MASCULINITY AND NATIONAL IDENTITY IN THE 19TH-CENTURY PHILIPPINES

Norman G. Owen,
University of Hong Kong

"Razas de aluvión, por decirlo así, pertenecientes a los últimos grados de la escala humana, faltas de virilidad y espontaneidad..."
Vicente Barrantes, *El Teatro Tagalo* (1889).[1]

"No es que sueñe en el éxito, sino que sueño con que demostremos una resistencia por la que se diga: sois un pueblo varonil."
Antonio Luna, letter to José Rizal, January 1892.[2]

1. THE GENDERED DIALOGUE OF IMPERIALISM AND NATIONALISM

Nationalism, in a colonial context, creates itself in large part through dialogue with imperialism. Though it also has indigenous roots, many of its public utterances arise as rebuttals of colonial assertions. For just as colonialism seeks to justify itself (to itself, as well as to the world) by claiming superiority over the colonized, so resistance, at one stage or another, tends to frame itself as a counter-argument (to itself, as well as to the world): No, we are not inferior!

Gender is one thread within this dialogue, though rarely the most visible one. Recent studies of British imperialism, especially in India, show that underlying British assertions of superiority was implied masculinity: we are strong, we are rational, we are manly, and so we deserve to dominate. By inference (and sometimes overtly) the Indians were depicted as weak, irrational, "effeminate" and therefore worthy to be dominated, like women. (Nandy 1983; Sinha 1995; Anderson 1997. Such analyses of gender imagery are quite distinct from that of Hyam 1990, whose study tends to ignore the imagery of imperialism in favor of the practical question of how colonies created sexual opportunities for the colonizers).

Indian nationalists responded to this in several different ways. One was to deny it ("We'll show you who's manly!"), both in rhetoric and in armed resistance. Another was to accept and internalize the critique in part ("Yes, we are effeminate, but...") but to blame it on historical conditions and strive to overcome it, e.g., by participation in sporting activities, such as hunting and cricket, which the British proclaimed as manly. It might be suggested that Gandhi's satyagraha movement, emphasizing non-violence and hand-spinning, even for men, pointed to a third alternative, challenging the very premise of the accusation ("So what if we are, by your standards, feminine?")

---

[1] Quoted in Schumacher (1973), p. 125
[2] In Rizal (1933), p. 293

In the domestic arena, some Indian men reasserted their masculinity by trying for greater control over their women (wives, sisters, and daughters) by keeping them at home and out of the public eye. This connected with a more general articulation of "Indian-ness" in opposition to Western values, so that if Western women were seen to be "liberated," then by that very token Indian women ought not to be. (This development also had the psychological advantage- for men- of reinforcing a private sphere of power in which they might take refuge from their impotence in a public sphere dominated by colonialism, much to the regret of later feminists; Jayawardena 1996; Jayawardena and Alwis 1996.)

It is my hope here to open the search for comparable discourse in the Spanish Philippines during the latter part of the 19th century, acknowledging that this is only one individual step on what might prove to be a lengthy journey by many scholars. I have so far only scratched the surface. I did not start with the major Spanish figures who articulated anti-Filipino sentiments in the late 19th century, such as Vicente Barrantes, Francisco Cañamaque, Pablo Feced y Temprado ("Quioquiap"), Salvador Font, and W.E. Retana y Gamboa, though it might have seemed logical to do so. To analyze their rhetoric would be valuable, but it requires access to sources not readily available to me; the best research base for a study of this topic would be Barcelona or Madrid.

Instead I have begun by examining a selected sample of Filipino nationalist writings, in particular those of four members of the "Propaganda Movement" that flourished in Spain in the late 1880s and early 1890s: José Rizal y Mercado, Graciano López Jaena, Marcelino Hilario Del Pilar, and Antonio Luna y Novicio. Many of their writings (private letters as well as published articles and books) have been republished in the Philippines within the last fifty years, as has their journal, La Solidaridad, constituting a body of texts readily available (whether in the original Spanish or Tagalog or in English translation) to contemporary scholars.

The exact relationship of the "Propagandists" to the Katipunan-led Revolution against Spain which broke out in 1896 has been the subject of much recent debate. These were mostly young men, born in the 1860s (though Del Pilar, born in 1850, and López Jaena, born in 1856, were a few years older, and, as we shall see, were somewhat less concerned with such "masculinist" issues as personal bravery). They were highly Hispanized (within a society where fewer than 10% of the population spoke Spanish), relatively wealthy, and better educated than almost any of their Filipino contemporaries. Because they lived in Europe, rather than in the Philippines, during this period; because they wrote in Spanish, and often addressed themselves to a liberal Spanish audience; and because they stopped short of advocating revolution, or even separatism (either of which would have seen them jailed instantly), the "Propagandists" have been seen by some contemporary nationalists as irrelevant to the real "revolt of the masses" led by the Katipunan, which drew on more indigenous, or at least "Tagalized," sources of inspiration.

I do not propose to enter into this historiographic debate here, but will claim three justifications for this study. First, the Propaganda Movement clearly played a part in shaping Katipunan thinking, as can be shown by citing, for example, Andrés Bonifacio's many allusions to Rizal[3]. Second, its direct rhetorical confrontation with the publicists of Spanish colonial ideology allows us to re-create part of the imperialist-nationalist dialogue of the late 19th century, by "*reflecting*" back the slurs cast on Filipinos by these writers. Finally, the 20th-century status of its leaders as "national heroes" -whether justified or not- along with the wide availability of

[3] Cf. Ileto (1979), pàg. 103 and passim.

their writings (especially those of Rizal) has helped shaped modern Filipino identity, for better or worse. If similar analysis of the writings of leading Katipuneros (Bonifacio, Emiliano Jacinto, Apolinario Mabini, et. al.) should lead to different conclusions, it would not negate this study, merely amplify it.

II. LESS THAN MEN: CHARACTERIZATIONS OF FILIPINOS

Besides being accused of being women (or effeminate), people can be characterized in several different ways as less than "men": they can be animals or savages; they can be slaves or serfs; they can be children. Each of these carries different implications, and calls for different strategies of resistance, though, as we shall see, often these derogations or defenses overlap or elide into each other: Spanish imperialists might in the same chapter (or even the same paragraph) suggest that the Filipinos were animals, children, slaves, and savages. There were many possible ripostes to these attacks, and over time the Propagandists tried most of them: denying that a given category was inherently to be despised, denying that it fit the Filipinos (often by attempting to demonstrate that they had the noble qualities they were alleged to lack), or acknowledging the truth of the charge in part but asserting that it was only temporary, a defect from which they could recover.

Animals and Savages

One of the most blatant, and offensive, comparisons was with animals. Less common, perhaps, in the 19th century than it had been in earlier periods, the identification of Filipinos as animals -most frequently as either "monkeys" or "carabaos"- can still be found in apologists for late Spanish colonialism, as indeed in the American imperialists who succeeded them. Cañamaque's[4] description of Filipino schoolchildren as appea[ring] more chongos (monkeys) than rational beings" was highly resented[5]. López Jaena's[6] caricatures of wicked friars and overly Hispanophile Filipinas incorporated such bestial slurs as part of his depiction of their depravity.

Closely related to this, but far more common in use and sweeping in implications, was the charge that Filipinos were "savage" and uncivilized: less than fully human, in effect. To deny this, Filipinos had to prove that they were just as "civilized" as Spaniards, which can be seen as a key Propagandist strategy at least from 1880, when Pedro Paterno published in Madrid his volume of verse entitled Sampaguitas. It was a major theme in Rizal's work, whether through proclaiming the glories of pre-Hispanic Filipino society (especially in his annotations to Morga's Sucesos de Filipinas), conspicuously displaying his own erudition in several European languages, or satirizing the pretensions of Spaniards in the Philippines.

This last tactic, counter-attack, can also be found in López Jaena and Luna, who often cast doubts as to whether Spain itself could be considered fully "civilized." Luna, for example, compares Madrid with Morocco[7]; López Jaena[8] asks, after the death of a Filipina at the 1887 Madrid Exposition: "Where in the world are we? In Warsaw or in Spain?" But by and large the Propagandists did not challenge the underlying proposition that "civilization" was to be preferred to "savagery" (and deserved to rule over it) and that modern Europe, at its best, was the epitome of "civilization." One fleeting exception to this generalization was their formation in 1889

---

[4] Cañamaques (1877), p. 46.

[5] Cf. Castillo y Jiménez (1897), p.15, describing the indios following the mestizo "canallas" "like a dog".

[6] López Jaena (1974), pp. 137, 210.

[7] Jose (1972), pp. 43-45.

[8] López Jaena (1974) p. 149

of an organization of "Indios Bravos" (a term by which they addressed each other for a while), which represented an attempt to claim the hitherto derogatory term "indio" proudly as their own, though it eventually gave way to "Filipino" in their discourse[9].

The essence of being an animal, or a savage, was to be lacking in rationality, and many Propagandist endeavors were devoted to proving that they possessed this quality, or implying that some Spaniards lacked it[10]. To a considerable extent the Propaganda Movement was directed against the friars (and the Jesuits), whose influence in the Philippines was seen as the source of most of the country's evils; a recurrent element of their critique was the charge that the friars promoted "superstition," which was the antithesis of rationality and therefore, by implication, of full humanity[11].

Yet to be fully human -and here the Hispanic model seems to diverge significantly from British articulations of manhood in the late Victorian era- also implied passion, the possession and expression of strong (and appropriate) emotions. Cañamaque, in fact, takes the very absence of visible emotion at Filipino funerals -they displayed instead "something, that looks like indifference and borders on stupidity"- and their "most stupid impassivity" when their town burns down as evidence of their inferiority[12].

