

Tracing Origins: *Ilustrado* Nationalism and the Racial Science of Migration Waves

FILOMENO V. AGUILAR JR.

If only our ancestors could be resurrected!
(Rizal 1890, 90)

Racial Science and the Quest for Origins

History was the key to identity for the pioneers of Filipino nationhood in the late nineteenth century. John Schumacher has recounted the struggle by which the youthful Europeanized originators of Filipino nationhood—the *ilustrados*, literally “enlightened”—reacted to the “chauvinism common to members of governing races” (1973, 191–220). Amid the onslaught of Spanish colonial racism, these educated youths

Filomeno V. Aguilar Jr. (fvaguilar@ateneo.edu) is Professor in the Department of History and Director of the Institute of Philippine Culture at Ateneo de Manila University.

This article is a revised version of a paper first presented at the Fourth European Philippine Studies Conference, Alcalá de Henares, Spain, September 9–12, 2001. I am grateful for a Visiting Research Fellowship at the Center for Southeast Asian Studies, Kyoto University, in the second half of 2001, which provided the opportunity to pursue the research project of which this article is a part. I am also indebted to a research leave awarded by James Cook University that enabled research in the Philippines and the United States. In Kyoto I received valuable comments, questions, and encouragement from Caroline Sy Hau, Patricio Abinales, Arthur Terry Rambo, Koji Tanaka, and Yoko Hayami. Carol was extremely kind in giving me liberal access to her copies of *La Solidaridad* and in being a critical sounding board for this article, while Jojo and Terry very generously shared with me useful materials. Acquiring a copy of the rare 1885 report of J. Montano was incredibly easy because of the generosity of Xavier Huetz de Lempis. I am grateful to Benedict Anderson, Russell McGregor, Lily Mendoza, and Fr. John N. Schumacher, S.J., for reading earlier versions and giving me valuable suggestions, corrections, and advice. I am also grateful to my many colleagues in Philippine history who participated in “The Mactan Conversation: A Conference on the ‘Genealogies of Philippine History’” held in Mactan, Cebu, April 4–6, 2003, where a version of this article was presented and critiqued. Thanks are also due to the reviewers commissioned by the *Journal of Asian Studies* for their constructive comments and suggestions. Most of all, thanks go to my boundlessly patient and understanding wife, Juliet, for prodding me on to work on this article and for sharing with me the thrills and perils of visiting Spain, *to-sba*.

The Journal of Asian Studies 64, no. 3 (August 2005):605–37.
© 2005 by the Association for Asian Studies, Inc.

defended their collective pride by searching the past for dignified roots. They proposed and debated various approaches, which included Pedro Paterno's extravagant claim that "ancient Tagalog civilization" had long been Christian (Schumacher 1979, 268–69). But whatever the view, ilustrados desired to illumine their origins in order to know themselves. Such "knowledge" was seen as vital to further political action. Understandably, a manifest tendency to glorify the ancients emerged. The foremost patriot, José Rizal, articulated "the ilustrado nostalgia for lost origins" by constructing "a flourishing, precolonial civilization, the lost eden," argues Reynaldo Ileto (1998, 31), "to reconstitute the unity of Philippine history" (35). Guided by European notions of order, linearity, and rationality, yet himself implicated in the "underside of history," Rizal, in Ileto's view, consciously imagined a past that effaced the differences in colonial society.

Diversity and divisions did mark the Spanish Philippines. But while studies of this group of pioneering youth have considered a range of factors and moments in the formation of national consciousness—such as class, religion, politics, economics, discourses of kinship ties, gender, and literary strategies¹—none has analyzed it in the context of nineteenth-century popular and scientific theories of race and attendant discourses of migration-diffusion. The period's dominant paradigm of "positive science" gave rise to the belief that peoples of distinct "races" moved into territories in discrete waves of migration. Each successive and progressively more advanced wave pushed the earlier arrivals into the interior. The extant cultural groups encountered by European ethnologists in their "primitive" state were assumed to be "survivals," residues that closely approximated the races of antiquity. Spanish friars in the Philippines had long speculated on the origins of its inhabitants (Scott 1994, 9), but the first systematic formulation of the migration-waves theory purporting to explain the peopling of the Philippine islands with two races and diverse cultural groups was advanced in 1882 by Ferdinand Blumentritt in *Versuch einer Ethnographie der Philippinen* (An Attempt at Writing a Philippine Ethnography). Blumentritt was a Prague-born professor of ethnology at the University of Leitmeritz in the Austro-Hungarian empire (Sichrovsky 1987). In 1885 the Frenchman J. Montano published the results of his "scientific mission," which classified and elaborated upon three races in a discussion of Philippine anthropology.² By the early 1900s, theories of migration waves pervaded the Southeast Asian region.³

