

Revolution, Redemption, and Romance: Reading Constructions of Filipino Spanish American Identities and Politics of Knowledge in Rizal's *Noli me Tangere* and *El Filibusterismo* alongside Filipino American Fiction

Steven Beardsley
English and Modern Languages Departments
Hamline University
1536 Hewitt Avenue
Saint Paul, Minnesota 55104 USA

Faculty Advisors: Veena Deo and María Jesús Leal

Abstract

This project analyzes the literary works and role of Filipino nationalist José Rizal before, during, and after the Spanish American War of 1898. Rizal's social activism and writing sparked a revolution against the Friarocracy in the Philippines. He has also influenced Filipino American writers who reference Rizal's construction of the Filipino woman in Christianity and Filipinos' fighting against oppression. Thus, the primary focus of this project is to look at Rizal's works through an interstitial lens showing how Filipino Spanish identity was created then and how it has informed contemporary ideas about intersecting social identities. The project does this by analyzing how historical figures such as Spaniards Unamuno and W.E. Retana have constructed Rizal as the quintessential Filipino Spaniard of the Philippines. The project also analyzes Rizal's writing such as his two novels: *Noli Me Tangere* and *El Filibusterismo*. This analysis is supported through a synthesis of reading and writing on secondary research and theory on his biographies, himself, his works, and on contemporary Filipino American literature through an interstitial lens. In conclusion, reading Rizal shows that the Philippines is a country whose cultural history and literature has been defined alongside Spanish and United States' colonialism. Reading Rizal also deconstructs stereotypes about gender, sexuality, race, and other social identities related to Filipino American identity.

Keywords: Filipino Spanish American Identities, José Rizal, Friarocracy

1. Introduction: José Rizal As The Politicized Signifier Of The Filipino Nation

José Rizal was born José Protasio Rizal Mercado y Alonso in Calamba, Philippines, in the Laguna province, in 1861 and executed by Spain in 1896. He was the son of two prosperous Filipino parents, though like many, he was mixed with Chinese and native heritage. At an early age he was educated at some of the best schools in Manila, including the University of Santo Tomás and the prestigious Ateneo de Manila University. He also studied abroad in Europe for nearly seven years at the Central University of Madrid, where he completed his degrees in medicine and in philosophy of letters by the age of 24. Rizal was considered a polyglot, mastering up to 22 different languages. He also became an ophthalmologist and performed cataract surgery on his mother. Hailed as a genius at a young age and throughout his life, Rizal would also become an activist while in Spain, writing against the Philippine Friarocracy and Spain's colonial enterprise in the Philippines. His activism included his two major novels that critique Spanish colonial rule: *Noli Me Tangere* and its sequel *El Filibusterismo*. In addition to these novels, Rizal published articles in *La Solidaridad*, a newspaper based in Madrid, Spain, that advocated for Filipino representation in the Spanish Cortes, Spanish legislature of the time, with Puerto Rico and Cuba¹. Rizal was executed for his writings by firing squad and considered a martyr and example for what would happen to Filipinos who wrote anti-colonial writings against the Spanish government.

Rizal did not advocate for revolution, yet scholarship and biographies at the time and after Rizal's death have argued that he was chosen as a Filipino hero and nationalist for his martyrdom. Instead, Rizal advocated for Filipino representation, education, and reform as part of The Propaganda Movement that preceded the Revolutionary movement of the 1890s. For instance, Maria Luisa T. Reyes in her essay on "The Role of Literature in Filipino Resistance to Spanish Colonialism" says:

The Propaganda Movement was reformist in nature. The *intelligentsia*, led by Rizal, advocated changes in colonial policy that would bring Spain and her colony into closer harmony. When that failed, the struggle turned to the Revolutionary Movement of the 1890s, led by the Katipunan (the secret society that toppled Spanish rule), founded by Bonifacio and later led by Emilio Aguinaldo².