That the Propagandists internalized such beliefs can be seen most clearly in the young romantics Luna and Rizal, whose every essay and letter seems permeated with the display of strong emotions. "People who feel are not slaves," Luna proclaimed, and the Philippines is "a country of feeling; feeling is brother to art; it is thus that many artists develop there." In depicting a masked ball, he reveals a sensibility that would not have disgraced young Werther himself: "My imagination was afire, prisoner of a fantasy, a kind of fever or delirium, like that which an amateur feels before an exposition of paintings; and thus I did not know where to look, where to gaze and feast my eyes in the sublime display of beauty"[13]. Rizal similarly waxed rapturous about the Muses -"So sweet is their society that after having tasted it, I cannot conceive how a young heart can abandon it"- though he implies that he later outgrew such sentimentality[14].

Slaves

At the end of the 20th century, we tend to perceive social class as something that people achieve (or have thrust upon them), rather than as innate and inherent, and certainly there were among both Spaniards and Propagandists of the 1880s some who thought this way. López Jaena [15], for example, regards slavery as simply the result of external circumstances, for which the master bears all the blame. Friar oppression creates "moral slavery" in the Philippines (and "Fray Botod" boasts that the Filipinos are all "slaves of Spain"); the tribute law is tantamount to slavery; the absence of suffrage makes López Jaena himself "a Spaniard in Spain but an Indio in the Philippines, that is, slave, pariah, helot." Similarly, among the aims of the Asociación Hispano-Filipina were: "To make the Filipinos free; to convert the slave into a citizen; to concede to the

---

[9] Schumacher (1973) pp. 213-214.

[10] Cf. "Logic in the Philippines" (1884), López Jaena (1974) pp. 121-127.

[11] Ibid. pp. 244-252.

[12] Cañamaque (1877), pp. 20, 61-63; cf. the dismissive resignation of a Filipino to the fact that his wife and children have left him, pp.49-50.

[13] Jose (1972) pp. 88-90; LS (1967-73), pp. 2, 142-143.

[14] Rizal (1972) p. 101.

[15] López Jaena (1974), pp. 21, 210, 68, 45.

inhabitant, exploited in his work by greed which consumes all, the same privileges and inherent rights enjoyed by the Spanish citizen"[16].

Yet throughout much of human history slavery has been regarded as reflecting an internal quality, disgracing the slave as much as, or even more than, the master. Some people, it was felt, were innately servile, and thus inferior to those who ruled them: this was part of natural hierarchy in society. Not all humans, or even adult males, were equal; not all possessed "honor," the essence of manhood. To be a "man" was, in many societies, congruent not just with physical masculinity, but with social class[17]. Full manhood was often limited: to free men (or even just to "heroes") in ancient Greece, to knights and nobles in medieval Europe, to Gentlemen in Victorian England, to samurai in Tokugawa Japan. In 19th-century Germany only about 5% of men were deemed to be capable of "giving satisfaction" in a duel[18].

Some of the Propagandists appear to have internalized this essentialist perspective on the dependent conditions of the Filipinos, and wrestled at length with its implications. Rizal's dictum that without slaves there are no masters is well known. In his letter to the young women of Malolos (see below) he says: "The present enslavement of our compatriots is the work of our mothers because of the absolute confidence of their loving hearts and of their great desire to improve the lot of their children... The mother who can teach nothing else but how to kneel and kiss the hand should not expect any other kind of children but stupid ones or oppressed slaves"[19]. To the staff of *La Solidaridad* he wrote, "Liberty is a woman who grants her favors only to the brave. Enslaved peoples have to suffer much to win her and those who abuse her, lose her. Liberty is not obtained just like that [bobilis bobilis], nor is it granted gratis and amore"[20].

The implication that Filipinos might deserve their servitude can also be found from time to time in other Propagandists. Antonio Luna, in one of his bouts of despair, said, "I go on believing... in spite of myself, that we are not worthy neither of liberty, nor of anything; a slave country, we will live for a long time, the humble servant of our masters who will cross our face with the whip"[21]. The Katipunero Apolinario Mabini, early in the Philippine-American War of 1899, issued a proclamation with a similar subtext, asserting that those who were not inspired to rally to the defense of the fatherland were "worthy only to be slaves, pariahs, and helots"[22].

What were the (perceived) qualities that a slave lacked? Freedom or liberty itself was the most obvious, but this might be interpreted as secondary, the outcome of internal virtues. In a sense, this discourse is really about control, especially selfcontrol, both literal (not being enslaved) and spiritual or metaphorical (controlling one's fear?). To have such control was to be a true man; to lack it was to be something less. On this the Spanish and the Propagandists agreed, differing only (or primarily) in the extent to which the Filipinos' apparent lack of such control was real or fictive, permanent or mutable, and the product of internal failings or of external oppression.

The younger Propagandists were also obsessed with courage and honour, qualities associated in many societies with masculinity, but often with an elevated class position as well, a kind of machismo of the nobility or gentry. This obsession can be seen most clearly in Antonio Lu-

---

[16] Jose (1972), p. 66.
[17] Conenell (1995) pp. 67-86.
[18] Bourke (1997).
[19] Rizal (1964), pp. 58-59.
[20] Rizal (1931), pp. 2, 158.
[21] Catmaitan (1987) pp. 92-93.
[22] Jose (1972), p. 216.

na, who, after a quarrelsome childhood, grew into a dangerous young man. Even as adolescents he and his brothers studied fencing, and military tactics (under a retired Spanish cavalry major) and practiced shooting until they became legendary marksmen, held by others of their generation "in admiration mixed with fear"[23].

After seeing a "Wild West" exhibit at the 1889 Paris Exposition Antonio, his brother Juan, José Rizal, and other Filipino expatriates founded "Los Indios Bravos," whose very name suggests the manly role they saw for themselves[24]. Continuing his fencing lessons in Madrid, Antonio encouraged other Filipino expatriates to take part, "as I knew the consequences to one who does not know how to handle a saber or a foil," implying that Spaniards had overtly challenged their manhood (and thus, that of the Philippines) in this arena. Juan, a painter based in Paris, who on his visits to Spain would meet Antonio in exhibition matches, boasted that "the Filipinos now enjoy the fame of being brave and strong in the handling of weapons"[25].

These martial skills were not simply for display, however. Led by Antonio Luna, the Propagandists tried to challenge their Spanish critics to duels, and rejoiced when their own "honor" was vindicated in these encounters. In 1890 Dominador Gómez, according to Luna, forced an apology from the Conde de Asmir, while another Filipino (García) earned one from a certain Capitán Urbina "after having, received a thrashing". When W.E. Retana insulted Rizal's family, the nationalists were to claim, he was challenged and forced to back down; later, after another affront, they tried their best to provoke him (since general slurs were not in themselves a legitimate cause for a duel), but he refused to fight even after being, pushed in the road and insulted on the dance floor, thus revealing himself to be a coward[26].

The most famous quarrel was between Antonio Luna and Celso Mir Deas, who had attacked Juan Luna in print (as an ingrate and filibusters), thinking him to be the author of an anti-Spanish article that Antonio had actually written. Antonio, with the support of the Filipino community in Madrid, travelled up to Barcelona to challenge Mir Deas. When the latter avoided him, the Filipinos concluded publicly that henceforth Mir Deas was "incapable of taking part in any question involving honor." Nevertheless, Luna felt "the unavoidable necessity of seeking [him] out and spitting, in his face," and when he finally tracked him down, "I told him he was infamous, a coward, and a canaille. I spat on his face, and I threw my card in his face.] ...In this way, I believe I will show that we Filipinos have more dignity, more courage, more honor than this cringing, insulter and coward." When Mir Deas still refused to fight, they publicly proclaimed his Ignominy, and the final triumph came when a "tribunal of honor" consisting of seven Spanish editors upheld Luna's conduct throughout the whole affair[27].

Such "manly" behavior was not limited to defending national honor, however, and Luna actually approached violence with his fellow Filipinos more often than with Spaniards. While in Spain Luna, who had been drinking, once challenged Rizal to a duel over a remark supposedly made about the mestiza Nelly Boustead, whom both had courted- and was accepted, so that both parties' seconds had to intervene to prevent bloodshed[28]. Later, in 1899, as a general in the PhilippineAmerican War, he not only slapped and whipped those under his command,

---

[23] Jose (1972), p. 35.

[24] Schumacher (1973), pp. 213-216.

[25] Jose (1972) pp. 49-50.

[26] Ibid., pp. 72; but note that Schumacher (1991), does not mention any such physical confrontations between Retana and Filipino expatriates.

[27] Jose (1972), pp.73-77; Schumacher (1973), pp.174-175; Rizal (1931), p.249.

[28] Jose (1972), p.59.

but tried to challenge Tomas Mascardo, a fellow officer who had defied his authority and allegedly questioned his "balls" [bayag], to a duel. Twice he physically assaulted Felipe Buencamino, the Secretary of Foreign Affairs of the infant Republic, for supposed betrayal of the Revolution[29].

An even more spectacular demonstration of violent machismo among the Filipino expatriates was Juan Luna's 1892 murder of his wife and mother-in-law -the sister and mother of fellow expatriates Felix and Trinidad Pardo de Tavera- supposedly in a jealous rage. After four months' imprisonment he was acquitted by a French court on the grounds that he acted "in defense of his family honor"[30]. Though this was reprehended by some other Filipinos (including, obviously, the Pardo de Tavera family), it did not prevent Juan from remaining an honored member of the national elite, welcome in Manila society, and, after the Revolution, an official commissioner to present his country's case abroad[31].