The timely application of the migration-waves framework to the Philippines colored the intellectual climate in which the early nationalists imagined the past. To be sure, in this, as in other political questions, no monolithic uniformity of ideas existed among the ilustrados. Isabelo de los Reyes (1889) expressed grave doubts

¹A vast literature exists on this subject. Apart from those works cited elsewhere in this article, see Agoncillo 1956; Rafael 1990; Schumacher 1991; Quibuyen 1999; Ordoñez 1998. The question of the male elite-dominated imagining of Filipino nationhood, however, has not been adequately addressed. Also intriguing is the transmutation of the ilustrados' *patria*, or "fatherland," to the *inang bayan*, or "motherland," of popular nationalism.

²Blumentritt's (1980) schema of two races, Negrito and Malay, contrasted with Montano's (1885) framework of three racial types, Negrito, Malay, and Indonesian. Montano located the last category mainly in Mindanao. Isabelo de los Reyes disputed Montano's introduction of "Indonesian" as a third racial category and supported the two-race schema of Blumentritt (1889, 7–9). Rizal similarly subscribed to Blumentritt's formulation.

³For instance, Walter Skeat and Charles Blagden published their grand *Pagan Races of the Malay Peninsula* (1906/1966, 2 vols.), which explored the racial-linguistic affinities of aboriginal groups. R. J. Wilkinson (1975) also started to publish his historical sketches that located aborigines, proto-Malays, Malays, and Europeans in a temporal-cultural sequence of migration.

whether the origins of population groups in the Philippines were ascertainable, but nonetheless attempted to reconstruct the pre-Spanish past through the “new science” of folklore (Anderson 2000). For his part, Graciano López Jaena (1951) voiced a profound ambivalence toward autochthony, as will become patent later in this article. An ardent supporter of the ilustrado campaign for equality, known as the Propaganda Movement, and a respected and indefatigable contributor to the ilustrado periodical, *La Solidaridad* (Solidarity), Blumentritt propounded key ideas that attracted a wide consensus among the educated youth. In a propitious and decisive confluence, Rizal was in Europe at just the historic juncture in which he could be influenced by and in turn influence Blumentritt’s ethnology. Rizal’s perception of the past, therefore, would be incomprehensible apart from Blumentritt, with whom he formed an indissoluble friendship.

Because the ilustrados believed that there were no court chronicles, manuscripts, temples, or monuments that could illumine the past, Rizal relied on the world of science to construct history and define an identity. During his stay in Europe in the 1880s, he read countless “scientific” books on the Philippines.⁴ In their correspondence, Blumentritt told Rizal about the existence in the British Museum of a rare copy of Antonio de Morga’s *Sucesos de las Islas Filipinas* (Events in the Philippine Islands), originally published in 1609 (Kramer 1998, 30; Coates 1968, 155–57). Rizal undertook the monumental project of copying and annotating Morga, his edition finally seeing print in Paris in late 1889.⁵ Most of the copies were sent to Manila via Hong Kong. The book was in demand, but it was soon banned in Manila and copies were confiscated and destroyed. As Ambeth Ocampo puts it, the book “attained ‘rare’ and ‘out of print’ status within a year of its publication” (1998, 185).

