

**FOUR DAYS IN NOVEMBER:
THE PERUVIAN EXPERIENCE
OF EUGENIO MARÍA DE HOSTOS¹**

Soldado del deber y de la ciencia
era límpido cielo su conciencia.
No al ocio vil su espíritu se avino:
la lucha y el trabajo eran su sino.
Sólo la muerte avasallar pudo,
y el gladiador cayó sobre el escudo,
resignado y con ánimo sereno,
como cae el valiente y cae el bueno.

“Elegía a la muerte de Hostos”

Ricardo Palma, 1903²

While researching the origins of Peruvian sociology, it became apparent to me that the Puerto Rican Eugenio María de Hostos was an important figure during that formative period. This is true not only because he wrote (lectured) one of the first Latin American tracts on sociology, but also because he had published extensively in the Peruvian press between November 1870 and December 1871, the period he resided in Lima. On the surface, he seems to have had a productive period in the Peruvian capital: he collaborated in at least two dailies, *La Sociedad* and *La Patria*, and he was elected president of the “Amantes del Saber” society. Having written so many editorials in Lima’s newspapers, it is surprising that much commentary glosses over Hostos’s visit to the Andean nation, simply stating that he visited Colombia, Peru, Chile, Argentina and Brazil.³

¹ This research was completed during a sabbatical leave in Lima, June 1997 to December 1997. Travel was funded by a grant from the Dean, College of Arts and Sciences, Loyola College. I would also like to thank the librarians of the “Sala Tauro”, and the Hemeroteca sections of the Biblioteca Nacional del Perú who were instrumental in providing me with materials.

² Ricardo Palma, *Epistolario*, ed. Raúl Porras Barrenechea, 2 vols., Lima, Editorial Cultura Antártica, 1949; v. I; p. 492. I have assigned the poem its title to make clear its referent, perhaps not apparent in this fragment. Palma wrote this poem to Hostos’s son.

³ See for example, Manuel Maldonado-Denis, “Introducción al pensamiento social de Eugenio María de Hostos”, *América: la lucha por la libertad*, by Eugenio María de Hostos, México, Siglo XXI, 1980; p. 16. From the Peruvian side of things various foreigners who resided in nineteenth-century Lima are included in histories of Peruvian literature, but not Hostos. In Alberto Varillas Montenegro’s *La literatura peruana del siglo XIX*, (Lima, Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú, 1992), there are numerous references to Juana Manuela Gorriti (from Argentina), Vicente Camacho (from Venezuela), Numa Pompilio Llona (from Ecuador) and even Ladislao Graña (from Spain). Yet there is not one reference to Hostos. The same holds true for Emilia Romero de Valle’s *Diccionario manual de literatura peruana y materias afines* (Lima, Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos, 1966), which contains lengthy entries for Gorriti, Camacho and Llona, but not for Hostos.

On the other hand, Hostos later commented on Lima's closed society and on the slowness with which a foreigner is accepted and allowed to participate.⁴ This is an important point. The time of Hostos's stay in Peru was a moment of great immigrations from Italy and Germany. From China, after the abolition of black slavery, came forced labor. Immigration policy and its implications for Peruvian ethnicity were hot topics in the editorial columns of the contemporary press. In the pages that follow, I will delve into some of the personal difficulties that Hostos faced in his contact with the Fourth Estate in Peru.

Early on in my research on sociological thought it became clear that Hostos was not an objective commentator on the War of the Pacific, a devastating conflict between Chile and Peru. While one may not have expected the Antillean intellectual to be objective on the matter of Puerto Rican independence, perhaps his most inflamed passion, there is no obvious reason for him to have come down on the side of Chile in the terrible war that occurred between 1879 and 1883.

Hostos's critique of the war went well beyond an evaluation of battles or strategies. His Krauso-positivist sociological analysis⁵ of Peru was quite severe. This critical writing was drafted in the years after he left Lima. For him, Peru was not like other countries in which he had resided (Puerto Rico, Spain, United States and Chile). Its lifestyle could only be described as "*sui generis*".⁶ Peruvian society was idle, living for pleasure and vanity, its literature futile and its poetry empty. The country was corrupt and debilitated.⁷ The government's treatment of the Chinese coolies was questionable,⁸ as were the circumstances under which the Chilean immigrant labor force were working.⁹ These conditions, which Hostos observed firsthand, may have influenced his view of the Andean nation.

According to Hostos, Peru suffered from three accidents of fate: wealth, territorial expanse and "la variedad de sus elementos etnográficos."¹⁰ This

⁴ Eugenio María de Hostos, *Obras completas (Edición crítica)*, Río Piedras, Universidad de Puerto Rico, 1988-1997; v. I, t. II; p. 438. This truly heroic effort at improving on the 1939 edition of Hostos's *Obras completas* is to be lauded. The critical edition contains extensive footnotes which include historical, biographical and literary references. There are various indices and other critical apparatus. Up to date eight tomes have been released. The present study will consult both editions, this new critical *Obras* and the earlier collection, published in Havana.