While none of the other Propagandists were as hot-headed as the Luna brothers, many of them shared their enthusiasm for swordplay[32], and most hoped to demonstrate both their personal and their national bravery, which were easily conflated. Rizal seems to have been particularly concerned, as witnessed by his involvement in the "Indios Bravos" and public displays of swordplay[33]. When he claimed he had been insulted by a fellow-Propagandist in an article in *La Solidaridad*, he made sure to tell Del Pilar (the editor): "I esteem the courage of [Eduardo de] Lete in attacking me with so much ferocity and bravery and, above all, with such confidence. I like men of determination"[34]. (Lete in turn protested: iIf it were an attack against you, why should I not have done it face to face? Do you believe, perhaps, that I do not have enough courage to proceed with frankness?)[35]. Rizal's whole adult life, up to his execution in December 1896, may be seen as a series of deliberate efforts to keep testing, his own courage.

To the older Propagandists, however, the question of personal bravery seems to have been less significant. López Jaena may have talked about "crossing swords" [romper lanzas] with Spanish critics[36], but it appears that this was intended only rhetorically, and indeed some historians have accused him of cowardice[37]. On the question of national honor and courage, however, he was emphatic: The same Filipinos whom Quioquiap despised had "fought in manly manner" [pelearon virilmente] beside Spaniards against Limahong, and "demonstrated their *energy, valor and virility*" in defeating England in 1762, thus saving, Spain from the "ignominious affront" of the surrender of Manila by its archbishop. The campaigns against the Muslim south and the Franco-Spanish invasion of Vietnam also stood as "an eloquent testimony to Filipino heroism"[38]. In one of his few ventures into fiction, López Jaena credits his mestiza protagonist with "showing in her determined character the indomitable ferocity of indio blood in... the onward surge of her blind fury, and the affected Castilian disdain in the face of provo-

---

[29] Ibid. pp. 297, 301, 339, 351-352; Ocampo (1997), p.24.

[30] Jose (1972), p. 100; Ocampo (1990), pp.162-165; Ocampo (1997), pp. 33-35.

[31] Jose (1972), pp. 104-107, 147-148.

[32] Even Mabini studied at the "sala de armas" Antonio set up on his return to Manila in 1894; ibid., pp.105-106.

[33] Cf. Rafael (1995), pp. 146-147, on the photografs of Rizal and Luna in full fencing regalia.

[34] Gatmaitan (1987), p. 99; Rizal (1933), p.337.

[35] ibid., pp.104-105; Rizal (1936), p.20.

[36] López Jaena (1974), pp. 108; (1951), p. 115.

[37] Joaquin (1977), p.52

[38] López Jaena (1974)pp. 128-129; (1951), p.139; Cf. Del Pilar (1987), p.132, for a similar list of martial exploits as proof of Filipino courage.

cation"[39]. Del Pilar, more focussed on legal and political tactics than on public image, nevertheless, in writing to the young women of Bulacan (see below), contrasts "the way to virtue" with "the path of perversity and cowardice"[40].

Finally, a person might rise above slavery (and savagery) simply by displaying a certain nobility /of style. Dominador Gómez, reflecting back on the heady days of the Filipino colony in Spain, refers to their poise (garbo) as well as to their "incurable patriotic madness," admitting their lack of discipline but claiming that they possessed "for sole compass our burning love for the Philippines and for code our thorough social education as purest gentlemen, without fault or flaw"[41]. If a caballero, and therefore a.man, could also be recognized by his attire, his "sporting" habits, his womanizing, and even his mustache, it would appear that Luna (who took curling irons to the battle front!) and Rizal -though not the notoriously slovenly López Jaena- aspired to this condition.

Women (and Children)

In unpacking these various threads of discourse, we run the risk of overlooking the extent to which they were intertwined. Del Pilar [42], in "Ang Kalayaan" ("Liberty"; 1893), links the animal and slave motifs in noting that "The beast does not have that liberty, which man enjoys. It is not the master of itself. The beast that attacks another is a slave of its hunger, of its ire, of its desires... Not like man... God has created man... Luna in turn pulled together themes of bravery and adulthood when he asked for "a bit of consistency... which demonstrates that we are neither children nor cowards"[43].

It is in this context that we may examine the gendered component of this discourse, the Spanish insinuation that Filipinos were somehow effeminate and the insistence of the Propagandists that they were just as manly as any peninsular. Children are everywhere regarded as less than men, and the characterization of the colonized as childlike, requiring the "adult" supervision of colonizers, is a commonplace of imperialism. When Quioquiap characterized Filipinos as "adolescents" or "big children" or "La Voz de la Patria" referred to the "incurable childhood" [niñez incurable] of the race, it evoked an immediate response from the quick-tempered López Jaena[44], who interpreted such comments as proof of a desire "that the Filipinos remain children forever, that the friars be their eternal wet nurses [nodrizas]."

Overt Spanish challenges to the masculinity of Filipinos, on the other hand, were relatively rare, though not unknown, as the Barrantes quote at the beginning of this paper shows. Quioquiap also suggested that the beardlessness of Filipino men was a sign of the lack of virility of the race[45].

More common was a constellation of aspersions that associated (alleged) Filipino inferiority with (alleged) female failings. Women implicitly shared all of the shortcomings of other less-than-men categories. Like savages, they lacked fall rationality, and were prone to superstition;

---

[39] Ibid., p. 163.

[40] Gatmaitan (1987), p. 68.

[41] Joaquin (1977), pp. 45-46. I have been unable to locate the spanish original of this passage, but I assume that "gentlemen" would have been "caballeros".

[42] Gatmaitan (1987), pp. 111-113.

[43] Jose (1972), pp. 367-368.

[44] lópez Jaena (1974), pp. 128-129, 185; (1951), pp. 138-139, 195.

[45] Schumacher (1973), p. 56; cf. the allusion in "La Voz de la Patria" to "bearded sopranos" [tiples barbudos; López Jaena (1974), p. 184; (1951), p. 195].

although López Jaena[46] blames the friars for submerg[ing] the Filipino woman in the unfathomable abysses of the darkness of ignorance," he cannot resist mentioning out that this is achieved in part by "exalting her imagination, which being oriental, is given to fantasy." They lacked the full range of emotion. Though the best of them were "all feeling, all tenderness, all sweetness, who fainted at the prick of a needle"[47], it took a man to explore the limits of sensibility. "Do not look for effeminate [afeminadas] (pardon the expression) beauties in the works of [Juan] Luna; Luna was not born for that; rather look for the cruel, the terrible, the horrifying, water, blood, fire, conflagration, ruin... and you will see on his palette death, shadows, strifes, ruins, debris, catastrophes, panic, terror, volcanic eruptions, sorrows, anguish, exalted human passions, agitated nature, violent storms, bravura, dash [bizarria], bravery [marcialidad], turmoil..."[48].

Similarly, women were incapable of the masculine virtue of honor, though in chastity they had a kind of substitute, and their courage, though admirable, was in a sense like that of a child, for it was without physical strength. What they were best at, it appeared, was endurance, rather than action; this resonates with the images of the noble suffering of the Virgin Mary, and of mothers generally, still a powerful theme in Philippine culture today. If there was bravery, it was one of stoic acceptance rather than of heroic deeds, a virtue available to those who did not fully control themselves, but were controlled by others[49].

Weakness, with or without overt gendering, was a recurrent theme in the imperialism-nationalistdiscourse. Quioquiap ("Ellos y Nosotros," El Liberal, 13/2/1887) refers to "the poor indio, weak in body and weak in mind" [cuerpo flaco y flaco cacumen] and to the recurrent image of "the castila, proudly on his feet, the Malay, submissively on his knees"[50]. The Filipinos, among themselves, expressed concerns about their "strength" or "weakness." Juan Luna is proud that they are "strong in handling weapons," and, even when apologizing for Antonio's excesses, insists that he is of "strong character"[51]. Antonio refers (publicly and satirically) to the Philippines as a "young nation of weaklings, without spirit, people whose afflicted skins persist in remaining sore"; then, in a rare moment of discretion, he suggests privately that for tactical reasons the Propagandists should avoid "boasting of our strength" or "demonstrating a power that we do not possess"[52]. Pedro Serrano Laktaw alludes twice to "weaklings" among alleged Manila subversives who appeared to be willing, to back down in court[53].

Yet weakness was also, in the minds of these men, an essential element of femininity. Luna refers to "the melancholy of all her being that breathes [respira] the majestic weakness of women, a soul which says what it means and feels what it says" [54], while Rizal suggests that a patriotic young woman should demand "a manly heart that can protect her weakness," rather than a "weak and timid heart"[55]. In short, although the Propagandists, as we shall see, resent-

---

[46] (1974), pp. 23-26.

[47] Jose (1972), pp. 54-55.

[48] López Jaena (1974), p. 34; (1951), p. 38.

[49] It is perhaps worth mentioning here that the congratulations to the young women of Malolos were often mixed with warnings of the "calumnies" of "detractors" that they would still have to endure; López Jaena (1974), p. 238; LS (1967-73), p. 89.

[50] Schumacher (1973), p. 56; López Jaena (1951), pp.138-139.

[51] Jose (1974), pp. 50, 59.

[52] Ibid., pp. 80, 98.

[53] Gatmaitan (1987), pp. 28-29.

[54] LS (1967-73),pp. 2, 440; Jose (1972)p. 366.

[55] Rizal (1964), p. 63

ed the aspersions Spaniards cast on Filipinas and expressed qualified respect for female intellectual and spiritual capacities, they did not challenge the basic Hispanic premise that to be feminine was to be inferior. Like their Spanish opponents they believed that women's only proper destiny was marriage and motherhood, through which their fulfillment was inevitably to be found in supplying the needs of their husbands and children. The Propagandists professed great admiration for women, but always insisted that they themselves were Men.

Men -powerful, mature males, who might serve as role models- are, however, notably absent from the writings of the Propagandists. Fathers, except for weak buffoons like Capitán Santiago, are scarcely mentioned. In the speeches, essays, and short stories, there are few positive references to older men, except some of the liberal Spanish politicians cultivated by López Jaena, though there are villains in the form of friars and their sympathizers. Much the same is true of *Noli*, where the essential contest is between (older) friars and young patriots. On the side of virtue is also Old Tasio, but his wisdom is not marched by his strength (cf Rizal's real-life admiration for Filipino priests José Burgos -deceased- and Vicente García - old and frail); the liberal Spanish authorities who appear to favor the cause of justice turn out to be weaklings in the face of the evil potency of the friars. For male role models, the Propagandists effectively only have themselves.