Rizal’s annotations of Morga were admittedly influenced by Blumentritt’s *Versuch*.⁶ The edifice of pre-Hispanic migration waves and the associated racial-cultural classification scheme adumbrated by Blumentritt provided the broad template within which race, nation, and civilization were exercised in the ilustrado mind. Dealing with sociocultural heterogeneity was far from straightforward, however, for Rizal and other ilustrados wrestled with the state of scientific knowledge along with the facticities of colonial life. With some of its propositions accepted and others rejected, racial science helped confront the fundamental existential questions of collective being: “Who are we? Where did we come from?” Like an adopted child who grew

⁴Disputing de los Reyes’s criticism that he romanticized the past, Rizal stressed that he read Antonio de Morga’s work seven times and trumpeted the historical sources to back his claims. “On the subject of the history of the civilization of the ancient Filipinos, I think I have read from cover to cover *all the works of contemporary writers*, except that of Father Plasencia and that of another author which had been lost” (Fores-Ganzon 1996, 2:507, 508; emphasis in original).

⁵Although dated 1890, Rizal’s edition of Morga must have appeared in print in late 1889. On December 28, 1889, Rizal wrote from Paris to Baldomero Roxas saying that he had sent four copies of the book to Lipa in Batangas, Philippines (NHC 1963, 1:413). On December 31, 1889, Mariano Ponce, writing to Rizal from Barcelona, acknowledged receiving a copy and requested ten more to be sent to the Philippines (NHC 1963, 1:439). For a critical discussion of Rizal’s view of Philippine history in Morga, see Ocampo 1998.

⁶Rizal credited Blumentritt’s work in a note on Sumatra as “the place of origin of Indios Filipinos.” He advised: “With respect to the ethnology of the Philippines, as the space at our command does not allow us to discuss the matter extensively, we recommend to the reader the most interesting work of Professor Blumentritt, *Versuch einer Ethnographie der Philippinen* (Gotha: Justus Perthes, 1882)” (1962, 243; 1961c, 259). Because of my inability to read German, my understanding of Blumentritt has been mediated by my reliance on Marcelino Maceda’s English translation (Blumentritt 1980).

up in another culture but is now in quest of roots (Yngvesson and Mahoney 2000)—reared by Mother Spain but now in search of *inang bayan*, or “the motherland” (Ileto 1979)—Rizal was in search of a narrative of self. He found the answer in scientific treatises.⁷ But given his political project, Rizal posed a question different from that of Blumentritt, who was concerned with classifying and ordering “the races” found in the Philippine islands. From the ethnologist’s tacit question of “What races are found in the Philippines?” Rizal drew and transposed the information to answer the question with which he grappled: “Who are we?”

Mediated therefore by the modernist discourse of European science, Rizal laid the epistemological foundations of Philippine history and identity. The influence of his person and his germinal theory made Blumentritt a cornerstone in this foundation. Although Blumentritt did not propound a notion of an idyllic past, his studies were mined by Rizal to erect the idea of a “golden age” prior to Spanish conquest in the sixteenth century. In Morga and in his essays, particularly “Sobre la Indolencia de los Filipinos” (On the Indolence of Filipinos) (see Fores-Ganzon 1996, 2:341–45), Rizal expressed his longing for the “ancient civilization” that he believed had been lost. The construct of an ancient bliss and prosperity was eventually refracted, using indigenous imageries, in Andres Bonifacio’s *Ang Dapat Mabatid ng mga Tagalog* (What the Tagalog Should Know) (see Ileto 1979, chap. 3). Indirectly, racial science left its traces in the revolutionary worldview of the Katipunan, the movement that waged the revolution against Spain in 1896.

As can be gleaned from the ilustrado texts that problematize origins and identity, this article seeks to show that the hypothesized third migration wave provided ilustrados with the basis for claiming Malay—and Filipino—identity.⁸ That identity, however, was beset with contradictions born of racial science, the ilustrados’ campaign for “assimilation,” and their intragroup differences. As a result, their imagined national community rendered highly uncertain the inclusion of what would later become known as the nation’s “minority” cultural and ethnic communities. Indeterminate in relation to the racial science of migration waves, the ilustrados’ mixed heritage would also cloud the borders of Filipinoness. Today the ramifications of the ilustrado quest for origins continue to be palpable.⁹ As a Filipino academic, I deem it imperative to shed light on the history of the boundaries of national belonging. Thus, this article revisits Blumentritt’s migration-waves framework, its place in the crafting of history and identity by Rizal and his cohort, and the consequences for nationhood of what heuristically may be called ilustrado nationalism.