⁵ On Hostos's Krausism, see José Ferrer Canales, "Hostos y Giner," *Asomante* 21.4 (1965), 7-28. On Krausism and Positivism in his works see José Luis Abellán, "La dimensión krauso-positivista en Eugenio María de Hostos", *Cuadernos Americanos, Nueva Época* 16 (1989), 58-66.

⁶ Hostos, *Obras*, 1988-1997; v. I, t. II; p. 434.

⁷ Eugenio María de Hostos, *Obras completas*, 21 vols., La Havana, Cultural, 1939; v. XX; pp. 313-314.

⁸ Hostos, *Obras*, 1988-1997; v. I, t. II; p. 383.

⁹ *Ibid.*; p. 382.

¹⁰ Hostos, *Obras*, 1939; v. VII; p. 116.

ethnic heterogeneity would have to be considered a problem for a Krausist philosophy that looks for, in the words of Solomon Lipp, "the smooth and harmonious functioning of human relationships."¹¹ Of course Krause developed his philosophy in Germany whose ethnic groups (if we can describe them in that way) were related in a cultural sense much more closely than the diverse ethnicities inhabiting the Andes. A problem surfaces when applying European philosophical models to the Americas where a very different social reality has emerged in the centuries since Columbus. As a Krausist, Hostos looked for a harmonious social organism in Peru and he only saw discord:

En la mera diversidad de razas que habitan el Perú, otro problema: dada la coexistencia de las razas quichua o aborígen, europea o criolla; de las subrazas que se han derivado de esos troncos; la diversa tradición, educación, costumbres, carácter y aptitudes de esos diversos elementos, ¿cómo se unifican, se funden, se identifican en un mismo pensamiento nacional, en una misma civilización, en un mismo sentimiento del progreso, en un pueblo para la república, en un ciudadano para el gobierno democrático?¹²

These themes are repeated in his *Viaje al Sur*¹³ and in his 1886 "Demografía de Lima" where he compares the city's inhabitants to livestock.¹⁴ Hostos believed that Peru lost the War of the Pacific as a result of its ethnic heterogeneity, an impediment that prohibited its society from functioning as an organism.

If Peru were ethnically disharmonious, Chile, conversely, had the "best" population on the Continent, "La mejor, en el sentido etnológico; en el social y en el político."¹⁵ Since the Conquest, ethnic blending in Chile has produced the most pure race, divided into just two classes, the cultured elite and a work force consisting of *huasos* and *rotos*.¹⁶ The term "pure" here does not imply racial purity, but instead a lack of contamination that comes from social disharmony. Chilean *mestizaje* has resulted in a race that boasts a physical distinctiveness, consisting in muscular energy, extraordinary morality, reserved force, unique intelligence, prudence, a national character and true patriotism.¹⁷ Chile, then, was a healthy organism.

Given the ideological currents of the period, there is nothing surprising about Hostos's racialist posture. Such attitudes were standard.¹⁸ However, when

¹¹ Solomon Lipp, *Francisco Giner de los Ríos: A Spanish Socrates*, Waterloo, Wilfrid Laurier Press, 1985; p. 27.

¹² Hostos, *Obras*, 1939; v. VII; p. 117.

¹³ *Ibid.*; v. VI; pp. 140-141, for example.

¹⁴ "Problema semoviente", Hostos, *Obras*, 1988-1997; v. I, t. II; p. 436.

¹⁵ Hostos, *Obras*, 1939; v. VII; p. 329.

¹⁶ Country and city workers, respectively, *ibid.*; v. VII; p. 330.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁸ See for example, W. Rex Crawford, *A Century of Latin American Thought*, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1961; Richard Graham, ed., *The Idea of Race in Latin America*, Austin, University

one compares his analysis of Peru with his appraisal of other multiethnic societies, a stark difference in perspective emerges. We have seen the favorable light with which he viewed Chile. In his scholarship on the Caribbean there is an almost total absence of racist attitudes. In his novel *La peregrinación de Bayoán*, published some eight years before arriving in Peru, he comments on race in Haiti. He denies that individuals have race in their spirit, proclaiming that there is an equal spark in all, regardless of their origins. He concludes with a call to justice for blacks.¹⁹ In another essay, the undated "La América Latina", he asserts that all of Latin America's thirty million inhabitants have equal appetites for civilization.²⁰ Such a balanced view on race is lost in his analysis of the War of the Pacific.