"Masculinity," like other social constructs, can only be defined -only exists, in effect- by virtue of the "other," by what it is not [56]. I will not enter here into the full range of possible "others" for the male Propagandists, but they may have included, at least at a subconscious level, the "third sex" (essentially transvestites), which has been an integral, if concealed, category in Philippine society since the days of pre-hispanic shamans. J. Neil C. Garcia (1997) provides an elegant and concise answer to the question raised by Isagani Cruz, "Was Rizal gay?," in which he points out not only that the question, as posed, is meaningless in terms of late 19th-century categories, but that the evidence that would enable us to answer it probably does not exist. Alternative sexualities are, for all practical purposes, not mentioned in the sources by and about the Propagandists that have survived, though we might note the adolescent amusement of López Jaena[57], in his crude and clumsy satire, "Un parto (literario) de D. Manuel Lorenzo y D'Ayot," asking whether his opponent is male or female [hembra o macho?], and, if male, how he can give birth, the answer being that his pen is his wife and he himself is the midwife [comadrón y partero], etc. Some subtle scholar may yet be able to deduce from the Propagandists' life and works (including posing as female models for paintings?) what they secretly felt about alternative sexualities, which could enhance our historical understanding greatly. At this stage we can only say that at a more overt level, their masculinity seems to have been defined very much in relationship to Woman, in two senses: to be a Man was to be a not-Woman, and being a Man implied specific ways of dealing with Women.

MOTHERS, MARIA CLARA, AND THE MAIDENS OF MALOLOS

In examining the attitudes of the Propagandists toward women, it is always important to remember that most of them were young and unmarried. Their ambivalence was based on ignorance, as much as on anything else. From their mothers (and sisters) they had generally learned to respect and admire women. Hispanized Catholicism had provided, in the felicitous phrase of Boxer (1975), a mixture of "Mary and Misogyny," the holiness of the Virgin juxtaposed with Eve's role in tempting men to destruction: woman as madonna or whore. Spanish

[56] Connell (1995), pp. 68-71.

[57] (1951),pp. 141-45; (1974),pp. 131-136.

machismo and romanticism reinforced their post-adolescent vision of women as objects of desire. Yet in the course of their wandering educational and political careers -into their 20s or early 30s- they rarely had the chance to develop meaningful close relations with any women outside the family of their birth.

Although he waxed sentimental about his female friends and lost loves, José Rizal was in fact a bit of a butterfly, flitting across the Philippines and Europe from one flirtation -and engagement- to another until he finally married Josephine Bracken literally on the eve of his execution [58]. He writes of a vague "longing" for a woman who would be "the partner of our heart, who shares our happiness and our misfortune"[59], but he spent most of his adult life without any such soul-mate, and in his novel Noli me Tangere Crisostomo Ibarra managed to be heroic with only the minimum of help from his true love, the hapless María Clara. Similarly, Antonio Luna describes (fictionally?) leaving, behind in Manila an unnamed woman "who felt more than anybody else my departure," whose rose he kept in the pages of his Materia Medica for years; then writes of "falling helplessly in love" and becoming "the official fiancé" [novio] of a "Madrid rosebud" [pimpollo]; then claimed to have been the "novio" of Nelly Boustead ("to love is not a crime, and if we had any fault it was for having concealed our love"), who soon became involved with Rizal instead; and when he returned to the Philippines he flirted amiably with various ladies of Manila and its suburbs, but he never married[60].

Yet among the Filipino expatriates in Spain, Rizal and Luna were not even among "the prime experts in the feminine line" who recruited women for their fiestas, as Gómez recollected it - eight are named, not counting Ariston Bautista Lim, who possessed the finest chami (antinc,-antinc,) against female resistance[61]. And though Juan Luna achieved his reputation by painting huge epic canvasses such as "Spoliarium", "The Blood Compact," and "The Battle of Lepanto," he was equally well known in certain circles for portraying the women of the streets of Madrid. López Jaena[62] quotes a Spanish connoisseur as saying, "The chulas painted by Luna are the real chulas... who stupefy; they are the free and easy chulas-the very same chulas of the very same Lavapies with all their witticism, their facetiousness, and their strut. To paint chulas, Luna."

With the exception of the solidly-married Del Pilar -who regularly wrote to his wife enquiring about her welfare and that of their two daughters- most of the Propagandists' dealings with women took the form either of superficial romance or of romantic fancy. To López Jaena[63] they are always "very beautiful ladies," "gracious women... the most beautiful ladies as the houris of Mohammed's heaven," mestizas "lovely and graceful, with the alabaster skin of the father, with fascinating dreamy eyes, like those of the mother; with graceful gait that sways like the climbing palm when stirred by the wind," "beautiful rosebuds," and "the fair sex." Luna rhapsodizes over brief encounters in the past: "What memories one has afterwards: her languor, her voice which reaches the soul; those rosy cheeks flushed with happiness, the excitement and the fatigue of the dance; the shy glance from dark eyes which mirror the soul like bright stars in a dark sky"[64].

Eventually the women of the Propagandists' imaginings seem more abstractions than actu-

---

[58] Guerrero (1971); Ocampo (1995), pp. 107-40.
[59] Rizal (1964), pp. 61-62.
[60] Jose (1972), pp. 42, 54-60, 107, 367-68; LS (1967 73), pp. (2) 473-74, (1)796-97.
[61] Joaquin (1977), pp. 47-48.
[62] (1974), pp. 176.
[63] (1974), pp. 39-41, 157, 199, 235-6, 244-52.
[64] Jose (1972), pp. 37.

al people. López Jaena[65] pens "A Sentence of Love" to the "Beautiful and Elegant Ladies of the Philippines... adorable Filipino women... Beautiful Filipino ladies!" with phrases such as these: "We are enthusiastic admirers of woman, we long for her social and religious redemption; we adore her in the august person of our mothers, our wives, daughters and sisters; we esteem her as a complement, an integral part of humankind, a providence in the home, inexhaustible treasury of comfort in our affections; we understand that woman deserves the highest considerations for her present position in society" - more eloquent than believable.

Mother Love

In almost every human society the intense love of a mother for her child is reciprocated, both in myth and reality, so it would be hard to prove that Filipinos or Spaniards of the late 19th century loved their mothers more, or more expressively, than, say, Irishmen or Jews or Japanese. Yet strong affection was certainly encouraged in these Hispanized societies, reinforced symbolically by the cult of the Virgin Mary, and we might to expect to find it particularly in unmarried sons. The mother figure tends to be totally idealized; there is little or no "shading" of her image, nor is there open admission of any mixed feelings about her.

For Rizal and Antonio Luna, the most important women in their lives were their mothers. Much has been written about Rizal's admiration of, and identification with, his mother, Theodora Alonso, who provided him with his earliest education and did much to shape his values, not just in childhood but throughout his life. His novels are full of mothers, from the tragic peasant Sisa, whose unbearable exploitation eventually drives her insane, to the stoic Capitana Maria, able to watch silently as her sons are beaten for a patriotic cause. There are good mothers and bad mothers, but the very worst women, Rizal implies, are those who are never mothers at all[66].

As for Luna, who came back from Europe when his mother summoned him and left everything to her in his last will, Trinidad Pardo de Tavera recalled that "The only one who [could] stop him and quiet his temper was his mother, whom he deeply loved and respected." In one essay, he praised a Spanish landlady who reminded him of his mother, and in "Episodio Revolucionario (Histórico)" (1898) his patriotic protagonists grew up "loving deliriously their mother who educated them with modesty and simplicity"[67]. López Jaena[68] begins his "Thoughts" [Pensamientos] with: "To My Mother. Your son lives; he lives for the Philippines; and in living for the Philippines, he lives for your love, for your affection."

The equation of love of mother with love of country was a commonplace among the Propagandists, but nevertheless was often clearly sincere. To the ideal mother a son owes not only unquestioning love and loyalty but, once he is man enough, protection, a willingness to sacrifice, even to die, in her defense. This conviction makes even stronger the constant appeal to the "Mother Country" (Madre Patria), a phrase commonly employed by the Propagandists, most floridly in speeches by López Jaena[69] who refers to the Philippines as the "daughter" of "Mother Spain" -"this tender and affectionate mother"- and to Cuba and Puerto Rico as "our amiable and beautiful sisters."

Spain was not, of course, the only "mother country" of Filipinos in the late 19th century. To

---

[65] (1974), pp. 244-252.

[66] Santiago (1992), pp. 119-120, pointing to "Dofia Consolación" in Noli as "the epitome of the devil woman".

[67] Jose (1972), pp. 278, 222, 46, 448-9.

[68] (1974), p. 51 ; (1951), p. 55.

[69] (1974), pp. 23, 32, 35, 64, etc.

Rizal, in particular, the Philippines itself was constantly evoked: "We have over us a duty: to redeem our mother from her captivity; our mother is pawned: we must redeem her before we amuse ourselves"[70]. Perhaps the most perceptive and subtle analysis of this imagery is by Vicente L. Rafael[71], who explores metaphors of dreaming, memory, translation, and mouming in Rizal's imagining of the "motherland." As separatist sentiment began to arise, and especially as the revolution approached, loyalties began to shift more openly from "Mother Spain" to "Mother Philippines" (Inang Bayan), although this created psychological, as well as rhetorical dilemmas: how could "Mother Spain" be bad? Under what circumstances could Filipinos justifiably revolt against even such a "mother"?[72].