Racism, Nationalism, and Philippine Historiography

By examining the theory of racial waves jointly with the nationalist creation of the past and the delineation of community, this article explores the ineluctable inter-

⁷Unlike de los Reyes, however, whose *Historia de Filipinas* (History of the Philippines, 1889) debated issues of prehistory, Rizal did not write as a scientist.

⁸Among the ilustrados, there was no sustained engagement with the question of origins and Filipinoness, despite its overarching salience. Various ilustrado texts—essays in periodicals, private correspondence, and Rizal’s exemplary works—do provide relevant but scattered statements. The statements that I have encountered are analyzed in this article. Because of their different contexts and direct concern with revolution and state building, the writings of the revolutionaries Apolinario Mabini and Emilio Jacinto and the edicts of Emilio Aguinaldo are excluded from the present discussion (but see Agoncillo 1960, 1973; Majul 1960, 1967).

⁹In addition to the present discussion, the discourse of ancient migration waves also inflects the debate on present-day migrations (see Aguilar 2000).

twining of racism and nationalism in the very narrative that is supposed to provide the nation with the moorings of its ontological being. In advancing this analysis, I recognize that the relationship between nationalism and racism is an unsettled theoretical question, as a sampling of positions will indicate. For instance, reacting to Tom Nairn's (1977) view that racism derives from nationalism, Benedict Anderson contends that these ideologies are distinct and separate in their origins, aspirations, and expressions (1991, 141–54). Nationalism thrives on political love and dreams of historical destinies, in contrast to racism's rage and obsession with contamination and class superiority. Etienne Balibar (1991) proffers a causal schema in which racism and nationalism are reciprocally determinative of each other. In Balibar's view, the "broad structure" of racism forms a supplement constitutive of the nation, providing the basis for its fictive ethnicity and unity. George Mosse (1995) asserts that racism is distinct from nationalism in that the former thrives on a sharp and totalistic certainty and the latter is a loosely constructed and flexible belief that can tolerate ethnic differences. In practice, however, the two have become difficult to distinguish, especially because the late nineteenth century saw nationalism and racism form an alliance that allowed racism to become operative and eventually ride upon nationalism.

Many striking parallels characterize nationalism and racism. Both ideologies construct ideal types and countertypes and are concerned with the principle of separateness from other political, social, or cultural entities. More important, Mosse emphasizes that "the search for roots is basic to racism" because "the roots of the race were thought to determine its future as well" (1995, 166–67). Racism's use of history and anthropology overlaps uncannily with nationalism's longing for a biography, a narrative of identity that prompts nationalism, according to Anderson, to conjure a genealogy "'up time'—towards Peking Man, Java Man, King Arthur, wherever the lamp of archeology casts its fitful gleam" (1991, 205). To quench the thirst for identity, modern nations conjure their existence in antiquity, pillaging available scientific data, even as they look simultaneously to an eternal future. For both racism and nationalism, the past holds an important key to conceptions of identity.

To expound upon the theoretical relationship of nationalism to racism is not the object of this article. Rather, it aims to identify the contradictions from the interaction of race and nation at the inception of Philippine nationalism in an empirically contingent interplay that is more complex than any theoretical position would suggest. Moreover, this article probes not only the colonial subject's denouncement of racial practices but also the appropriation and marshalling of racial science and racial identities as a form of resistance. The *ilustrados* were not unique, for comparable strategies were resorted to by other dominated, marginalized, or minoritized groups from the 1870s to the 1920s when "science became both more specialized and authoritative as a cultural resource and language of interpretation" (Stepan and Gilman 1993, 175).¹⁰ The *ilustrados* specifically drew on racial science to form a counter-