Racist views lead Hostos to theorize that Chile won the war because it was more civilized than its two opponents, Bolivia and Peru.²¹ How did he come to this conclusion? I will argue here that Hostos's racist view of Peru may have resulted from his negative personal experiences in Lima. Besides lobbying for Antillean independence, Hostos came to the Andean nation to present his educational program. His efforts to promote independence for Cuba and Puerto Rico fell on deaf ears and his pedagogy did not gain a foothold in the Peruvian capital. While there, he saw and experienced substantial corruption, observing firsthand the administration of José Balta, the rise of Nicolás de Piérola, and the apogee of Meiggs, Gibbs, and Dreyfus. Hostos comments on that era in "El Perú", written a few months after his departure.²² He recounts a conversation in which he was told that by defending the Peruvian government he could advance not only the cause of Cuban independence, but also increase his financial standing.²³ Luis Alberto Sánchez confirms that there were attempts to payoff the venerable Puerto Rican, who resisted.²⁴ At another moment Sánchez is more severe, suggesting that Hostos had to leave Peru because he resisted bribes by the North American Henry Meiggs, who practically governed the country at that time.²⁵

There is another political element that may or not be relevant to our discussion. The political background for Hostos's experiences was Manuel

of Texas Press, 1990; and Nancy Leys Stepan, *The Hour of Eugenics*, Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1991.

¹⁹ Hostos, *Obras*, 1939; v. VIII; pp. 53-54.

²⁰ *Ibid.*; v. VII; p. 7.

²¹ *Ibid.*; v. VII; p. 349.

²² *Ibid.*, v. VII; pp. 111-144.

²³ *Ibid.*; v. VI; p. 168.

²⁴ Luis Alberto Sánchez, *Nuestras vidas son los ríos... (Historia y leyenda de los González Prada)*, 2th ed., Lima, Fundación del Banco de Comercio, 1986; p. 52.

²⁵ Luis Alberto Sánchez, *Escritores representativos de América*, 1st series, 2th ed., Madrid, Gredos, 1963; v. II; p. 148.

Pardo's slow march toward the presidency. His candidacy was named in April 1871, he won his party's electoral college (like the U.S. primary) in October 1871, and overcame a civil war in 1872 in which Balta was eventually assassinated²⁶ (this last after Hostos had left the country). All of these political and social realities were part of a mosaic that may have impacted on Hostos's Peruvian experiences.

Besides the Puerto Rican's distaste for graft, I have discovered still another reason that may have colored his view of Peru, more than any other. He was the primary editorial writer for *La Patria*, a Lima newspaper published in Spanish and Italian. For some three and a half months Hostos belted out daily articles on a number of topics, Chile, the disinherited, Peruvian politics, the Chinese in Peru, the German colony of Pozuzo, and of course the Caribbean. These progressive editorials appeared without an author heading, and to the reader it may not have been obvious who the writer was or that his country of origin was Puerto Rico.

Hostos probably wrote 95 per cent of all the editorials published in *La Patria*, from its first number, July 28, 1871, until his resignation November 20 that same year. In a most extraordinary series of journalistic events, his letter of resignation sparked a four-day assault on his work, character and ethics. The slurs against him may have resulted from power struggles within the press establishment, within the State, and between State and Church. Let's look at some of the specifics.

The owner of *La Patria* was Tommaso Caivano, an Italian immigrant who resided in Lima. Besides being the general editor, Caivano was also responsible for the first three columns on page two that were published in Italian for Lima's, at that time, sizable Italian population. Later the entire Sunday edition was produced in Italian.

A precursor to the incidents in question appeared on Saturday, November 11, 1871. On that day on page two, column one, there was an announcement in Italian from Tommaso Caivano. In that short blurb, he informs his readers that the paper would now be published entirely in Spanish and that the Italian section would appear as a weekly.²⁷ What in effect had happened was that the business was sold for 25,000 soles to Federico Torrico, a now forgotten artist, who would control it until 1873 when José Casimiro Ulloa would become the next owner.

Our four days in November began on Monday, November 20, 1871, when another item appeared, this time in Spanish, signed by Torrico, the new owner and editor. The substance of this brief letter coincides with the previous statement in Italian, published a week earlier.²⁸ Further down in the same column,

²⁶ Fredrick B. Pike, *The Modern History of Peru*, New York, Frederick A. Praeger, 1967; pp. 126-131.

²⁷ *La Patria*, sábado, 11 de noviembre de 1871; p. 2a.

²⁸ *La Patria*, lunes, 20 de noviembre de 1871; p. 2a.

there is a letter from Hostos saying goodbye to his readers. He does not supply any reason for his departure. His epistle is preceded with the following introduction:

Antes de iniciar sus trabajos la nueva redacción de *La Patria* hemos recibido la siguiente carta del señor don Eugenio María Hostos, redactor del diario durante la dirección del señor Caivano.²⁹

From this introductory statement it seems that with the change of ownership came a new editorial staff, "la nueva redacción de *La Patria*." Hostos may have resigned, as Ricardo Palma suggests, because under Torrico's ownership the paper gave up its liberal bias.³⁰ For whatever reason, he resigned, or was fired, with the change in ownership. There is nothing unusual about this. Changes in newspaper ownership often bring turnabouts in editorial personnel. What was peculiar about this staff transition was the public circus that was to follow.