But the transfer of affection -of identity- was made, and symbolically consummated on 21 January 1899, when Aguinaldo proclaimed the promulgation of the constitution: "Now we have married our mother, the Philippines, with the Sovereign People in what we call the Philippine Republic"[73]. The continuing linkage between love of (actual) mother and love of country is displayed in Luna's "Episodio," which culminates in the heroic mother saying to her patriotic son, "Your mother blesses you. I live happily [gustosa] for my Country [Patria] my son and my money. We are content, and there where you are, will be your mother"[74].

Fathers, as noted, are generally absent or insignificant, except insofar as the concept may be verbally embedded in the term "Patria." Sometimes parents are mentioned jointly, but the constant assumption is that mothers are responsible for all child-raising. Men are only involved as progenitors and providers, and even that is not particularly emphasized; there is no suggestion that a "manly" man is one who sires many children.

Sisters and Sweethearts

The realm of women in general, and young, unmarried women in particular, was a much more precarious one for the Propagandists. Such maidens ,were, of course, the object of romantic fantasies, but sometimes they were also sisters -literal or figurative- to be protected, like mothers, from the unwelcome attentions of other men. As in many other nationalisms, including that in British India, the protection of "our" women from "other" males became an emotional rallying-cry. Men, it seems, will almost always fight with other men over women, trying to protect the "honor" of those they claim and, as opportunity permits, to "dishonor" those claimed by their enemies. (Thus the evenings many of the Filipino expatriates spent in the brothels of Madrid and Barcelona may have been, at some level, expressions of a kind of nationalism as well as of lust, boredom, and the desire for camaraderie.)

Stories of Spanish friars forcing themselves on innocent young Filipinas were a staple of the Propaganda Movement, with those in Rizal's novels (*Noli* and *El Filibusterismo*) the best-known, though not quite as lurid as the sketch "Fray Botod" by López Jaena, which compares the friar's entourage of "candingcanding" (she-kids [cabritas]) to the "Oriental dancers" (temple prostitutes) of India[76]. Paradoxically, Del Pilar's La soberania monacal, the most sustained

---

[70] Rizal (1933), pp. 3-6 1.
[71] (1995), pp. 136-46.
[72] Ileto (1979), pp. 121-31, 192-94.
[73] Jose (1972), pp. 172.
[74] Ibid., 448-49.
[75] (1974), pp. 195-219.
[76] The suggestion of Rafael (1995), pp. 146-47, that the friars were "menacingly androgynous" to the Propagandists I find fascinating, but not convincing, since similar reactions are found, both in the Philippines and elsewhere, to foreign oppressors who did not wear long robes.

attack on the friars, barely raises this particular allegation, referring in passing to those arbitrarily deported at the friar's whim, including "the fathers and mothers of unconquerable beauties [hen-nosuras inconquistables]"[77].

But it was not only the friars who threatened the honor of Filipinas. Both of López Jaena's other published sketches -"Everything is Humbug" (Todo es 'hambug') and "Between Kastila and Filipina" (Entre kastila y filipina)[78]- revolve around Filipinas who marry Spaniards and end up ashamed or degraded by them. Filipino expatriates attempted to pick a fight with W.E. Retana when he insulted Filipino womanhood[79], and many of the essays of Luna were clearly intended to convey the message that Filipinas were more attractive (and more chaste) than Spanish imperialists said. As soon as the Philippine-American war began in 1899, Philippine propaganda was once again full of alleged sexual insults and assaults, from strip-searching women in the streets to outright rape[80].

Only Del Pilar, who had daughters himself, seemed capable of separating female from national honor, suggesting that it was not just foreign oppressors who posed a threat to young Filipinas. In his letter to the young women of Bulacan (see below) he describes the practice of local women going to Manila as wet-nurses [nodrizas] as scandalous: "This affects our honor, virgins of Bulacan"[81]. And when his daughter Sofia reached puberty he wrote to warn his wife of the dancers she might encounter, such as "someone who would not be ashamed if he thinks of offending my daughter"[82]. Like the rest of the Propagandists, however, and like the Spanish imperialists they were combatting, Del Pilar still considered female virtue an appropriate site for male struggles. Once (in jest?) he told a friend how best to revenge himself on someone: "...make love to his wife. This is the attitude that one takes for those who always like to take the advantage. Tell the woman that you envy her husband for having married a precious jewel"[83].

Men needed to protect the "honor and dignity" of the women under their care, but the women themselves also had to display "modesty," which was considered one of the essential attributes of civilization. The absence of this virtue was frequently alleged by Spanish critics of the Philippines. Cañamaque[84], for example, leers at a young Filipina bride-to-be wearing a short skirt and a revealing blouse, chides the nude river porters (male and female) and those roadside dwellers who come out undressed to stare at travellers for their lack of "decency" (honestidad), omits as unsuitable for reader's eyes the suggestive lyrics of the rhyming couplets recited at a native dance, and implies that a number of village marriages are within prohibited degrees of consanguinity (and are therefore, technically, incestuous), all within the first 60 pages of a 590-page book!

Antonio Luna, in return, contended that Filipinas were in fact more modest than the Spanish women. In Madrid, he complains, the women are loud and blasphemous and even kiss in public. Close dancing in bars demonstrates "the height of indecency: the curves of women disappeared completely smothered in the arms of the men... That was immorality of the highest

---

77 Del Pilar (1987), pp. 1-19.
78 López Jaena (1974), pp. 137-141 and 157-166.
79 Jose (1972), p. 72.
80 Jose (1972), pp. 194, 214, 239, 262-63.
81 Gatmaitan (1987), p. 69.
82 Ibid., pp. 114-115.
83 Gatmaitan (1987), p. 56; cf. Luna trying to provoke Retana by grabbing away the girl he was dancing with; Jose (1972), p. 72.
84 (1877), pp. 29-31, 42, 60, 34.

order; decency thrown overboard; civilization and culture... where?"[85]. Although he found the Madrileñas very attractive he claimed he had little respect for Spanish women, who "left much to be desired in their frank manners, never seen by me among our respectable women who attend our dances." The contrast is explicit; once, Luna writes, he kissed his "Filipina sweetheart" and he was slapped "because she thought she was disgraced no end; but here in Spain, kisses are just an ordinary thing!"[86]

His ambivalence toward the "available" women of Europe is apparent here, as it is in his sympathetic pen-portrait of a Madrid prostitute, "Magdalena"[87]. She was "of poor but honorable parents," but had been betrayed by her lover [novio] and became "one of these young women who start by giving up modesty and end by selling their bodies for a handful of silver." Yet "the world condemns her without understanding her," and mocks as a fool anyone who tries to befriend her or to release her from her "luxurious jail." This may well be fictional, rather than actual reportage, but it is consonant with the sensibility of a young, man who seems -like many young men- embarrassed by the contrast between his romantic ideals and his own urges, who can write with relief to Rizal about the Boustead sisters, "I do believe that we have behaved valorously and saved absolutely our girls, though we are very sorry that these poor girls have suffered so much for us and that we are the cause of it all"[88].

Yet neither Luna nor Rizal wound up with Nelly Boustead (or her sister), and this lack of permanent commitment to any one woman -as opposed to the idealized Woman- also appears to be characteristic of the Propagandists, with the usual exception of Del Pilar. Some avoided settling down because they were too busy par-tying with chulas. Others, like Rizal -who was renowned for refusing to visit the brothels of Spain- found that a keen sense of nationalist duty kept summoning them away from one "love" after another. Almost all, to be fair, were also in financial straits that would have made it difficult for them to marry overseas, though most were past the age (22-24) at which young men normally married in the Philippines. (Juan Luna's artistic success made it possible for him to marry Paz Pardo de Tavera in Paris, but their marriage was hardly a model of monogamy or stability!) Promiscuity, patriotism, and penury all seemingly led to the same conclusion: it was fine to admire women in Europe -whether closely or from afar- but not to make a serious commitment to them.

But if young women in Europe might or might not be fair game for a brief romantic fling, Filipinas -at least those of the elite class- were not, and the more that the Propagandists wrote about them, the less convincing their portraits are. By far the best known is María Clara, heroine of the *Noli*: beautiful and fragile, humorless and prone to fainting, a perennial victim and a bumbler. She is bullied by her parents and abused by the friars (one of whom turns out to be her real father); she betrays her lover and winds up in a nunnery, only to be further abused there. As Carmen Guerrero Nakpil (1962) put it, "she made a talent for unhappiness her greatest virtue."

Generations of Filipino feminists have wrestled with this character, particularly since Nakpil's cynical aphorism that María Clara was the "greatest misfortune that has befallen the Filipina in the last one hundred years." Some have attempted -with little success- to argue that the portrait is satirical: "Though commonly thought to be Rizal's ideal role model for women,

---

[85] Jose (1972), pp. 52-53; LS (1967-73) n° 1, p.715-17.

[86] Jose (1972), pp. 101-102, 366; LS (1967-73), n° 2, pp.143-145; cf. "Un Beso en Filipinas," LS (1967-73), n° 2, pp. 472-485, with its concluding sigh,"*¡Cuánto cuesta besar a las filipinas!*").

[87] Jose (1972), pp. 53-54, 85-86; LS (1967-73), n° 2, pp.108-111.

[88] Jose (1972), pp. 56-57.

María Clara actually provides a subtle critique of the predominant mold of women in his time"[89]. But most are reduced to admitting that Rizal, whose observations of the older female characters in his novels are deft[90], simply had a blind spot for a certain vapid type of young woman, particularly one who symbolized virtue, the feminine principle that masculine nationalism was duty-bound to protect.

