Fla.: University of Miami North-South Center Books, 1995); James L. Dietz, ed., *Latin America's Economic Development: Confronting Crisis*, 2d ed. (Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner, 1995); Michael E. Conroy et al., *A Cautionary Tale: Failed U.S. Development Policy in Central America* (Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner, 1996); Paul Farmer, "Hiding Structural Violence in Agrarian Societies: The Case of Haiti" (paper presented in the Agrarian Studies Seminar, Yale University, New Haven, Conn., Dec. 1996); and Richard Tardanico and Rafael Menjívar, eds., *Global Restructuring, Employment, and Social Inequality in Urban Latin America* (Coral Gables, Fla.: University of Miami North-South Center Books, 1997). In a recent, influential paper presented to the MacArthur Foundation/Interamerican Development Bank Conference on "Inequality Reducing Growth in Latin America's Market Economies," Carol Graham and Moisés Naim observed that amid the success of macroeconomic stabilization and market expansion, "There has been a 'rediscovery' of underdevelopment . . . a realization that something is 'missing' " (Graham and Naim, "The Political Economy of Institutional Reform in Latin America," manuscript, Jan. 1997).

38. Hence Escobar's critique in *Encountering Development* that even the most bitter *dependentista* critics of diffusionism have become prisoners of the naturalized categories generated by the development apparatus—not least the central priority of "development" in the so-called Third World. For a supporting argument regarding the staying power of liberal developmentalist discourses within the North American academy, see Berger, *Under Northern Eyes*; and Cumings, "Global Realm with No Limit."

39. See, e.g., Paul Baran, *The Political Economy of Growth* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1957); Robert Rhodes, ed., *Imperialism and Underdevelopment: A Reader* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1970); James Cockcroft et al., eds., *Dependency and Underdevelopment: Latin America's Political Economy* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1972), pt. 1; James Petras, "Chile," in *Latin America: The*

Struggle with Dependency and Beyond, ed. Ronald Chilcote and Joel Edelstein (New York: John Wiley, 1974), 495–578; and Walter LeFeber, *Inevitable Revolutions: The United States in Central America* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1984); for a more recent application by a Latin Americanist, see John Mason Hart, *Revolutionary Mexico: The Coming and Process of the Mexican Revolution* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1987). Also see a series of recent works by James Petras and Morris Morley that evolves a theory of the “imperial state” in an increasingly “internationalized” world order. These authors highlight the U.S. state’s long-running commitment to the maintenance of hemispheric and global systems that support the interests of an increasingly well-integrated, international capitalist class. They question the usefulness of work that raises notions of the limited autonomy of the U.S. state from transnational capital, and they regard political (and cultural) phenomena as dependent variables and “short-term” factors. See, e.g., James Petras and Morris Morley, *U.S. Hegemony under Siege: Class, Politics, and Development in Latin America* (London: Verso, 1990); and *Latin America in the Time of Cholera: Electoral Politics, Market Economics, and Permanent Crisis* (London: Routledge, 1992); “The U.S. Imperial State,” *Review* (Fernand Braudel Center), 4, no. 2 (1990); and Berger, *Under Northern Eyes*, which is heavily influenced by the theory.

40. In a recent communication, Ricardo Salvatore points out that frequent depictions of dependency as a “deep,” “penetrating” reality call attention to “a language of sexual domination” that pervades its texts. For dependentistas, “Dispossession had effeminating effects on local producers; they became subservient to foreign capitalists. Those governments who resisted adopted manly postures. . . . Those who did not, acted in a womanly fashion, ‘giving themselves to’ (*entregándose*) foreign capital. ‘Comprador’ bourgeoisies were ‘inviting’ of foreign capital, their ‘courtship’ of foreigners revealed their inability to perform the manly task of autonomous industrialization. Titles like *The Rape of the Peasantry* speak clearly of the rooting of dependency theory in sexual language.” Of course, the image of penetration also characterized the diffusionist paradigm as well. For a recent study that explores the influence of social constructions of gender in notions of development, see Catherine V. Scott, *Gender and Development: Rethinking Modernization and Dependency Theory* (Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner, 1996).