First Hostos's resignation letter. The short note is what one would expect from a dispatch of this type, except that, besides *La Patria*, it was carried by many of Lima's other dailies. In it, he tells his readers, with whom he has a relationship, that he abandons them "no sin tristeza:"

que he querido por ellos mantenerme siempre a la altura de las ideas, y mantener para ellos a esa altura el periódico que ellos y yo (ellos con su fe en mi imparcialidad, yo con mi fe en los principios) hemos formado y con increíble rapidez acreditado.³¹

Hostos closes his statement affirming that his impartiality is the sole legacy he leaves behind to the new editorial staff.

The letter should not have been controversial, but in the days that followed, it sparked the most outrageous series of commentaries. What was the point of contention? At least initially there was an outcry over Hostos's claim that the newspaper was formed by his readers and him, "el periódico que ellos y yo hemos formado." The very next day, Tuesday, Tommaso Caivano, the former editor and owner of *La Patria*, now the manager of the Italian section, responds in very strong terms, writing that he read Hostos's announcement "con el mayor asombro."³² Given that it was published in "casi todos los periódicos de ayer," Caivano's astonishment can be understood. A matter that should have been private, had now become a very public affair.

The Italian editor explains specifically his concerns, taking issue with Hostos's declaration of impartiality and of "forming" *La Patria* with his readers. The next paragraph demonstrates the emotion of the issue, his disgust with

²⁹ *Ibid.*

³⁰ Palma, *op. cit.*; v. I; p. 492.

³¹ *La Patria*, lunes, 20 de noviembre de 1871; p. 2a.

³² *La Patria*, martes, 21 de noviembre de 1871; p. 2a-b.

the editorialist, and sets the stage for the barrage of letters that follow:

¿Es propio, es conveniente, ese todo y ese lenguaje, en la boca de quien no fue más que *uno de los redactores* de aquel diario; en la boca de quien escribía según las *órdenes* y según el plan trazado por el director del periódico, y cuyos artículos estaban sujetos a la *censura* previa del predicho periódico; *censura* de que él tuvo muchas veces que hacer uso, *por razones que usted conoce perfectamente?*³³

Caivano asserts that Hostos was subjected to editorial censorship and that he submitted to it, putting his claim to “imparcialidad” in doubt. But Editor Caivano is not finished with his attempt to demolish Hostos’s character. He chides the Puerto Rican, notwithstanding his “ilustración ilimitada,” for professing to have embodied “todo lo que se ha hecho de bueno en el diario *La Patria*.”³⁴ The Italian concludes his diatribe denouncing Hostos as a boisterous individual who gives “siempre mayor tono e importancia de la que le corresponde.”³⁵ He suggests that if Hostos replies to his letter, it will prove he is a selfish man who likes to talk about himself.

Not surprisingly, Hostos does respond on Wednesday, but before getting to that letter, I would like to comment on one other that followed Caivano’s on Tuesday. This one was drafted by Felipe Gerardo Cazenueve and affirms that Hostos could not have been the only person to have formed *La Patria*, since he, Cazenueve, also worked hard to that end, as did two others, Caivano and Carrillo. From this we can deduce that there were four principal writers working for *La Patria*, all of whom helped to found the paper. Ricardo Palma, writing from the distant future (1903), would “remember” that Hostos did indeed co-found the paper, but he recalls the Puerto Rican founding the paper with Torrico, not with Caivano.³⁶

Hostos rebuts these two letters the very next day, Wednesday, November 22, 1871. He rejects Caivano’s claim that he was censored while at the same time implying the entire controversy is based on hyperbole and distortion of fact. He asserts that, to defend his independence as a writer, he twice attempted to resign, once on the 9th and then again on the 31st of October. He contends that he was finally persuaded not to depart on both occasions by Caivano himself.³⁷ Besides his resistance to censorship, Hostos also emphasizes his primary role on the editorial page:

afirma usted que yo no era *La Patria*, mas que *uno de los redactores*. Falso. El *único* redactor político de *La Patria*, he sido yo.³⁸

³³ *Ibid.*; p. 2b. His italics.

³⁴ *Ibid.*

³⁵ *Ibid.*

³⁶ Palma, *op. cit.*; v. I; p. 491.

³⁷ *La Patria*, miércoles, 22 de noviembre de 1871; p. 3e.

³⁸ *Ibid.* His italics.

Here Hostos's original democratic declaration that he "formed" the paper with his readers now transmutes into the view that, because *La Patria* is political and he was the only political writer, he *is La Patria*. He maintains having written all editorials for the paper since its inception, July 28, 1871, except for four or five.³⁹

This entire debate centers on the definition of a newspaper. Is it the collected efforts of all the staff, "la parte italiana," "la crónica local," "la sección de comunicados," "los artículos" (Hostos's categories), or is it the tone, the mood, and the political and social posture of the editorial section? Hostos himself softens his exaggerated claim of *being La Patria* by praising several of his colleagues who wrote for the different sections of the four-page daily. Their role in the publishing enterprise creates two levels of defining a paper.⁴⁰ Because it is difficult to describe a newspaper in such terms, the public squabble continued on Thursday, November 23, 1871, a day, I'm sure, Hostos never forgot.