¹⁰Siam presents an analogous appropriation of racial science as a form of resistance against European colonialism but with the contrasting effect that, despite social hierarchies, the kingdom's subjects were homogenized and then nationalized; ideas of a "Tai race" also fed ultranationalism and expansionism in the 1930s (see Terwiel 1978, 1991, 1996; Streckfuss 1993; Thongchai 2000). The rise of nationalism in China and Japan in the late nineteenth century drew on racial science to rework indigenous notions of identity into racialized constructs of purity and descent that included some and excluded others from the nation (see Dikötter 1997). On recent paleoanthropology inflected by Chinese nationalism, see Sautman 2001; on archaeology and ethnic/national origins and identities, see Kohl 1998. Within the scientific community, resistance based on the idioms of science by African and Jewish Americans in the 1870–1920 period is discussed in Stepan and Gilman 1993.

discourse to the “unscientific” claims of Spanish friars and colonials. But although they debunked charges of innate inferiority, their enmeshment in racial thought impinged on the struggle for nationhood. The ironies and compromises of this process strike deeply at the sense of nation, which may explain the nationalist historiography’s avoiding frontal encounter with this past.

In the 1960s, Renato Constantino pointed out that the designation “Filipino” originally referred to Spaniards born in the colonial Philippines, but it was transformed by ilustrados into “a class concept” until it “finally embraced the entire nation and became a means of national identification” (1969, 4–11). Because Constantino saw the problematics of class and imperialism as preponderant, he did not pursue the traces of race. In his last major work, William Henry Scott countered that since the seventeenth century “Filipino” had sometimes been used to mean the people of the Philippine islands, thus anteceding its creole referent (1994, 6–7). Scott, however, saw no need to narrate the term’s change from a geographic to a national badge. Citing Scott, Vicente Rafael (2000) has signaled at the ironies and everyday slippages of the national label but, while dissecting the racism of the United States as colonizer, has stopped at excavating the internal nexus of racism embedded in Filipino nationalism.

Also in the 1960s, Edgar Wickberg (1964, 1965) established that the hegemonic Filipino elite descended from Chinese mestizos who first gained economic ascendancy in the mid-eighteenth century. The passage from Chinese mestizo to Filipino, however, has been sidelined by the spotlight on the more edifying progress “from Indio to Filipino,” as Domingo Abella [1978] titled his work. In the 1970s Scott stressed that “cultural minorities” were a colonial artifact and that prior to the colonial period they were indistinguishable from those that subsequently became the Hispanized “majority” (1982, 28–41). Scott implied their equal claim to Filipinoness but did not recount why many did not consider them to be Filipinos. John Schumacher has admitted that “[i]n the Philippines the pagan Igorots and Muslim Moros were considered and treated by Christian Filipinos as outside the civilized Filipino community,” but claimed that their “humiliating treatment” in the 1887 Madrid Exposition “stung many of the educated Filipinos into identifying themselves with these their ‘brothers’ and ‘countrymen’” (1973, 67). This assertion could not explain why, for example, Muslim leaders who decided to accept the central state had to assert a “Muslim-Filipino” identity beginning in the 1930s, as Patricio Abinales (2000) has elucidated. The “majority Filipinos” have considered Muslims inherently different, while some Muslims “do not appear too happy in being called ‘Filipinos’” (Majul 1973, 346). Schumacher’s solution to the question of national inclusiveness in the 1887 exposition would appear to have closed the issue, but his has been an incomplete account.

Paralleling the elisions that pervade the genealogy of “Filipino” are the partial confrontations with the theory of migration waves. Under the aegis of American colonialism, racial science continued to exert its sway upon the Filipino intelligentsia. Using archaeological finds, H. Otley Beyer (1948) starting in the 1920s developed his own version of the migration-waves theory, which from the late 1950s Robert Fox and others would critique and modify.¹¹ Since the 1970s, the theory has received sustained criticism from anthropologists and historians. F. Landa Jocano (1975, 1991, 1998) has relentlessly argued that the theory distorts, rather than illuminates, the

¹¹See Zamora 1967 for important contributions to this debate. Beyer’s migration-waves theory is graphically presented in Reyes et al. 1953.