The Philippines, even when it was not expressly "Inang Bayan," was always figured as female. Rizal's poetry (especially the "Song of María Clara" in *Noli*) and López Jaena's rhetoric reflect the same tropes, which perhaps reaches their peak in Fernando Ma. Guerrero's 1899 poem, "Mi Patria" (published in Luna's *La Independencia*). This personalizes "Filipinas" as, among other images, an intrepid matron, an "heiress of giants," a "*maga*", and a "divine nymph." The figure is explicitly sensual:

"She has stars on her brows
and honey from the rose on her lips.
When amorously she smiles
dawn gives her its rays"

[...*tiene estrellas en su frente / y en sus lablos miel de rosa..amorosa / la aurora la da sus rayos*]

but ultimately untouchable, because she is, in the end, the:

"sacred mother of my life,
that nourishes my wounded soul
with the fire of your vigor!"

[...*santa madre de mi vida, / que nutriste mi alma herida, / con fuego de tus ardores*] [91]

How could any man, any patriot, fail to be attracted, and yet daunted by, such forbidden beauty?

A few years later the "subversive" Filipino playwrights of the early 19th century also encoded the nation and freedom as female, fought over by patriots on one side, colonialists and collaborators on the other. Rafael[92] says that "It is if these dramas... [cast] nationhood in terms of the masculine struggle over a feminized object... Women personify the beloved nation waiting to be rescued." He goes on to add, however, that women "are objects of masculine contention, but they are also active interlocutors in the debate over the future disposition of their body politic." It is hard to find such agency in Propagandist creations like María Clara, though there was, as we shall see in the case of the young women of Malolos, some ambivalence when confronted by Filipinas acting decisively in real life.

Where did this leave the Filipina, in the Propagandist construction of national masculinity? Mostly as a lovely abstraction, the target of patriotic and romantic ardor, more acted upon than acting herself. Luna's rhapsodies on the belles of his youth -presumably dating back to his adolescent poems on the young women of La Concordia College- are even more two-dimensional than María Clara. They evoke a young man's lyrical reveries of feminine beauty rather than any actual damsel that might have inspired them: "... they possess exquisite sensitivity, a faithful character... The Filipino woman, whom we might call a song rather than a poem [Que es canto, mas bien que frase], is in a high social position"[93]. Rizal's expatriate musings -"Les femmes de mon pays me plaisent beaucoup; je ne m'en sois la cause, mais je trouve chez-elles un je ne

---

[89] López-Gonzaga (1996), p. 144.
[90] Santillan-Castrence (1960); cf Santiago (1992), pp. 120-122.
[91] Jose (1972), pp. 163-167.
[92] Rafael (1993), pp. 212-213.
[93] Jose (1972), pp. 34, 366.

sois [sic] quoi qui me charme et me fait rêver"- reflect the same inability to articulate the "I don't know what" that charms him[94].

It is to the credit of the Propagandists, however, that although they inherited a Hispanized, hierarchical view of the relationship between men and women that they were rarely able to transcend, at least they did not try to make it any more masculinist than it already was. They never suggested increasing the control of (male) heads of households over wives and daughters, for example, much less confining, them in some kind of purdah, which became a sub-theme of contemporary Indian nationalism. No doubt this was largely because their arch-enemies, the Spanish friars, embodied patriarchal conservatism in the Philippines, whereas in British India, Western imperialism appeared in the opposite role, as more liberal than local customs. But surely it also reflected the fact that the Propagandists' own families contained women who, even if they accepted their symbolic subordination to men (as the Church ordained) were hardly likely to accept, or flourish under, tighter control. Nor did the Propagandists, to my knowledge, urge that masculinity be expressed through more vigorous procreation; if the Philippines is over-populated today, and if this is due in part to male pride in fathering many children, it is not the fault of Rizal, Luna et al.

In fact the Propagandists acknowledged the capacity of women in their lives, even if they generally seemed incapable of depicting it in their fiction and verse. Rizal's letters to his sisters (who would become leaders of the women's branch of the Katipunan after his death) show an active, if paternalistic, concern for their intellectual and personal development. A few years later (in 1898) Luna, as editor of *La Independencia*, recruited two women -Rosa Sevilla and Florentina Arellano- to his staff[95], the first female journalists in the Philippines. He also published in it a story about a noble mother and her heroic son and devoted daughter, full of high-flown expressions of matemal love and patriotism, which includes the curious observation that the widowed mother was quite a businesswoman, "with good revenues, and hard-working and active like the Filipino women of twenty years ago. There was no business that she was not studying nor enterprise in which she was not subscribing to some shares. Rich, her wealth grew through her commercial ingenuity, through her economy." Presumably Luna wrote this to appeal to just such women, in the hope that they might contribute to the war effort, but whatever his motives, he apparently had no difficulty reconciling the enterprise of "Doña Titay" with his remarks eight years earlier on "the majestic weakness of women"[96].

The Maidens of Malolos

Nowhere was the ambivalence of the Propagandists more clearly -which is to say, more confusedly- expressed than in the case of the young women of Malolos, which came to their attention early in 1889, just as *La Solidaridad* was launched. The facts of the matter, as known to the Propagandists, were simple. Some twenty young women (Del Pilar called them "muchachas," but López Jaena referred to them as "las jóvenes" and as "señoritas," and Rizal addressed them in Tagalog as "dalagas") from the town of Malolos in the province of Bulacan requested that they be allowed to establish an evening school in which they could study Spanish at their own expense. The local friar, who effectively controlled the town, prevented this, but when Governor General Valeriano Weyler came to the province on 12 December 1888, they presented him with a petition to orant their request, which he did (though there are hints that this did not settle the matter completely).

[94] Rizal (1962), pp. 42.
[95] Jose (1972), p. 161, and plate VIII, after 224.
[96] Ibid., pp. 448-49, 366.

This news was greeted by the Propagandists with great glee, and Del Pilar immediately wrote to Rizal, who was in London, asking him to "write them a letter in Tagalog" which would be "a help for our champions [campeones] there and in Manila"[97]. Rizal complied at once, and his letter of February 1899 (which circulated in manuscript) has become one of the defining documents of women's history in the Philippines[98]. At the same time López Jaena wrote "Amor a Espana, o A las jóvenes de Malolos"[99] for *La Solidaridad*, and a month later the same journal published a sonnet by "Kuitib" (?) entitled "A las dalagas malolenses"[100]. Meanwhile, Del Pilar wrote to his niece, Josefa Gatmaitan, in the neighboring town of Bulacan (the provincial capital), and through her to "the young women of Bulacan" about these events[101]. These works provide us with a corpus of texts in which we can see some of the different ways in which male nationalists dealt with the triumph of their Filipina sisters.

López Jaena rejoices in the news because it shows that "the Filipino people does not want to remain behind the contemporary movement; when even the women [hasta las mujeres] are asking for education, light, instruction" it is proof of neglect in the Islands. Now "one petition, and a petition of women" at that, has triumphed over "Machiavellian intrigue."

For too long, he continues, obscurantist elements have taken advantage of the "oriental" imagination of the Filipina to deceive her, but now Weyler, "great patriot and liberal, knowing that the influence of women on society is everything", resolved this question satisfactorily. He praises "the noble intrepidity, the admirable attitude and tenacity" with which these "charming" [simpáticas] young women presented their petition, demanding justice and "vindication of their reputation [honras] and loyalty," which had been secretly questioned. It is ridiculous to impute to them any other motive than to "be able to speak the harmonious and melodious language" of the ìpatria," and therefore to be Spaniards in reality [hecho] as well as in law [derecho].

These wishes of the "fair sex" deserve our enthusiastic support, López Jaena says, the more so as we are democratic; they should be an example to women in other towns. Their determined movement encourages us beyond measure [nos halaga sobremanera]; Spain, "our common mother," will surely succeed in improving political and social conditions in these towns. Finally, he suggests to the "charming" young ladies that "tomorrow, when they are mothers," they should not forget that they owe their advancement to the homeland [patria], and that their sacred duty as women and Spanish mothers is "to infuse in the tender hearts of their children inextinguishable love for Spain."

To López Jaena, then, the young women of Malolos are essentially just a wonderful new weapon in his ongoing campaigns to claim for Filipinos the rights of Spanish citizens and to weaken and denigrate the power of the friars. The presumed weakness of women makes their success here all the more gratifying; their decorative quality makes it all the more appealing. There is not even the flicker of any recognition that the "fair sex" might aspire to more than speaking melodious Castilian and becoming patriotic Spanish mothers.

"Kuitib," in his sonnet, celebrates the "illustrious [preclaras] virgins of the Orient" for inspiring hope amid doubts and "patient suffering," and calls on them to:

---

97 Rizal (1931), p. 120.

98 The Tagalog text and a Spanish translation can be found in Rizal (1931), pp. 122-139; Rizal (1964), pp. 56-66 contains an English translation.

99 López Jaena (1951), pp. 241-245; (1974), pp. 234-238; LS (1967-73), n° 1, pp. 12-18.

100 LS (1967-73), nº 1, p.89.

101 Gatmaitan (1987), pp. 67-71.

"Inspire the defenders of the nation
Lend your charm to their valor
In seeking the splendors of progress.
And invoking memories of greatness
Foment the common ardor-
The outburst of love, courage and grandeur."

[*Animad a los patrios defensores, / Uniendo vuestro encanto a su proeza / Del progreso al buscar los esplendores; / Y evocando recuerdos de grandeza / Volcanicen un-nimes ardores/ La explosión del amor, valor y alteza.*]

Though this appears more heartfelt, and less obviously manipulative, than López Jaena's message, it reaches the same conclusion. The significance of the young women of Malolos is not in themselves, but in what they inspire in (male) others, whether the "patrios defensores" or their own children, through their courage, their patriotism, or their "charm."

Rizal's letter is lengthier and subtler than either of these, and it is impossible to do it justice here. In it he praises the bravery of the young women, especially for standing up to the friars. "The Filipino woman no longer bows her head and bends her knees; her hope in the future is revived... You have discovered that it is not goodness to be too obedient to... those who pose as little gods, but to obey what is reasonable and just." Rizal (like López Jaena) clearly hopes to weaken the power of the friars, but there is also in this letter a sense that he genuinely believes in the virtues of reason for its own sake, and therefore of education for women.