On that day a good portion of the paper's staff wrote testimonies in support of Tommaso Caivano, many of them with the intent of "proving" that Hostos did submit to censorship. If the previous epistolary events were limited to several inches of a column, this Thursday blockbuster occupied some three quarters of page three⁴¹ (in a four-page daily, the first containing business information, the last advertisements, the articles and letters being limited to the second and third). This offensive by a very unified front directly questioned Hostos's integrity as a person and as a writer.

All of the elements contained in these combative communiqués are much too complicated to detail here. Suffice to say the entire petty salvo intended to prove beyond a doubt that the Puerto Rican submitted to censorship. The "proof" centers around an editorial on President Balta. Hostos supposedly submitted a version that was rejected. Another interpretation, completely different, was eventually published on November the 3rd. Now both were printed, side by side, so the reading public could see the magnitude of the editorial changes (there are hardly any similarities between the two versions). Also included as part of the "proof" were declarations from G. Cazenueve, G. Carrillo, J. Urialde, and Carlos Riquelme swearing that in general the editorialist did submit to censorship, and that in particular his piece on "La proclama del presidente" was doctored into a much softer critique of President Balta, titled now "Un concejo del presidente." Adjacent to the two renderings of the editorial, there is also a long (2 and 1/2 columns) piecemeal attack from Caivano on Hostos's work and character.

³⁹ *Ibid.*

⁴⁰ "La parte editorial de un diario es la que forma y acredita los periódicos...", *ibid.*

⁴¹ *La Patria*, jueves, 23 de noviembre de 1871; p. 3b-f.

One festering question is why, if Hostos and Caivano did not get along, did the former resign at the moment he liberated himself from the latter's supposed grip? Or if his resignation was a response to the new editor and owner, why did he then have a public battle with the previous owner Caivano, with whom he was able to work the previous three and one half months? The possibility should be considered that the former owner received some benefit from Balta and/or the President's followers. Clearly the second version of the Balta editorial makes the paper appear to be pro-Balta, while Hostos seemed to be against the chief executive.

The result of such malfeasance is that Hostos, who proposed freedom and tolerance, ended up disgraced and tarnished as an egotistical liar. Yet, was it merely a case of material interests prevailing over an enlightened ideology, or could it have been envy toward a superior intellect? Furthermore, did the Peruvian press suffer from some kind of xenophobia which worked against foreigners? Did Hostos's ego simply flatten out other authors' self-images and thereby open his persona up to retribution? Or did the editorialist simply become a political pawn in an attempt to win over the president of the republic? These are difficult questions indeed, and unfortunately there are no happy answers. Either Hostos was an egomaniacal enlightened intellectual despot or the world of nineteenth-century Peruvian journalism was a very dark place, or even worse, some combination of both possibilities may have been at play.

The global assault against Hostos on Thursday, November 23rd effectively culminates the debate in the pages of *La Patria*. Yet the controversy was not restricted to that publication, having spilled over into many of the major dailies. Certainly this very public *querelle* was nothing new for the period—many contemporary newspapers spent a good amount of energy denigrating each other. In *La Patria* there are references to articles in *La Sociedad*, *El Correo del Perú*, and others. This spirit was so pronounced that sometimes the disputes went international as would be the case two years later between *La Patria* and *La Gaceta* (Brussels, published in Spanish).⁴² These attacks on each other's integrity all represent a certain immaturity characteristic of this nascent press—not yet elevated above personal rivalries—which kept it from its ultimate goal, to print the news.

Two tasks remain to understand Hostos's Peruvian experience. First the extent that other dailies covered this event needs to be ascertained. *La Patria*, *El Comercio*, *El Nacional*, *La Sociedad*, *El Heraldo* and *La República* all participated in varying degrees. I have not been able to verify the breadth of coverage in *El Heraldo* and *La República*, yet the other papers provide a very interesting window into the matter. The most respected daily of the time, *El*

⁴² *La Patria*, 2 de octubre de 1873. A similar journalistic event happened some twelve years earlier when *La Revista de Lima* attacked the press in Spain on the same topic: immigration.

Comercio, carried Hostos's letter on Monday, Caivano's response on Tuesday, and the Puerto Rican's counterresponse on Wednesday (November 20, 21, 22, 1871).⁴³ It did not publish, however, the *tour de force* against the editorialist on Thursday.

The case of *El Nacional* is revealing. It covered the entire week, beginning on Monday with Hostos's initial letter of resignation. On that day *El Nacional* publicly proclaimed Hostos a man of conscience and offered him the columns of the newspaper. Yet by Thursday, when it printed the barrage against him, any praise of his principals, or any offer of work had been withdrawn.⁴⁴ What could have caused *El Nacional's* change in position? Could it have been paid to withdraw its support for the Puerto Rican intellectual?