41. See, e.g., Andre Gunder Frank, *Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1967); Celso Furtado, *Economic Development of Latin America: Historical Background and Contemporary Problems* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1970); Theotonio Dos Santos, “The Structure of Dependence,” in *Readings in U.S. Imperialism*, ed. K. T. Fann and Donald C. Hodges (Boston: Porter Sargent, 1971), 225–36; Cockcroft et al., *Dependency and Underdevelopment*; Chilcote and Edelstein, *The Struggle with Dependency*; Fernando Henrique Cardoso and Enzo Faletto, *Dependencia y desarrollo en América Latina* (Mexico City: Siglo Veintiuno, 1971); idem, *Dependency and Development in Latin America*, rev. ed. (Berkeley and Los Angeles: Uni-

versity of California Press, 1979); Cardoso, "The Consumption of Dependency Theory in the United States," *Latin American Research Review* 12 (fall 1977): 7–24; Immanuel Wallerstein, *The Capitalist World-Economy* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1979); idem, *The Politics of the World-Economy: The States, the Movements, and the Civilizations* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1984); and idem, *The Modern World-System III: The Second Era of Great Expansion of the Capitalist World-Economy, 1730–1840s* (New York: Academic Press, 1989). For a recent application of dependency theory to Mexico, see Ramón Eduardo Ruiz, *The People of Sonora and Yankee Capitalists* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1988); for the application of world-systems theory to Central America, see Thomas D. Schoonover, *The United States in Central America, 1860–1911: Episodes of Social Imperialism and Imperial Rivalry in the World System* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1991).

42. Albert Hirschman characterized this elite discourse when he wrote about "the age of self-incrimination" (c. 1820s to World War I). See "Ideologies of Economic Development in Latin America," in *Latin American Issues: Essays and Comments*, ed. Albert O. Hirschman (New York: Twentieth Century Fund, 1961), 4–9.

43. See Albert O. Hirschman, *The Passions and the Interests: Political Arguments for Capitalism before Its Triumph* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1977), pt. 1. For an antidote to models that focus exclusively on economic interest to the exclusion of passion and the aesthetic "pleasures of empire" that also underwrite (and subtly legitimate) imperial power, see Edward W. Said, *Culture and Imperialism* (New York: Knopf, 1993); Pike, *The United States and Latin America*; Helen Delpar, *The Enormous Vogue of Things Mexican: Cultural Relations between the United States and Mexico, 1921–1935* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1992); and Poole's essay in this volume.

44. But cf. the work by "later dependency theorists" Fernando Henrique Cardoso and Peter Evans, which argues for a somewhat expanded horizon of development under capitalism in Brazil. See, e.g., Cardoso, "Associated-Dependent Development: Theoretical and Practical Implications," in *Authoritarian Brazil: Origins, Policies, and Future*, ed. Alfred Stepan (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press), 142–76; and Peter Evans, *Dependent Development: The Alliance of Multinational, State, and Local Capital in Brazil* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1979).

45. Cf. Irving Louis Horowitz, *The Rise and Fall of Project Camelot: Studies in the Relationship between Social Science and Practical Politics* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1967); and Sigmund Diamond, *Compromised Campus: The Collaboration of Universities with the Intelligence Community, 1945–1955* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992).

46. This "Declaration of Latin American Economists" and coverage of the 1965 conference is found in Cockcroft et al., *Dependency and Underdevelopment*,

chap. 11; cf. González-Chiaramonte, "American Cultural Diplomacy, Argentine Nationalism."

47. Cf. the critique found in the collection edited by Anthony King, *Culture, Globalization, and the World-System* (Binghamton: Department of Art and Art History, State University of New York, 1991).