Rizal's role in the eventual revolution of the Philippines in 1896 lay in his power to illustrate the oppressive nature of the Friarocracy through his two novels and other writing. His novels and his death would influence leaders, such as Bonifacio, who led the independence movement against the Spanish colonial government using Rizal's name as the president and leader of the movement³. Despite the acts of other writers and political leaders of the time, José Rizal has been appropriated as the signifier of the Filipino nation; biographies, scholarship, and his works are used to construct and reconstruct him as a heroic and iconic figure of the Filipino nation often through the politicized nationalizing projects of his biographers. For instance, Rizal's creation as a nationalist is also prefigured before, during, and after his death through his rivalry with the Spanish historian W.E. Retana, whose views on Rizal before and after his death changed dramatically.

The deconstructing, constructing, and reconstructing of Rizal as a symbol of the Philippines in absolutist and essential terms ironically causes Filipino identity to be rendered unstable. As Maria Theresa Valenzuela notes in her essay "Constructing National Heroes: Postcolonial Philippines and Cuban Biographies of José Rizal and José Martí," scholars have attempted to read Rizal as an important national hero, often in efforts to justify Spanish or American colonialism or to promote a postcolonial Filipino nationhood⁴. At the same time, these different acts of reading Rizal render him, the Philippines, and Filipino identities as subjects that refuse to be rigidly defined as they cannot be separated from Spanish and American colonialisms alone. In other words, the instability of Rizal's appropriation as a signifier also causes his signification of the Filipino nation and the Philippines as unstable.

This essay analyzes critical scholarship on Rizal, his life, and his works within the context of the War of 1898. Rizal's role as a heroic signifier of the Filipino nation has important consequences for the Philippines, Spain, and the United States. Moreover, rather than seeing Rizal as an essentialized Filipino hero, he should be seen as representing an interstitial subjectivity combining American, Spanish, and Filipino cultural influences of a nationhood. From this lens, the characters and overall idea of nationalism that Rizal constructs in his works can be deconstructed from a contemporary lens that understands the need for a transcultural individual that exists while keeping their race, gender, sexuality, and other social identities influx and predetermined at the same time. Also, Filipino American writers have written against constructions that Rizal perpetuates in his writing such as the construction of the subaltern or chaste Filipino women. The goal of this essay is to see how Rizal's influence has impacted Filipino subjectivities in terms of nationalizing projects that connect the Philippines, Spain, the United States, and even Latin America.

1.1 Retana's and Unamuno's Rizal as the quintessential Filipino Spaniard

The appropriation of José Rizal played a significant role during the time period of the War of 1898. Before the revolution he wrote texts that developed the idea of a Filipino prehistory before the occupation of Spain in 1521. These writings include his additions to *Historical Events of the Philippine Islands*, by Dr. Antonio De Morga, in 1889 archived in a Historical Institute in Manila and his own essay "The Indolence of the Filipino." In these texts Rizal became an important historical authority on Filipino prehistory. From a nationalist viewpoint, Rizal sought to localize a pre-colonial past that glorified the Philippines prior to Spanish arrival and even argued that the Philippines began its decadence, in terms of educational stagnation and labor, directly after Spanish rule. For instance, in the preface to Morga's writing compendium, Rizal addresses Filipinos by stating the need to invoke the words of the Spaniard Morga to better illustrate to them Rizal's goal of awakening their "consciousness of our past, already effaced from your memory, and to rectify what has been falsified and slandered"⁵.