What was Hostos's state of mind during those contentious four days in November? It seems that the array of anti-Hostos letters published in *La Patria*, *El Comercio* and *El Nacional* greatly offended him, so much so, that he ultimately challenged Caivano to a duel, according to a note published in *El Nacional* two days later.⁴⁵ Hostos made the challenge through two representatives, Colonel Baltasar Latorre, a noted explorer, and Francisco Javier Cisneros. Caivano responded charging Manuel A. Fuentes, an important lawyer and author, and Héctor F. Varela, who happened to be visiting Lima at that time, to accept the challenge. Yet the two pairs of agents united, and in the above-mentioned missive, all four men declare and affirm that the two "litigants" should withdraw from the deadly showdown.

The tensions between the players and the assault on Hostos's integrity were only the personal side of the event. There was also a larger political debate that developed. As mentioned above, the controversy centered on Hostos's acceptance of censorship from Caivano or not. Hostos affirmed total editorial independence in his articles and Caivano and his supporters "proved" that the author submitted to censorship. These events, as we have seen, were monitored at the various periodicals.

The editors at *La Sociedad*, an ultraconservative Catholic publication, saw the goings-on at *La Patria* as an opportunity to further the Catholic cause. It may or may not be relevant that Hostos had written at least two articles on ethnicity for *La Sociedad* six or seven months earlier, signing them with the pen name *Observator*.⁴⁶ His letter of resignation did not appear in *La Sociedad*

⁴³ *El Comercio*, 20 de noviembre de 1871; p. 5f; *ibid.*; 21 de noviembre de 1871; p. 3c; *ibid.*; 22 de noviembre de 1871; p. 4d.

⁴⁴ *El Nacional*, lunes, 20 de noviembre de 1871; p. 2b; *ibid.*; martes, 21 de noviembre de 1871; *ibid.*; miércoles, 22 de noviembre de 1871; *ibid.*; jueves, 23 de noviembre de 1871.

⁴⁵ Héctor F. Varela, B. Latorre, Manuel A. Fuentes, E.J. Cisneros y Correa, "Asunto personal entre los señores Hostos y Caivano," *El Nacional*, sábado, 25 de noviembre de 1871; p. 3e. Reproducido en Hostos, *Obras completas*, 1939; v. II; pp. 21-22.

⁴⁶ Eugenio María de Hostos, "El Chino," *La Sociedad*, 17 de diciembre de 1870; p. 2f-a; "El Cholo," *ibid.*; 23 de diciembre de 1870; pp. 3c-d. There are articles on other topics which also bear the pen name "Observator".

on the Monday or any other day. On Tuesday, the Catholic periodical simply acknowledges the change in format at *La Patria* as a positive innovation.⁴⁷ On Wednesday it was silent on the matter, but on Thursday the “intraliberal” dispute was inserted into the larger conservative-liberal struggle. An anonymous *Sociedad* editorial writer professes a desire to refrain from interfering in a personal matter. He does not mention the two primary protagonists by name, but does allude to the dissension between the ex-editor and the “Spanish” writer at *La Patria*. He then proceeds to demonstrate that the “liberal” freedoms of press and speech are nothing more than hypocrisy. According to this op-ed piece, there are two liberals working for a liberal newspaper (the owner and principal editorial writer no less) that proclaims freedom of the press. Yet unaware of what that freedom means, the owner states that he censored the other. Here is a sample of the tone of the article:

los liberales quieren libertad de imprenta exterior, decretada, ilusoria; pero le cierran la puerta de sus redacciones porque desconfían mucho de sus colegas, siendo como son contradictorias las ideas de todas ellas.⁴⁸

As the days turned into weeks, *La Sociedad* repeatedly brought up the insincerity of liberal editorials regarding freedom of thought⁴⁹ and of the press.⁵⁰ Besides liberal duplicity with the diverse liberties, the Catholic gazette also suggested that dueling, is well, un-Christian.

So here we have it. Hostos has his hands slapped in at least four newspapers by all or many of his former co-writers. His private grief from the situation must have been magnified by his becoming an “example” of “liberal hypocrisy.” He becomes offended, challenges Caivano to a duel, and along with the Italian is publicly told to behave himself (implying that dueling may be for Puerto Ricans and Italians, but definitely not for Peruvians). Besides being a foreigner, and rejected by his colleagues, it is also insinuated that he does not respect the spirit of Christianity. This series of bitter events, then, is probably at least one of the roots for his seeming animosity toward Peru, and for his eventual support of Chile in the War of the Pacific, a country in which he was openly adored. Caivano, on the other hand, who married an upper-class woman from Lima, took a very different course, praising Peru in his critically acclaimed (at least in Peru) *Historia de la guerra de América entre Chile, Perú y Bolivia* (1882).

⁴⁷ *La Sociedad*, martes, 21 de noviembre de 1871; p. 2b.