48. See, e.g., Ariel Dorfman and Armand Mattelart, *Para leer al Pato Donald* (Valparaíso: Ediciones Universitarias, 1971); English ed.: *How to Read Donald Duck: Imperialist Ideology in the Disney Comic*, trans. David Kunzle (New York: International General, 1975); Julianne Burton, "Don (Juanito) Duck and the Imperial-Patriarchal Unconscious: Disney Studios, the Good Neighbor Policy, and the Packaging of Latin America," in *Nationalisms and Sexualities*, ed. Andrew Parker et al. (New York: Routledge, 1992), 21–41; the retrospective critique in Eric Smoodin, ed., *Disney Discourse: Producing the Magic Kingdom* (New York: Routledge, 1994); and Charles Bergquist, *Labor and the Course of American Democracy: U.S. History in Latin American Perspective* (London: Verso, 1996), chap. 4; and the more general theoretical statement in John Tomlinson, *Cultural Imperialism: A Critical Introduction* (Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991). Compare the chapters by Fein and Derby in this volume; Fein, "Hollywood and United States–Mexico Relations"; and Roseberry, *Anthropologies and Histories*, chap. 4, for a more culturally compelling treatment of "Americanization in the Americas." Also note the evolution of cultural analysis in Immanuel Wallerstein's most recent writings: e.g., "Culture as the Ideological Battleground of the Modern World-System," in *Global Culture: Nationalism, Globalization, and Modernity*, ed. Mike Featherstone (London: Sage Publications, 1990), 31–55; and *Geopolitics and Geocultures: The Changing World-System* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991).

49. Cf. Fernando Coronil, "Beyond Occidentalism: Toward Nonimperial Geohistorical Categories," *Cultural Anthropology* 11 (Feb. 1996): 51–87.

50. For incisive analyses of such discourses, see McClintock, *Imperial Leather*; Doreen Massey, *Space, Place, and Gender* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994); Doty, *Imperial Encounters*; Wolfe, "History and Imperialism."

51. Cf. the forum in *Radical History Review* 57 (fall 1993), in which some contributors seek to integrate "the triptych of race-gender-class" into studies of imperialism. See especially the introduction by Van Gosse (4–6) and the commentaries by Cumings (46–59), Duara (60–64), Hobsbawm (73–75), and Rosenberg (82–83). Also see Albert Hirschman's *Propensity to Self-Subversion* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1995) for an illuminating discussion of how the combination of recent events and new theoretical insights enable a scholar to re-think and build on what he or she has written earlier.

52. Cardoso and Faletto, *Dependency and Development*, xvi; also see Cardoso, "The Consumption of Dependency Theory," 13.

53. The quotation is taken from Roseberry's essay in this volume. Two depen-

dency-oriented monographs that “internalize the external” with great explanatory power are Charles Bergquist, *Coffee and Conflict in Colombia, 1886–1910*, rev. ed. (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1986); and Allen Wells, *Yucatán’s Gilded Age: Haciendas, Henequen, and International Harvester, 1860–1915* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1985).

54. Cardoso and Faletto, *Dependency and Development*, xviii.

55. By putting *insiders* and *outsiders* in quotation marks, we mean to problematize these terms, questioning the dichotomous, bounded notions associated with them.

56. See, e.g., Gregg Andrews, *Shoulder to Shoulder? The American Federation of Labor, the United States, and the Mexican Revolution, 1910–1924* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1991); O’Brien, *The Revolutionary Mission*; and Gilbert M. Joseph and Allen Wells, “Corporate Control of a Monocrop Economy: International Harvester and Yucatán’s Henequen Industry during the Porfiriato,” *Latin American Research Review* 17, no. 1 (1982): 69–99.

57. William Schell, “Integral Outsiders, Mexico City’s American Colony, 1876–1911: Society and Political-Economy in Porfirian Mexico” (Ph.D. diss., University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1992); cf. Jürgen Buchenau, “Not Quite Mexican and Not Quite German: The Boker Family in Mexico” (paper presented at “Rethinking the Postcolonial Encounter”); and see “Americans in Haiti Fear an Invasion,” *New York Times*, 30 July 1994, 3, for a treatment of expatriate attitudes in an explosive contemporary situation.