The purpose of Rizal's annotations in the text is to better illustrate this past in order to understand the then current socio-political climate of colonial rule. At the same time, Rizal's projection of a pre-colonial past also included contemporaneous anticolonial rhetoric. For instance, in his essay "The Indolence of the Filipino," Rizal deconstructs the stereotype of the Filipino as being indolent and argues that their indolence actually stemmed from the arrival of

the Spaniards and Christianity and is maintained through Christian rules and institutions. Moreover, Rizal argues emphatically that the misfortune of the Filipino lies in how he/she is convinced by the government and the church that

to get happiness it is necessary for him to lay aside his dignity as a rational creature, to attend mass, to believe what is told him, to pay what is demanded of him, to pay and forever to pay; to work, to suffer and be silent, without aspiring to anything, without aspiring to know or even to understand Spanish, without separating himself from his *carabao*, as the priests shamelessly say, without protesting against any injustice, against any arbitrary action, against an assault, against an insult, that is, not to have heart, brain or spirit: a creature with arms and a purse full of gold [. . .] there's the ideal native!⁶

In other words, Rizal reveals the exploitative nature of the friars and how they made Filipinos complacent through Catholicism. Rizal argues, then, that the friars and the government did not give Filipinos the education they needed to advocate for themselves. He sees the government as reducing the Filipino to an animal made of gold out of which the priests and government can constantly get money. He also illustrates how contact between the people of the Philippines and the colonial Spaniard mission constructed an idealized “indigenous” identity. This is an idealized identity for the Spanish friar and government officials because they benefited from Filipinos acting complacent and they were able to live idealized lives in the Philippines by exploiting the indigenous population. This is also demonstrated by the label “Filipino” as a consequence of this contact and how Spain constructed and created the country’s name in honor of the Spanish King Philip II⁷. In this sense, Rizal’s polemical argument is not only anticolonial but also criticizes an essentialized native Filipino identity constructed by colonial powers and created by the colonial regime to exploit indigenous peoples.

It is clear that Rizal’s writings before the war of 1898 were anticolonial and argued for Filipino rights in the Spanish Cortes or Spanish legislature. Moreover, his writings were especially incendiary to his Spanish contemporary W.E. Retana, who was a historical authority of Spain at the time. According to Christopher Schmidt-Nowara in his book *The Conquest of History: Spanish Colonialism and National Histories in the Nineteenth Century*, while Rizal aimed to construct a pre-colonial history of the Philippines, Retana countered by saying that “[t]he Philippines . . . have no history. . . . [T]he History of the Philippines is nothing more than a chapter of the History of Spain”⁸. While Rizal was still alive, Retana would argue that Philippine historicity was only an extension of Spanish historicity and that the colony owed much of its success to the mother country. Schmidt-Nowara argues that Retana’s opinion of Rizal would adapt and change throughout this time period as Spain sought to regain control after the loss of its colonies to the U.S. He would claim that individuals like Rizal from Spain’s lost colonies, Puerto Rico, Cuba, and the Philippines, benefited from Spanish colonialism because they became educated members of Spanish civilization. For instance, Schmidt-Nowara writes that along with Retana, another important Spanish writer of the time, Miguel de Unamuno:

represented the history and culture of the Philippines as dependent on Spain; the peoples of the Philippines were another example of primitives elevated by their inclusion in Spanish civilization. Rizal—like Maceo in Cuba—in his very opposition to Spanish rule became the living, and dying, proof of its excellence⁹.

Retana and Unamuno appropriated Rizal’s ability to critique and oppose Spanish rule to show how it was emblematic of Spanish civilization’s ability to elevate and cultivate the intellect of the Filipino. Yet Rizal’s status as an *ilustrado*, or Filipino from an upper-middle class family, allowed him to study abroad in Spain and other parts of Europe, becoming educated and influenced by European liberalism, nationalism, and modern developments in medicine and science. Schmidt-Nowara suggests that Retana used this element of Rizal’s history and his opposition to the revolution in the Philippines to justify the idea that Spanish civilization could cultivate the intellect of a Filipino such as Rizal. This leads to the dangerous conclusion that writers after Retana would emphasize how Rizal’s intellectual development and ideas would make him into an essentialized model of Spanish education for a brown race of Filipinos.