⁴⁸ *La Sociedad*, jueves, 23 de noviembre de 1871; p. 2b.

⁴⁹ “Prensa de Lima,” *La Sociedad*, viernes, 24 de noviembre de 1871; p. 2b; “La libertad de pensamiento,” *ibid.*; 2a; “La libertad de pensamiento,” *ibid.*; sábado, 25 de noviembre de 1871; p. 2a.

⁵⁰ “La libertad de imprenta,” *La Sociedad*, martes, 28 de noviembre de 1871; p. 2a; “Un jurado de duelo,” *ibid.*; miércoles, 29 de noviembre de 1871; “La libertad de imprenta,” *ibid.*; viernes, 1 de diciembre de 1871; “La libertad de imprenta,” *ibid.*; sábado, 2 de diciembre de 1871; “La libertad de imprenta,” *ibid.*; lunes, 4 de diciembre de 1871.

One could argue that Hostos himself had a role in blowing the matter up, releasing his resignation letter to various publications, not foreseeing that events would snowball out of control. But it may also have been that his former colleagues were maneuvering, trying to retain their power within *La Patria*. They also may have been lashing out at the man who was morally incorruptible. Finally, it is also likely that money flowed into one or more of the newspapers to meet extrajournalistic goals.

I believe that this series of events colored Hostos's view of Peru. From a Krausist perspective, he came to see that nation as an unhealthy organism. This organicist stance seemed to be substantiated by Peru's disgraceful loss in its struggle against its southern neighbor. What Hostos developed then, was not political racism,⁵¹ but a form of hatred toward the Andean nation that expressed itself as personal racism, the result of individual experience, very different from his general theoretical understanding of race.

Epilogue

Hostos was not completely vilified in Peru by the above-mentioned events. From Chile he published a few times in the prestigious *Correo del Perú*.⁵² As time went on it does seem that he forgot and forgave. After the War of the Pacific, Ricardo Palma wrote to intellectuals all over Latin America asking for donations to restock the National Library which the Chileans had sacked. Hostos responded from Santo Domingo in 1886 with a promise to try to raise books from the Dominican Republic, from Puerto Rico and from Cuba. In that letter he calls Peru a "país querido," a country he has never been able to forget.⁵³ Hostos continued to correspond with Palma until his death in 1903.⁵⁴

Thomas Ward
Colegio Loyola
Baltimore, MD

⁵¹ I owe the idea of distinguishing personal racism from political racism to my colleague in the Loyola English Department, David Dougherty.

⁵² "Notas de un viajero", *El Correo del Perú*, 15 de junio de 1872; pp. 188c-189c. In this essay Hostos comments on conversation topics among the *huasos*. Also, "Notas de un viajero", *Ibid.*; 22 de junio de 1872; pp. 196a-196c. In this second part of the essay, Hostos recounts how, while trekking to Llolli, an uninhabited place in the Andes, his horse stumbles and he almost falls to his death.

⁵³ Palma, *op. cit.*; v. II; p. 83.

⁵⁴ Palma, *op. cit.*; v. I; pp. 213-216.

APPENDIX

A Preliminary Sketch of Hostos's Works Published in *La Patria*

This controversy has a bearing on Hostos's *Obras completas*. Hostos and Caivano agree that Hostos wrote most of the editorials for the daily. Yet very few of them appear in the 1939 Havana edition of the *Obras*. Some very positive progress has been made including these forgotten gems in the new comprehensive *Obras completas* being edited by the University of Puerto Rico, Río Piedras.

Hostos claims he wrote all except four or five of the editorials. Caivano lists the ones that he believes Hostos did not write. By eliminating those in which Caivano disputes Hostos's authorship, accepting only those items which they both agree Hostos wrote, we can reduce the margin of error and propose some new essays for inclusion in the *Obras completas*. I have examined the three copies of *La Patria* held by the Biblioteca Nacional del Perú, two sets in the Sala de Investigadores Tauro and a third in the Hemeroteca. Even in spite of a number of missing dates, the possibility of various unacknowledged Hostos essays is very real. The problem with these articles, given the quarrel commented on in this paper, is the degree these essays are Hostos's pure work and, given the possibility of editorial blue-penciling, the degree they are not. Yet would Hostos affirm his lack of censorship if he did not agree with some or all the commentary expressed in the essays? An interesting question, since it is unlikely he would claim paternity to a doctored article with which he did not agree.

Caivano disputes Hostos's authorship for the following dates: July 28, Sept 5, Sept 6, Sept 11, one essay of several on Sept 20, three on Sept 21, and one each on Sept 22, Sept 25, Oct 10, Nov 4. I was unable to verify a few missing dates. Sundays are not relevant; they were generally printed in Italian, or not at all.