58. Paco Ignacio Taibo II, *Four Hands*, trans. Laura Dail (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1994); Mauricio Tenorio-Trillo, “Viejos gringos: Radicales norteamericanos en los años treinta y su visión de México,” *Secuencia* 21 (Sept.–Dec. 1991): 95–116; idem, “A Gringa Vieja in Mexico: Ella Wolfe” (paper presented at “Rethinking the Postcolonial Encounter”).

59. Christian Smith, *Resisting Reagan: The U.S. Central American Peace Movement* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996); cf. Susan Bibler Coutin, *The Culture of Protest: Religious Activism and the U.S. Sanctuary Movement* (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1993), for a similar account of “border crossings” between first and third worlds that developed international notions of citizenship and ecumenical interpretations of faith.

60. The now classic “billiard ball” metaphor comes from Eric Wolf’s *Europe and the People without History* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1982); it is central to Roseberry’s analysis in “Americanization in the Americas” (see esp. 85ff). For conceptualizations of “transculturation” that are extremely relevant to the essays in this volume, see Pratt, *Imperial Eyes*; and Fernando Coronil’s introduction to *Cuban Counterpoint*, by Fernando Ortiz (1940; Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1995), ix–lvi. Sadly, “billiard ball” notions of cultural contact still weigh heavily in policy-making circles. Witness political scientist Samuel P. Huntington’s clumsy understanding of cultural engagement in

his recent, disturbing salvo in the "culture wars," *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1996).

61. Sherry B. Ortner, "Resistance and the Problem of Ethnographic Refusal," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 37 (Jan. 1995): 173–93 (quotation, 176); also see Arjun Appadurai, "Global Ethnoscapes: Notes and Queries for a Transnational Anthropology," in *Recapturing Anthropology: Working in the Present*, ed. Richard G. Fox (Santa Fe, N.M.: School of American Research Press, 1991), 191–210; John Borneman, "American Anthropology as Foreign Policy," *American Anthropologist* 97 (Dec. 1995): 663–72, esp. 669; Akhil Gupta and James Ferguson, "Beyond 'Culture': Space, Identity, and the Politics of Difference," *Cultural Anthropology* 7, no. 1 (Feb. 1992): 6–23; and Joseph and Nugent, "Popular Culture and State Formation," 3–23, esp. 15–18.

62. Massey, *Space, Place, and Gender*, 8. Massey's work is representative of a "new regional geography" that focuses on the "identities of place." These identities "are always unfixed, contested and multiple." Places are "open and porous" and social relations stretch beyond the place itself: "the global [is] part of what constitutes the local, the outside . . . part of the inside" (ibid., 5). Also see Massey and Pat Jess, eds., *A Place in the World? Places, Culture, and Globalization* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995); and J. Nicholas Entriken, "Place and Region," *Progress in Human Geography* 18, no. 2 (1994): 227–33. For a fuller discussion and additional citations of this new current in cultural geography, see LeGrand's essay in this volume. For a practical application to contemporary ecological and agrarian problems, see Wes Jackson, *Becoming Native to This Place* (Washington, D.C.: Counterpoint, 1996).

63. The quotation comes from William Roseberry's essay in this volume.

64. Compare, however, Daniel Nugent, "Close Encounters of the Uncommunicative Kind: Pershing's Punitive Expedition to Mexico" (paper presented at "Rethinking the Postcolonial Encounter"), which argues that in certain punitive contexts of empire, communication is entirely foreclosed by imperial arrogance, racism, and brutality.

65. For other examples of unintended, unexpected, or paradoxical consequences, see especially the essays in this volume by Stern, Findlay, Topik, Rorinda, LeGrand, Klubock, and Derby.