Before discussing the historical implications of how Retana and Unamuno read Rizal, Schmidt-Nowara tries to explain Retana’s near about face after Rizal’s martyrdom. For instance, while Rizal was alive and criticizing the rule of the friars, Retana came to their defense: in the “1890s, he founded the reactionary periodical *La Política de España en Filipinas* to counter *La Solidaridad*, published numerous studies of the Philippine, several of them disparaging accounts of popular culture and religion”¹⁰. Retana also sought to defend the Spanish colonial enterprise by using accepted contemporary scientific thought that constructed inherent racial hierarchies to bolster his arguments. For instance, Retana says of the overall intelligence of the Filipino, “Why should it cause offense that I conceive of the Malay race as inferior to the European race? This is a purely scientific opinion that I do not sustain by myself but in agreement with many learned anthropologists”¹¹. Retana used popular pseudo-scientific thought, now debunked as thoroughly racist, emphasize European and Spanish superiority over the colonized Filipinos. Rizal also became

educated and wrote extensively in the Spanish language against this racialization, but Retana saw Rizal as a threat to his historical authority in Spain. In other words, he founded his own periodical and supported his arguments through reasoning of the time to not only counter Rizal and monopolize and contain Filipino history but to also maintain his authority as a historian of Spain.

Additionally, Retana countered Rizal's claims that the Philippines had regressed after Spanish colonialism by saying Spanish civilization had provided the Philippines with education, economic development, and religion: "the Spaniards have done more than amass riches; they have educated millions of indios. . . They are, like brothers of ours of lesser age, imitations of everything Spanish"¹². Retana claims here that Filipinos lacked these structural institutions prior to Spanish rule and that they were better for being able to imitate Spanish customs and culture. This mimicry, however, is dismantled in Rizal's two novels as Filipino women try to adopt Spanish social mores and codes of behavior and become demonized in the process. Moreover, Filipino subjectivity still retained indigenous cultural aspects prior to and after Spanish colonialism, making Filipino subjectivity more complex and not as easily categorized through a Spanish lens from the start of contact. Despite Retana's counterarguments and rivalry with Rizal, he changed his tactics after Rizal's death and after Spain lost the Philippines and other colonies to the United States.

Though Schmidt-Nowara argues that Retana attempted to become the sole authority of Spanish and Filipino history through his rivalry with Rizal, his change to Rizal's advocate after Rizal's death is not without its own political agenda. For instance, Schmidt-Nowara says that Retana would shift his opinion of friar rule by taking Rizal's position and blaming the friars for friction between the Philippines and Spain¹³. In other words, Retana revised his earlier defense of friar rule in order to assert the idea that Rizal was right all along. This assertion is not without significance, as Schmidt-Nowara argues:

Retana's Rizal was a monument to the achievements of Spanish colonization, the dying proof of Spain's efforts to recreate itself overseas. In other words, as in his pre-1898 writings, Retana continued, in more subtle and conciliatory terms, to insist that Philippine history was an extension of Spanish history¹⁴.

Schmidt-Nowara then argues that instead of directly criticizing Rizal and asserting that Filipino history is merely an extension of Spanish history, Retana used Rizal's achievements and works as an example of the positive effects Spanish colonialism can have on the Filipino. He argued that the Spanish colonial enterprise created a Rizal and that all Filipinos should follow Rizal's example despite the fact that Rizal is not representative of the Filipino illiterate, women, subaltern, or many others. Additionally, Schmidt-Nowara argues that Retana practiced what was called "hispanismo, a political and intellectual movement in Spain that emphasized the essential cultural identity between Spain and its former colonies"¹⁵. In this sense, Schmidt-Nowara notes how other historians have interpreted Retana's hispanismo as being reactionary to the events of 1898 during the decline of Spain's colonial empire. Moreover, Schmidt-Nowara disagrees with how other historians have interpreted hispanismo by saying, "Instead of seeing it as originating in response to the crisis of 1898 after decades of ignoring the Americas, I see it as the continuation of efforts associated with the reconsolidation of empire over the course of the nineteenth century"¹⁶. This interpretation reveals that Spanish national identity was also being constructed in terms of the colonized Philippines as well as through the colonies of Cuba and Puerto Rico. Spanish national identity and subjectivity in part also relied on colonies for its self-identity, particularly the Philippines. The Philippine other promoted unity in the mother country because it allowed Spain to see itself in control of its colonies. If the Philippines could be controlled and unified abroad, then it offered the possibility for Spain to remain unified at home.