Yet when he commends their desire for schooling, most of his arguments have to do not with their own potential as reasoning human beings, but with their future role as mothers:

"...Young womanhood, the nursery of fruitful flowers, ought to accumulate riches to bequeath to its descendants. What could the offspring be of a woman whose only virtue is to murmur prayers...?"

"...Let us be reasonable and open our eyes, especially you women, because you are the ones who open the minds of men. Consider that a good mother is different from the one created by the friars. ...The country should not expect honor and prosperity so long as the education of the child is defective, so long as the women who raise the children are enslaved and ignorant. Nothing can be drunk in a turbid and bitter spring."

"...Everybody knows the power and the prudence of the women in the Philippines. Hence they bind them, chain them, weaken their spirit, so sure are they that so long as the mother is a slave, all her children can be enslaved also. This is the reason for the enslavement of Asia; the women in Asia are ignorant and oppressed. Europe and America are powerful because there the women are free and educated, their mind is lucid and their character is strong."

"...Teach your children to guard and love their honor, to love their fellowmen, their native land, and to perform their duties. Tell them repeatedly to prefer death with honor to life with dishonor. They should imitate the women of Sparta..."

Of the seven points Rizal makes at the end of this open letter, only one applies specifically to women:

"Fifth. If Filipino woman will not change, she should not be entrusted with the education of her children. She should only bear them. She should be deprived of her authority in the home; otherwise she may unwittingly betray her husband, children, country, and all."

As the last sentence suggests, Rizal also thinks of women as potential wives and helpers [katulong] to their patriotic husbands:

"...Why does not a young woman ask of the man she is going to love for a noble and hon-

orable name, a manly heart that can protect her weakness, a noble mind that will not permit him to be the father of slaves? Instill in his mind activity and industry, noble behavior, worthy sentiments, and do not surrender your young womanhood to a weak and timid heart. When she becomes a wife, she should help her husband in every difficulty, encourage him, share with him all perils, console him and drive away all his woes."

The clear implication -though Rizal does not say this directly, and might well have repudiated the inference- is that the Propagandists were wrestling with the friars for the souls of Filipina women, who were the objects, more than the protagonists, of this nationalistic struggle. Young women should rid themselves of superstitions so that they could freely choose a brave young patriot over an obscurantist and exploitative foreign priest, not so that they might choose to live for themselves.

Some contemporary Filipina feminists, irked at being reduced to mothers and "helpers," have thus rejected any suggestion that Rizal was a progressive on gender matters, and certainly by the standards of the 1990s he comes across as rather reactionary, if not an outright "male chauvinist pig"[102]. But in the context of his own time, his views may actually have represented a small step forward. Mary Beth Norton (1980) has argued that the American Revolution had "an indelible effect" upon American women, in part by recognizing them as patriotic mothers. Women's primary responsibilities remained confined to the domestic sphere, but for the first time these were conceived of as public duties -"to raise republican sons who would love their country and preserve its virtuous characters"[103]- not merely private ones. By acknowledging that women's actions were of value to the Philippines, not just to their families, Rizal (and perhaps even López Jaena?) may have facilitated the more active public roles played by Filipinas in the Revolution and in the 20th century.

Del Pilar had a particular interest in Malolos, for he came from Bulacan and had been involved in anti-friar intrigues in that province, especially in Malolos, right up to his departure for Spain in October 1888[104]. Even from Barcelona he kept abreast of ongoing friction there, including an open confrontation early in 1889 between the friar and Basilia Tiongson, one of the leaders of the "young women"[105]. He would have known far better than López Jaena or Rizal that the school petition was about more than the innocent desire of some young women to learn Spanish, but was also part of a larger campaign to embarrass the friars.

His letter to his niece may be read, from one angle, as an effort to stir up in Bulacan town the same kind of anti-friar mischief that had occurred in Malolos. He appeals to local civic rivalries: "How can a town like that [Bulacan]... be inferior to the town of Malolos?" Even if we are behind in "dresses and bagatelles," we should not defer in "the aspiration to know, in the efforts of the intelligence," for "the honor and prestige of Bulacan" are at stake. He even names the young women he expects to lead the cause!

Del Pilar also incorporates the customary rhetoric about honor and the moral influence of women: "you are the ones called upon to regenerate our town... by your influence in the family, daughter or sister, wife or mother, the woman is not only the consoling balm of the rigors of life; she is rather the element that insensibly conducts men on the way to virtue or on the path of perversity and cowardice." He remarks on the support that the "beautiful and saintly half" of Malolos has received, and recommends Rizal's letter to them. He notes that "The young women

---

[102] Arinto (1996), p. 185.
[103] Ibid., p. 298.
[104] Schumacher (1973), pp. 95-114.
[105] Gatmaitan (1987), pp. 53-54.

of today, single, or married, will become mothers tomorrow," so it behooves them to become educated for the sake of posterity.

But there are also hints of a -enuine appreciation of women's intellectual potential in Del Pilar's letter (and we are reminded once again that he was the father of two daughters). "The virtue [most] acceptable to the Creator," he claims, "consists in perfecting the intelligence, that He in his infinite love conceded" to humans to light the road of life. "Your duty is to perfect your intelligence by means of education; ...because do not forget, very dear young women; an intelligence without instruction is like a beacon without light."

He argues forcefully for the utility of Spanish -especially for women- as an essential tool for dealing with the real (colonial) world, and he commands his niece to write back to him in that language. He also mentions that in some countries there are public academic competitions involving both boys and girls "in rough battles of intelligence." Of course the stated benefit of Spanish is so that mothers can teach their children, and that of coeducational competition is that "the instruction of the woman stimulates and elevates the instruction of man," but at least Del Pilar is willing to concede the possibility of men and women engaging as intellectual equals.

What this -more than María Clara, more than the flatteries of López Jaena or the fantasies of Luna- represents is the beginnings of a patriotism that does not depend on hyper-masculinity, that does not define itself by its superiority over women, but can actually conceive of them as full partners in the national struggle. There are glimmers of this, too, in Luna's hiring of female journalists, and perhaps in some of Rizal's later writings - but, tragically, none of these young men lived long enough for their gender ideologies to evolve any further. (In 1899 Mabini, who though Spanish-speaking had never been to Spain, actually proposed female suffrage in his radical - and ultimately unsuccessful- draft of a constitution for the new Republic, but he too died a few years later.)

IV. WHAT SIGNIFIED THE PROPAGANDISTS? NATIONAL IDENTITY AND MASCULINITY

There can be little doubt that the Propagandists -this handful of elite young men, whose public careers lasted only a decade or two- played an important part in shaping Filipino identity, not just in their own generation, but ever since. None of my comments in this paper should be interpreted as dismissing their importance in Philippine history. They were among the first, if not the first, to articulate what it meant to be "Filipino" in terms of geography, culture, and ethnicity, bringing together criollos, mestizos, and indios in a new identity that could apply to everyone who called the Islands home. They created networks that bridged, however tenuously, the disparate islands, language groups, and ethnicities that traditionally had divided the archipelago. They provided the Philippines with both a pre-Hispanic past and a crust of Hispanized "civilization," and proclaimed them proudly to the world. Much of what Filipinos today acknowledge as their culture was compiled, if not invented, by Rizal and his friends.

Politically, they spoke up for the Philippines against Spanish claims of superiority and against the manifest injustices of colonialism. They did so at great personal risk and hardship; a few (including Rizal) were killed, many (including Luna) were jailed, and almost all suffered from hunger and disease in their self-imposed exile, as well as from the knowledge that they had brought persecution down on their families in the Philippines. Of the four central figures in this study, none lived to the end of the century: Del Pilar, López Jaena, and Rizal all died in 1896 and Luna in 1899.

Throughout their lives they struggled with defining appropriate goals for the Philippines

-reform? assimilation with Spain? separation?-and effective tactics toward those goals- education? protests and petitions? revolution? Publicly, they Generally advocated peaceful means to achieve moderate goals (though even these were too radical for the Spanish authorities) stopping short of options that would have led to almost instant incarceration, even in Spain, which was far more liberal than the Philippines at the time. Whether these choices represented their actual beliefs -and, if so, whether these stemmed from conviction or merely from self-interest- or whether they were forced on them by circumstances has been a matter of considerable controversy ever since, and the Propacandists have, from their time to ours, been subject to criticism for not proceeding from reform to revolution, like the Katipunan.

Yet even as they were trying to work out their national identity as "Filipinos" they were simultaneously trying, to work out their own male identities (Del Pilar once again excepted). In the circumstances, and especially in the face of Spanish slurs that implied lack of virility in all its forms (strength, honor, bravery, rationality, self-control, etc.), it was easy for them to conflate the two, as we have seen. During the Philippine-American War Luna expressed outrage at young men "who did not feel enough virility and patriotism to serve in the ranks of the army"[106].

The result was that many of their writings embodied elements of European nationalist machismo: the country was always imagined as "Mother" (or at least as "Woman"), protected by the heroic Man, full of amor propio (pundonor), quicktempered, strong, brave, and passionate. Women -unless they were whores- were invariably beautiful, pure, and without any function but that of mothers, wives, or sweethearts of patriotic men. Blanc-Szanton[107] has argued that lowland Ilonggo society never internalized "Mediterranean" gender ideology in its entirety, but the Propagandists came very close to doing so.