66. Regarding sports and leisure activities and new patterns of consumption, see also Louis Pérez, "Between Baseball and Bullfighting: The Quest for Nationality in Cuba, 1868–1898," *Journal of American History* 81 (Sept. 1994): 493–517; Michael F. Jiménez, "'From Plantation to Cup': Coffee and Capitalism in the United States, 1830–1930," in *Coffee, Society, and Power in Latin America*, ed. William Roseberry, Lowell Gudmundson, and Mario Samper Kutschbach (Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995), 38–64; and Jeffrey M. Pilcher, "Tamales or Timbales: Cuisine and the Negotiation of Mexican National Identity, 1821–1911," *The Americas* 53 (Oct. 1996): 193–216.

67. Cf. Arjun Appadurai, "Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy," in Featherstone, *Global Culture*, 295–310.

68. Cf. the treatment of similar themes in the essays in *Social Text* 10, nos. 31–32 (1992).

69. The following discussion is based on James C. Scott's stimulating commentary at "Rethinking the Postcolonial Encounter."

70. Ibid.; cf. Scott's masterful ethnography of "Sedaka" in *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1985). For a pioneering study of plebeian material culture—as well as of foreign influences on elite and popular pastimes—in turn-of-the-century Mexico, see William H. Beezley, *Judas at the Jockey Club and Other Episodes of Porfirian Mexico* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1987).

71. Cf. James C. Scott, "Why the State Is the Enemy of People Who Move Around" (lecture presented in the International Migration and Refugee Movements Seminar, Yale University, New Haven, Conn., 2 April 1997).

72. See, e.g., Gloria K. Giffords, *Mexican Folk Retablos: Masterpieces on Tin* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1974); and Jorge Durand and Douglas S. Massey, *Miracles on the Border: Retablos of Mexican Migrants to the United States* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1995).

73. Delpar, *The Enormous Vogue*; Tenorio-Trillo, "Viejos gringos"; James Oles, ed., *South of the Border: Mexico in the American Imagination, 1914–1947/México en la imaginación norteamericana, 1914–1947* (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1993); Adriana Williams, *Covarrubias* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1994).

74. Joseph and Nugent, "Popular Culture and State Formation," 15–18; Rick A. López, "Art, Politics, and Culture in the Formation of Mexican Revolutionary Nationalism" (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, forthcoming).

75. Also see the chapters by Stern, Salvatore, and Roseberry, all of which establish interpretive frames for ordering the multiple agents and voices of Latin America's foreign-local encounter.

76. Also see Eric Roorda, "Gold Braid and Striped Pants: The Culture of Foreign Relations between the United States and the Dominican Republic, 1930–1953" (paper presented at the Latin American Studies Association Meeting, Atlanta, Mar. 1994).

77. For a sense of the compartmentalization that must be overcome, as well as some encouraging trends, see Hogan and Paterson, *Explaining the History of American Foreign Relations*; Stark, "Against Parsimony"; and Murphy and Rojas de Ferro, introduction to *International Review of Political Economy* 2 (winter 1995): 63–69.

78. Cf., for example, the multiple, hybrid personas (e.g., "The Aztec High-Tech," "The Warrior for Gringostroika") depicted in the pointed satire and radical humor of performance artist Guillermo Gómez-Peña, a student of "cultural" issues since he came to the United States from Mexico in 1978. Also

see Helena Solberg and David Meyer's empathetic and poignant film, "Bananas Is My Business" (1994), about the extraordinary transformation Brazilian entertainer Carmen Miranda underwent following her encounter with Hollywood.

79. Thus, the new cultural historian of inter-American relations cannot ignore the pivotal moments in North American political culture that serve as orienting points for the in-depth analysis we propose. Among these we might include the emergence of the Monroe Doctrine; the ideology of Manifest Destiny and the search for a route to California; the closing of the western frontier; the consolidation of the first transnational firms in oil, mining, and agricultural machinery; the heyday of American gunboat diplomacy and the first Pan-American Conferences; the successive invasions of Central American and Caribbean republics; the Good Neighbor Policy and the search for allies in World War II; the onset of the Cold War and the Nuclear Age; the Alliance for Progress; and the postcommunist New World Order. Indeed, the place of wars in U.S. political culture might well provide a long, distinctive thread in the fabric of our analysis of inter-American relations. Some of the best work on U.S. empire from a cultural studies perspective examines how wars both reflect and help shape class, gender, and racial dynamics in American society. See, e.g., Kaplan and Pease, *Cultures of United States Imperialism*, esp. the essays by Richard Slotkin (164–81), Vicente Raphael (185–218), and Amy Kaplan (219–36), and those in pt. 4 ("Imperial Spectacles"). Also see Eileen Findlay's essay in this volume.