1.2 Austin Craig's and Leon Maria Guerrero's Rizal as an Anglo-Saxon trained scholar and first Filipino

While Spaniards such as Retana and Unamuno constructed Rizal as a quintessential example of the effects of Spanish civilization on the Filipino, American biographer and Philippine university scholar Austin Craig who wrote in 1909 *The Story of José Rizal: The Greatest Man of the Brown Race* and Filipino ambassador and historian Leon Maria Guerrero who wrote *The First Filipino: A Biography of José Rizal* would have similar yet different political agendas for their respective constructions. Maria Theresa Valenzuela argues in her essay "Constructing National Heroes: Postcolonial Philippine and Cuban Biographies of José Rizal and José Martí" that Austin Craig's *Los errores de Retana* is a critique of Retana's *Vida y escritos*. Valenzuela argues that the discourse between *Errores* and *Vida y escritos* is symptomatic of the regime change going on in the Philippines from Spain to the United States. Craig crafts Rizal through an American lens rather than a Spanish one, replacing the Rizal of Retana with one more palatable for a Western (US) audience¹⁷.

Austin Craig's critique of the historical inaccuracies of Retana's account reveals the political need to represent Rizal as someone who was educated through western ideology but not necessarily through Spanish civilization. In this sense, Craig's biography reconstructs Rizal as someone who owes his success more to European, particularly Anglo-Saxon, training as opposed to Spanish language and culture. Valenzuela further supports this argument by saying that "Craig moved to the Philippines at the beginning of the US colonial period to pursue a career in Philippine universities [. . .] The purpose of Craig's scholarship was to build upon the growing body of work on the Filipino martyr and gear it toward an Anglo-Saxon consciousness"¹⁸. Craig's political agenda is elucidated by his desire to implement the American school system in the Philippines to replace the existing Spanish school system. Additionally, this highlights Craig's challenge to Retana's historical authority, noting how American colonialism had superseded that of Spanish empire. Craig promoted a historical account of Rizal that was emblematic of the United States' imperialist success in the Pacific. Yet Craig's works themselves express a condescending attitude to Rizal, such as the title of his other work on Rizal, *The Story of José Rizal: The Greatest Man of the Brown Race*. Valenzuela argues that the text in "itself is an anthropological nod to the exotic, a kind of guide to the 'brown race' as the modifier 'brown' in the title also categorically separates Rizal into a 'not like us whites' category"¹⁹. While Retana argued that Filipino history existed as Spanish history, Craig creates a clearer binary opposition between Filipinos of the "brown race" that are seen as racially inferior to "whites," in this case, the American colonizers. Craig reconstructs Rizal as a "model" of Filipinos, an individual that all other Filipinos should aspire to as their heroic, nationalized signifier.

This version of Rizal echoes a similar articulation of the Asian American community in the United States both in the past and currently as the "model minority." Valenzuela takes up the "model minority" mythology through the way Craig illustrates Rizal's martyrdom. She writes that after the memorial page in Craig's biography a quotation by United States President William Howard Taft says, "The study of the life and character of Dr. Rizal cannot but be beneficial to those desirous of imitating him"²⁰. While Valenzuela argues that this is a paternalistic desire for other Filipinos to become like Rizal, it also reinforces a historical mythos dependent on the "American Dream." Rizal not only becomes an ideal "Filipino" subjugated by U.S. imperialism; rather, he becomes the representation of hard work, intelligence, and humility that U.S. imperialism desired of not only the Filipinos but other Asian American communities that were and continue to be marginalized in the United States. Taft's quote and Craig's rendering of Rizal imply that Filipinos and other Asian Americans would benefit from following Rizal's example instead of fulfilling their potential as their own separate selves. At the same time, this rhetoric, instead of reinforcing U.S. imperialism, undermines it and reveals the slippages present in the inability of Filipino women, the subaltern, and other Asian American communities to imitate an already unstable representation of the figure of the Filipino national/native since he continues to be (re)appropriated for conflicting political interests.