There are three possible citations for each essay. Initial references and dates refer to *La Patria*, "año 1." Subsequent references are to *Obras completas*, La Havana, Cultura, 1939, and finally to *Obras completas (Edición crítica)*, Río Piedras, Universidad de Puerto Rico, 1988-1997. Where no reference to either of the *Obras* is listed, there exists a possible Hostos essay, worthy to be included in the *Obras (Edición crítica)*.

July 28: No according to Caivano

Aug. 01: Speech to the "Amantes del Saber" Society, núm. 2.

Aug. 04: "Los principios," núm. 5.

Aug. 05: "La más peligrosa de las formas políticas," núm. 6.

Aug. 12: "Trabajadores chilenos"; *Obras completas* (Havana), VII, pp. 163-167.

- Aug. 18: "Los desamparados," núm. 16; *Obras completas* (Havana), VII, pp. 168-172.
- Aug. 25: "Los chinos," núm. 22; *Obras completas* (Havana), VII, pp. 173-177 (*Obras* lists date as Aug. 26).
- Aug. 31: "Justa concesión," núm. 26.
- Sept 01: "Concordia electoral," núm. 27.
- Sept 02: "Otra vez," núm. 28.
- Sept 04: "Medítelo," núm. 29.
- Sept 05: No according to Caivano
- Sept 06: No according to Caivano
- Sept 11: No according to Caivano
- Sept 12: "No quieren," núm 35.
- Sept 13: "Seguridad individual," núm. 36.
- Sept 16: "Yaraví"
- Sept 20: No according to Caivano
- Sept 21: No according to Caivano
- Sept 22: 3 published; Caivano denies Hostos's authorship to 1st:
 "El partido liberal"
 "La venida del señor Balta"
 "La persecución," núm. 43.
- Sept 23: 3 published:
 "Ya es tiempo"
 "La injusticia a la injuria"
 "El coronel Espinosa," núm. 44; Not included in *Obras* (Havana), but included in *Obras* (Río Piedras), v. I, t. II, pp. 236-239.
- Sept 25: No according to Caivano
- Oct. 02: "La dignidad," núm. 51.
- Oct. 06: "De Chimbote a Huaraz" o "El ferrocarril de los abismos" (pt. 1), núm. 55.
- Oct. 07: "De Chimbote a Huaraz" o "El ferrocarril de los abismos" (pt. 2), núm. 56.
- Oct. 07: "La colonia de Pozuzo," núm. 56;
- Oct. 09: "De Chimbote a Huaraz" o "El ferrocarril de los abismos" (pt. 3), núm. 57.
- Oct. 10: "De Chimbote a Huaraz" o "El ferrocarril de los abismos"

- (pt. 4), núm. 58. Curiously Caivano only denies authorship to Hostos on this part 4. Could it be that Hostos did not author this installment?
- Oct. 11: "De Chimbote a Huaraz" o "El ferrocarril de los abismos" (pt. 5), núm. 59.
- Oct. 12: "De Chimbote a Huaraz" o "El ferrocarril de los abismos" (pt. 6), núm. 60; *Obras completas* (Havana), (pts. 1-6), v. VII, pp. 185-205.
- Oct. 12: "Desesperados," núm. 60.
- Oct. 13: "Calmante," núm. 61.
- Oct. 17: "Armonías disonantes," núm. 64.
- Oct. 18: "Las abominaciones democráticas," núm. 65; not included in *Obras* (Havana), but included in *Obras* (Río Piedras), v. I, t. II, pp. 239-242.
- Oct. 19: "El bando," núm. 66.
- Oct. 20: "El pueblo," núm. 67.
- Oct. 23: "Contraste," núm. 69.
- Oct. 24: Too ambiguous to call
- Oct. 25: "La permanente y los estudiantes," núm. 71.
- Oct. 28: "Aramburú"
"Razonemos," núm. 74; not included in *Obras* (Havana), but included in *Obras* (Río Piedras), v. I, t. II, pp. 245-248.
- Oct. 30: "Oiga la buena fe," núm 75.
- Nov. 03: "Un concejo del presidente," núm. 78.
Given the particulars of this essay (see above), it should not be given consideration.
- Nov. 04: No according to Caivano
- Nov. 06: "Estado normal," núm. 80.
- Nov. 08: "Principios," núm. 82; not included in *Obras* (Havana), but included in *Obras* (Río Piedras), v. I, t. II, pp. 249-252.
- Nov. 09: "Esos torpes," núm. 83.
- Nov. 11: "La protesta del ejército," núm. 85.
- Nov. 15: "El americano," pt. II, núm. 88. (Is there a part 1, published Monday, November 13, or Tuesday, November 14?)
- Nov. 17: "El americano," pt. III, núm 90.

Beyond the essays that I found in my review of the various sets of *La Patria* held by the Biblioteca Nacional in Lima, the

editors of the *Obras completas* (Río Piedras) have discovered another work which they have included in their *Obras*:

Oct 12: "Vicisitud del patriotismo," title assigned by the editors, *Obras* (Río Piedras), v. I, t. II, pp. 242-245.