Of course, we must also consider comparable markers for Central America, South America, and the Caribbean: namely, independence from the old colonial powers; the process of state and nation building that followed; the extension of export economies into the interior; the period of outward-looking economic growth in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries; the Great Depression; the rise and fall of import substitution industrialization; and neoliberalism and economic restructuring—among others.

80. For a persuasive overview of how "big power politics" and changes in the "international rules of the game" exerted a preponderant impact on U.S.–Latin American relations from the eighteenth century on, see Smith, *Talons of the Eagle*.

81. See, e.g., David Harvey, *The Condition of Postmodernity* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989); Featherstone, *Global Culture*; and Stuart Hall, "Brave New World," *Socialist Review* 21 (1991): 57–64.

82. For some of the challenges that attend periodization in cross-cultural contexts, see the recent forum, "Periodization in World History," *American Historical Review* 101 (June 1996): 748–82. Stern's essay in this volume provides a rough periodization of foreign-local encounter since colonial times; cf. Roseberry, *Anthropologies and Histories*, 91ff.; Keith Haynes's broader, political-economic schema in "Capitalism and the Periodization of International Relations: Colonialism, Imperialism, Ultraimperialism, and Postimperialism," *Radical History Review* 57 (fall 1993): 21–32; and Smith's attempt, in *Talons of the Eagle*, to periodize U.S.–Latin American relations within the context of epochal shifts in

international power politics. Also see Salvatore's contribution in this volume for a more restricted periodization of representational regimes.

83. Schoonover, *The United States in Central America*; John H. Coatsworth, *Central America and the United States: The Clients and the Colossus* (New York: Twayne, 1994); Eric Roorda, *The Dictator Next Door: The Good Neighbor Policy and the Trujillo Regime in the Dominican Republic, 1930-1945* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1998); Paul W. Drake, ed., *Money Doctors, Foreign Debts, and Economic Reforms in Latin America from the 1890s to the Present* (Wilmington, Del.: Scholarly Resources, 1994); and Drake, *The Money Doctor in the Andes: The Kemmerer Missions, 1923-1933* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1989).

84. In addition to the chapters in this volume by Topik, Schroeder, and Roorda, see Crawford, "Cross-Cultural Encounter"; Nugent, "Close Encounters of the Uncommunicative Kind"; Malcolm B. Colcleugh, "War-Time Portraits of the Gringo: American Invaders and the Manufacture of Mexican Nationalism," *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association*, n.s., 6 (1995): 81-99; and Langley and Schoonover, *Banana Men*.

85. See, e.g., Jimmy M. Skaggs, *The Great Guano Rush: Entrepreneurs and American Overseas Expansion* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1994); Paul Dosal, *Doing Business with the Dictators: A Political History of United Fruit in Guatemala, 1899-1944* (Wilmington, Del.: Scholarly Resources, 1993); Langley and Schoonover, *Banana Men*; Brown, *Oil and Revolution*; Linda B. Hall, *Oil, Banks, and Politics: The United States and Postrevolutionary Mexico, 1917-1924* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1995); O'Brien, *The Revolutionary Mission*; Joseph A. Fry, "Constructing an Empire? Guano, Bananas, and American Foreign Relations," *Diplomatic History* 20 (summer 1996): 483-89; Darío A. Euraque, *Reinterpreting the Banana Republic: Region and State in Honduras, 1870-1972* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996); and Steven C. Topik, *Trade and Gunboats: The United States and Brazil in the Age of Empire* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1997).