While Valenzuela illustrates Rizal's reconstruction to fit the political aims of Spanish and American colonialism and imperialism, she also illustrates the idea of the "secret-self" used in biographical studies. Valenzuela quotes from Leon Edel that:

the biographer's job is to infer what lies out of sight below, the 'secret myth' that's causing that particular and individual pattern of bumps and lumps that's presented to the world. Simply put, the biographer searches for internal motivation²¹.

This "secret-self" Valenzuela then identifies for Craig is Rizal's "Anglo-Saxon" training that makes him the "Greatest Man of the Brown Race." Put simply, this "secret-self" is constructed through the lens of the biography and this particular case does not acknowledge Rizal's work as an individual born in the Philippines and who still retains his own transcultural identity in being not only in the Philippines but traveling Europe, Latin America, and the U.S. as well. That is, his "Anglo-Saxon" training is not what drives Rizal's writings and activism against Spain, and is instead, what Craig uses to justify American imperialism in cultivating the intellect of a "brown race."

The next significant biography, *The First Filipino: A biography of José Rizal* (1965), on Rizal politicizes Rizal further and restructures him as a postcolonial representation of Filipino Nationalism. Though Valenzuela mentions the creation of other biographies on Rizal by other Filipinos, she argues that Leon Maria Guerrero's scholarship radiates with credibility on the part of the author as a historian of the Philippines and how Guerrero, by naming Rizal The First "makes the birth of a 'Filipino' identity concomitant with the birth of the Philippine nation"²². Guerrero's goal, unlike that of the Spaniards Retana and Unamuno and American Craig, is to maintain and essentialize a Filipino nation and culture. As a Filipino ambassador, Valenzuela argues that "if Craig can be said to have made his career on the back of Rizal, Guerrero's career was devoted to Philippine national formation"²³. If anything, Rizal returns as the signifier of Philippine nationhood, but this time he is devoid of foreign influences in a nationalizing project to solidify Filipino nationalism.

2. Conclusion

Valenzuela notes that “[a]lthough Rizal himself did not acknowledge and participate in the Katipunan, the chief revolutionary group opposing Spain in the Philippines, Guerrero describes Rizal himself as ‘chosen’ because the Katipunan adopted ‘Rizal’ as a code word”²⁴. Even today, Rizal’s importance as a political signifier is representative of the “Rizal Law,” a law in the Philippines that requires the study of him and his two seminal works in the classrooms of secondary and postsecondary institutions. Rizal also has a park named after him, and “Rizal Day” is celebrated in the Philippines on December 30. Recently, the small population of Filipinos in California have also celebrated “Rizal Day”²⁵. In other words, though Guerrero and other Filipino scholars claim that Filipinos chose him to be their national hero, his importance as the Philippine national hero and Philippine Spanish literature are rarely studied by Spain and the United States in Spanish, English, or Modern Languages Departments. According to Adam Lifshy in “The Literary Alterities of Philippine Nationalism in Jose Rizal’s *El Filibusterismo*,” the reason for this lies in how Hispanists have been divided into two categories of peninsularists and Latin Americanists and how this binarism leads to a lack of awareness of other literature such as African literature in Spanish²⁶. Moreover, Lifshy points to not only the necessity of examining this group of literature rarely studied outside of the Philippines, but the globalized importance of Rizal and his works on Filipino, Spanish, and American subjectivity and identity. Lifshy, referring to how the Philippines has been constructed and developed after Spanish and American colonialism asks, “What does it mean for one of the most globalized nations in the world, both historically and currently, to be consistently marginalized in the most prominent academic debates on globalization?”²⁷. Therein lies one of the main purposes of this study, to shed light on the importance of Rizal scholarship on contemporary debates around transcultural identity as well as promoting the understanding of a Filipino, Spanish American subjectivity. Rizal is of geopolitical importance as a historical writer located at many sites of transcultural exchange and construction. While biographers and historians have appropriated Rizal, his two seminal novels critique this appropriation of a particular Filipino to signify an idealized Filipino national and nation. Reading his writings alongside contemporary Filipino American literature offers a way of “un-oning” these conflicting (re)appropriations of Rizal in order to see Filipino how Filipino Spanish American literature should be read within a transcultural and interstitial context.