This "masculinity" became incorporated into Philippine "national identity" -or, to be more precise, into the societal self-image perpetuated by the ruling elite- for a number of reasons. One is simply that most of the Propagandists' efforts to define Filipino identity, except for their political strategy and tactics, carried well into the 20th century. This in turn was due in part to the relative lack of alternative visions by other "heroes." Among the leading Katipuneros, for example, we possess almost no writings by Bonifacio -and the validity of those we have has been recently challenged- and Aguinaldo was no intellectual, leaving, Mabini as virtually the only potential spokesman for the broader philosophy of the movement. Recently Ileto and a few other historians have attempted to decode and re-articulate the world-view of ordinary Katipuneros, using fugitive and non-traditional sources, but by now the Propa-andists have had a century's head start.

Thus, for example, the question of "Who is a Filipino?" is still largely answered as it was by the Propagandists: a Filipino is anyone, regardless of ethnicity or language, who makes the Philippines his or her home (with the possible exception of the Chinese?). Even the incorporation of the Igorots and Moros was foreshadowed when the Propagandists claimed them as suffering kinsmen at the 1887 Philippine Exhibition in Madrid[108]. The conception of the pre-Hispanic Philippines as a place of primordial "civilization" rather than "savagery," a novelty in the days of Rizal, Paterno, and Isabelo de los Reyes, is now a commonplace in school texts, though there is still debate over the details. The Propagandists' attack on the power of foreign clergy achieved a kind of fortuitous success when the United States, with its own tradition

---

[106] José (1972), pp. 222-223

[107] Blanc-Szaton (1990), pp. 350-351 and passim.

[108] López Jaena (1974), pp. 148-56.

of separating church and state, seized the Philippines, and the "black legend" they spread about the iniquities of the friars is still widely circulated and believed. Thus it is not surprising that their Hispanized nationalist masculinity, with its romantic images of patriotic young heroes and beautiful but passive damsels, became incorporated into the "national" culture along with the rest of the Propagandist world-view, so that a hundred years later we find Imelda Marcos still warbling songs about beauty in the kind of outfit once referred to as a "Maria Clara."

There were doubtless also other reasons for the long life of this gender ideology. To what extent did the nationalist machismo fit in with existing Filipino attitudes toward masculinity, whether indigenous or the product of three hundred years of "Mary and Misogyny"? What part did the United States, which always favored reformist over revolutionary "heroes" in their colony, play in favor of the Propagandists, thus reinforcing this mythology? Or did the ruling, elite -the very class from which the Propagandists themselves came- deploy this as part of their continuing cultural hegemony, much as Southern whites in the United States promulgated romantic myths of sweet-talking belles, white-pillared houses, and happy darkies on ante-bellum plantations? Even to raise these questions, much less to attempt to answer them, takes us well beyond the bounds of this paper.

It must be clear, however, that whatever problems gender ideology may pose to 20th-century Filipinos, it is not really the fault of the Propagandists, most of whom died before this century began. They were young males doing their best to define themselves, in a Spanish context, both as Filipinos and as men. If at times they conflated the questions, or if in trying to rebut Spanish challenges to Philippine masculinity they failed to question the very premises of the challenge, it can be forgiven. The blame, if there is one, lies with whoever -American colonialists, Manila elites, commissioners (official and unofficial) for the identification of heroes, or just unreconstructed romantics- took their post-pubescent fantasies and built them into a national image and ideology. It should be possible, if the spirit is willing and the effort is sufficient, to deconstruct their "masculinity" without disqualifying them as heroes.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ARINTO, Patricia B. (1996), "Reading Correspondences: A Critical Analysis of the Letters Between Rizal and His Sisters." *Review of Women's Studies* 5/2-6/1, pp.181-90.

BLANC-SZANTON, M. Christina (1990), "Collision of Cultures: Historical Reformulations of Gender in the Lowland Visayas, Philippines." In *Power and Difference: Gender in Island Southeast Asia*, pp. 345-84.

BOURKE, Joanna (1997), Review of George L. Mosse, *The Image of man. The Creation of Modern Masculinity* (Oxford University Press, 1996). Reviews in History (online): http://ihr.sas.ac.uk/ihr/reviews/bourke.html (Accessed 28/7/98)

BOXER, Charles R. (1975), *Mary and Misogyny.- Women in Iberian Expansion Overseas, 1415-1815: Some Facts, Fancies, and Personalities*, Duckworth, London.

CAÑAMAQUE, Francisco (1877). *Recuerdos de Filipinas. Cosas, casos y usos de aquellas islas: vistos, oidos, tocados y contados por ... con una carta prólogo del Excmo. Sr. D. Patricio de la Escosura de la Academia Española*. 2 vols., Carlos Bailly-Bailliere, Madrid.

CASTILLO Y JIMÉNEZ, José Mª. (1897). *El Katipunan; ó el Filibusterismo en Filipinas*, Asilo de Huérfanos del S.C. de Jesús, Madrid.

CONNELL, R.W. (1995). *Masculinities*, University of California Press, Berkeley.
DEL PILAR, Marcelo Hilario. (1987). *La soberanía monacal*. With Magno Gatmaitan, *The Life and Writings of Marcelo Hilario Del Pilar*, pp. 131-71. [Originally published Barcelona, 1888]
GARCIA, J. Neil C. (1997). "Was Rizal Gay?" In Garcia, *Closet Queeries*, pp. 164-74.
GATMAITAN, Magno. (1987). *The Life and Writings of Marcelo Hilario Del Pilar*, Historical Conservation Society, Manila.
GUERRERO, Leon Ma. (1971). *The First Filipino: A Biography of José Rizal*, National Historical Commission, Manila.
HYAM, Ronald. (1990). *Empire and Sexuality: The British Experience*, Manchester University Press, Manchester.
ILETO, Reynaldo Clemeña. (1979). *Pasyon and Revolution: Popular Movements in the Philippines, 1840-1910*, Ateneo de Manila University Press, Quezon City.
JAYAWARDENA, Kumanri. (1996). *The White Woman's Other Burden: Western Women and South Asia During British Colonial Rule*, Routledge, New York.
JAYAWARDENA, Kumanri, and Malathi de Alwis, eds. (1996). *Embodied Violence: Communalising Women's sexuality in South Asia*, Kali for Women, New Delhi.
JOAQUIN, Nick. (1977). *A Question of Heroes*, National Book Store, Metro Manila.
JOSE, Vivencio R. (1972). *The Rise and Fall of Antonio Luna*, University of the Philippines, Quezon City. [Reprint from PSSHR 36 (March-Dec. 1971)]
LÓPEZ-GONZAGA, Violeta. (1996). "Images of Women and Their Role in Society in Jose Rizal's Writings", in *Jose Rizal and the Asian Renaissance*, pp. 171-189.
LÓPEZ JAENA, Graciano. (1951). *Discursos y Artículos Varios.- Nueva edición revisada y adicionada con escritos no incluìdos en la primera. Notas y comentarios por el Prof. Jaime C. de Veyra*, Bureau of Printing, Manila. [First edition Barcelona, 1891].
LÓPEZ JAENA, Graciano. (1974). *Speeches, Articles and Letters. Translated and Annotated by Encarnacion Alzona; Edited with additional annotations by Teodoro A. Agoncillo*, National Historical Commission, Manila. [Translation of López Jaena 1951].
LA SOLIDARIDAD. (1967-73). Translated by Guadalupe Forés-Ganzon. 2 vols., University of the Philippines Press, Quezon City.
NAKPIL, Carmen Guerrero. (1962). *Woman Enough and Other Essays*, Vibal Publishing House, Manila.
NANDY, Ashis. (1983). *The Intimate Enemy: Loss and Recovery of Self Under Colonialism*, Oxford University Press, New Delhi.
NORTON, Mary Beth. (1980). *Liberty's Daughters.- The Revolutionary Experience of American Women*, 1750-1800, Little, Brown & Co, Boston.
OCAMPO, Ambeth. (1990). *Looking Back*, Anvil Publishing, Pasig City.
OCAMPO, Ambeth. (1995). Rizal *Without the Overcoat*. Rev. ed., Anvil Publishing, Pasig City. [First edition 1990].
OCAMPO, Ambeth. (1997). *Luna's Moustache*, Anvil Publishing, Pasig City.
RAFAEL, Vicente. (1993). "White Love: Surveillance and Nationalist Resistance in the United States Colonization of the Philippines." In *The Cultures of United States Imperialism*, pp. 185-218.
RAFAEL, Vicente L. (1995). "Nationalism, Imagery, and the Filipino Intelligentsia in the 19th Century." In *Discrepant Histories: Translocal Essays on Filipino Culture*, pp. 133-58. [Originally in *Critical Inquiry 16* (1990)]

RIZAL, José. (1931). *Epistolario Rizalino: Tomo segundo*: 1887-1890, Bureau of Printing, Manila.
RIZAL, José. (1933). *Epistolario Rizalino: Tomo tercero*: 1890-1892, Bureau of Printing, Manila.
RIZAL, José. (1936). *Epistolario Rizalino: Tomo cuarto*: 1892-1896, Bureau of Printing, Manila.
RIZAL, José. (1962). *Quotations from Rizal's Writings*: Jose Rizal, National Centennial Commission, Manila.
RIZAL, José. (1964). *Political and Historical Writings*, National Heroes Commission, Manila.
SANTIAGO, Lilia Quindoza. (1992). "The Filipina as Metaphor for Crisis." In *Women Reading... : Feminist Perspectives on Philippine Literary Texts*, ed. Thelma B. Kintanar.
SCHUMACHER, John N. (1973). *The Propaganda Movement: 1880-1895. The Creators of a Filipino Consciousness, the Makers of Revolution*, Solidaridad Publishing House, Manila.
SCHUMACHER, John N. (1991). "Wenceslao E. Retana in Philippine History." In *The Making of a Nation: Essays on Nineteenth-Century Philippine Nationalism*, pp. 134-55.
SINHA, Mrinalini. (1995). *Colonial Masculinity: The Manly Englishman and the Effeminate Bengali in the Late Nineteenth Century*, Manchester UP, Manchester.

◆