86. See, e.g., Rosalie Schwartz, *Pleasure Island: Tourism and Temptation in Cuba* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1997); Quetzil Castañeda, *In the Museum of Maya Culture: Touring Chichén Itzá* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996); and Julio E. Moreno, "Constructing the 'Mexican Dream': Consumer Culture in Mexico City and the Historical Reconstruction of Modern Mexico in the 1940s" (Ph.D. diss., University of California at Irvine, forthcoming).

87. Ricardo Salvatore and Carlos Aguirre, eds., *The Birth of the Penitentiary in Latin America* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1996).

88. Ron Robin, *Enclaves of America: The Rhetoric of American Political Architecture Abroad, 1900-1965* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1996); and Karen Robert, "Inventing the Southern Metropolis: American Models of Urban Growth in Nineteenth-Century Buenos Aires," and Julie Franks, "Forging

National Institutions in the Dominican Sugar Zone, 1880–1924” (papers presented at “Rethinking the Postcolonial Encounter”).

89. Robert Rydell, *All the World's a Fair: Visions of Empire, International Expositions, 1876–1916* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984); Mauricio Tenorio-Trillo, *Mexico at the World's Fairs: Crafting a Modern Nation* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1996); and Rosenberg, *Spreading the American Dream*, esp. chap. 1.

90. J. Valerie Fifer, *United States Perceptions of Latin America, 1850–1930: A 'New West' South of Capricorn?* (Manchester, U.K.: Manchester University Press, 1991), esp. chaps. 1, 4; Lutz and Collins, *Reading National Geographic*; Curtis M. Hinsley, *Savages and Scientists: The Smithsonian Institution and the Development of American Anthropology, 1846–1910* (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1981); George Stocking, *Colonial Situations: Essays on the Contextualization of Ethnographic Knowledge* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1991); Borneman, “American Anthropology as Foreign Policy”; Peter R. Schmidt and Thomas C. Patterson, eds., *Making Alternative Histories: The Practice of Archaeology and History in Non-Western Settings* (Santa Fe, N.M.: SAR Press, 1996); Nancy Leys Stepan, *The Hour of Eugenics: Race, Gender, and Nation in Latin America* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1991); Marcos Cueto, ed., *Salud, cultura y sociedad en América Latina: Nuevas perspectivas históricas* (Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos, 1996); David Arnold, ed., *Imperial Medicine and Indigenous Societies* (Manchester, U.K.: Manchester University Press, 1988); and Alejandra García Quintanilla, “Reshaping the Social Body: Hunger among the Yucatec Maya at the Turn of the Century” (paper presented at “Rethinking the Postcolonial Encounter”).

91. In addition to Palmer's chapter in this volume, see Robert Arno, ed., *Philanthropy and Cultural Imperialism* (Boston: G. K. Hall, 1980); Edward H. Berman, *The Influence of the Carnegie, Ford, and Rockefeller Foundations on American Foreign Policy: The Ideology of Philanthropy* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1983); Donald T. Critchlow, *The Brookings Institution, 1916–1952: Expertise and the Public Interest in a Democratic Society* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois Press, 1985); Elizabeth Cobbs, *The Rich Neighbor Policy: Rockefeller and Kaiser in Brazil* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1992); and Marcos Cueto, ed., *Missionaries of Science: The Rockefeller Foundation in Latin America* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1992).

92. Rosenberg, *Spreading the American Dream*; David Stoll, *Fishers of Men or Founders of Empire: The Wycliffe Bible Translators in Latin America* (London: Zed Press, 1982); Soren Hvalkopf and Peter Aaby, eds., *Is God an American? An Anthropological Perspective on the Missionary Work of the Summer Institute of Linguistics* (London: Survival International, 1981); Gerard Colby with Charlotte Dennett, *Thy Will Be Done: The Conquest of the Amazon: Nelson Rockefeller and Evangelism in the Age of Oil* (New York: HarperCollins, 1995), which attempts to