3. References

1. Álvarez-Tardío, Beatriz. "María Clara y La Comunidad Imaginada En Noli Me Tangere De José Rizal." CIEHL: Cuaderno Internacional de Estudios Humanísticos y Literatura 19 (2013): 110, MLA International Bibliography (1521-8007).
2. Reyes, Maria, Luisa T. "The Role of Literature in Filipino Resistance to Spanish Colonialism." A Historical Companion to Postcolonial Literatures: Continental Europe and Its Empires. Prem Poddar and Rajeev Patke. Edinburg: Edinburgh University Press, 2008. Credo Reference: 2, http://search.credoreference.com/content/entry/edinburghpcl/the_role_of_literature_in_filipino_resistance_to_spanish_colonialism/0.
3. Rafael, Vicente L. *The Promise of the Foreign: Nationalism and the Technics of Translation in the Spanish Philippines*. (Durham: Duke UP, 2005), quoted in Lifshy, Adam. "The Literary Alterities of Philippine Nationalism in José Rizal's *El Filibusterismo*." PMLA 123.5 (2008): 1437, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25501945>.
4. Valenzuela, Maria Theresa. "Constructing National Heroes: Postcolonial Philippine and Cuban Biographies of José Rizal and José Martí." *Biography: An Interdisciplinary Quarterly* 37.3 (2014): 746, doi: 10.1353/bio.2014.0063.
5. Morga, Antonio de. *Historical Events of the Phillipine Islands* (Publications of the National Historical Institute). (Manila: National Historical Institute, 1990), VII.
6. Rizal, José. "The Indolence of the Filipino." Ed. Austin Craig. Trans. Charles E. Derbyshire. (United Kingdom: Dodo Press, 2009), IV.
7. Ponce, Martin, Joseph. *Beyond the Nation: Diasporic Filipino Literature and Queer Reading*. (New York: New York UP, 2012), 11.
8. W.E. Retana. "Contra un documento . . . dos," *La Política de España en Filipinas* (Madrid, 1891) quoted in Schmidt-Nowara, Christopher. *The Conquest of History: Spanish Colonialism and National Histories*. (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh, 2011), 164.
9. *Ibid.*, 164.
10. *Ibid.*, 175.
11. W.E. Retana, "A 'El Día'," *La Política de España en Filipinas* (Madrid, 1891), quoted in *Ibid.*, 176.

12. W.E. Retana, "Indios," in Martínez de Zúniga, *Estadismo de las islas Filipinas*, quoted in *Ibid.*, 178.
13. *Ibid.*, 186.
14. *Ibid.*, 186.
15. *Ibid.*, 191.
16. *Ibid.*, 191.
17. Valenzuela, 751.
18. *Ibid.*, 751.
19. *Ibid.*, 752.
20. *Ibid.*, 752.
21. Edel, Leon. *Literary Biography: The Alexander Lectures 1955–56*. (Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1957), quoted in *Ibid.*, 753.
22. *Ibid.*, 753.
23. *Ibid.*, 754.
24. *Ibid.*, 755.
25. Angeles, Steve, "Rizal Day Becomes Official Holiday in California City," *Balitang America*. ABS-CBN International, 30 December, 2013, <http://news.abs-cbn.com/global-filipino/12/30/13/rizal-day-becomes-official-holiday-california-city>.
26. Lifshey, 1441.
27. *Ibid.*, 1441.