racial origins and affinities of Filipinos while denigrating the vitality and autochthonous development of Filipino culture, which would seem to have been borrowed wholesale from outside. Arnold Azurin has scored the theory for its colonial, racist, and anti-Filipino framework, which fuels notions such as the Igorot “belong to another race” (1993, 15–28). Scott has called it a “speculative rather than factual” theory that erroneously tagged Negritos as the archipelago’s aboriginal occupants (1992, 8–12). Rafael has criticized its racialization of Philippine society and its function in legitimating conquest by the United States (2000, 35–37). The theory is now widely discredited among Filipino academics and intellectuals, who routinely lament its perpetuation in history textbooks.¹² But, late twentieth-century critiques of the theory, many of which spring from a nationalist impulse, need to be reconciled with the theory’s salience in the formation of national consciousness. Because of its centrality to ilustrado nationalism and because of the context that it provided for the intertwining of race and nation in “Filipino,” the racial science of migration waves cannot simply be wished away.

Tracing Ancestors, Differentiating the *Indio*

Selectively using science as memory, José Rizal portrayed “the ancient Filipinos” (*los antiguos Filipinos*) as possessing a civilization of which one could be proud, in some aspects even superior to that of Europe. This exalted past was his riposte to Spanish taunts and insults about the crudity and racial inferiority of *indios*, Spain’s colonial subjects. Thus, gender equality and cognatic kinship among the preconquest elites elicited the remark that “the Filipinos acted very much in conformity with natural laws, being ahead of the Europeans” (Rizal 1962, 276; 1961c, 294). In regard to thievery, Rizal opined that “the ancient Filipinos” resorted to a “practice that leaves a door to repentance and saves the honor of the repentant [which] ought to have been imitated by the Europeans” (1962, 287; see also 1961c, 306). In case this first method failed, “the ancient Filipinos used another method already more *perfect and civilized* inasmuch as it resembled the judgment of God and the practices of the Middle Ages” (1962, 287; see also 1961c, 306; emphasis in original). The precolonial mode of justice—which prompted Rizal to sigh: “¡Si nuestros antepasados resucitasen!” (If only our ancestors could be resurrected!)—was far better than Spanish practices, which failed to investigate the complaints aired in 1887 by tenants, including Rizal’s family, against the Dominican friars who owned the Calamba estate (1890, 90; Fores-Ganzon 1996, 2:88–93).

The glories of the preconquest golden age of *our* ancestors underscored the failure and injustices of Spanish colonialism. The friars were faulted for the colony’s backwardness. Excluding the Jesuits, Rizal asserted that “after the religious saw their position consolidated, they began to spread calumnies and to debase the races of the Philippines, with a view to giving themselves more importance, always making themselves indispensable, and using the alleged crudity of the *Indio* to excuse their

¹²Similarly, A. Terry Rambo, Karl Hutterer, and Kathleen Gillogly have lamented the durability of the migration-waves model in Southeast Asia: “The persistence of such a theoretically dubious model for such an extended period, despite its general rejection elsewhere in the world, raises troubling questions about the state of ethnological research in Southeast Asia” (1988, 3).

stupidity and ignorance” (1961c, 329; trans. author). Debased and brutalized, the ancestors’ “intellectual level” plummeted: “In the past they knew how to reason; at present they are satisfied with merely asking and believing” (Rizal 1961c, 307; trans. author). With the loss of reason, the “ancient Filipinos” were kept in the dark. The ancestors regressed.

Who were these ancestors? In posing this question, I call attention to the fact that the ilustrados did not reckon the forebears of all the peoples in the archipelago as ancestors, nor did they consider all natives to be indios. In Rizal’s construct, not all the “races” at the time of the Spanish conquest were at par in their state of culture and capacity for civilization. The multiple and autonomous preconquest social groups that Rizal represented as *las sociedades malayo-filipinas* (the Philippine-Malayan societies) were separable into two distinct categories by his time (1961c, 298). On one hand were “the civilized Filipinos” (*los Filipinos civilizados*), who did not resist conversion to Catholicism; on the other were “the mountain tribes” (*las tribus montaÑesas*), who resisted and therefore were not civilized (see, for example, Rizal 1961c, 332; 1962, 311). The ancestors were to be identified partially on the basis of “race”—“Malayness”—and partially on “civilization,” principally acceptance of Spanish culture.

In tracing lineage, Ferdinand Blumentritt’s *Versuch* appeared to have served Rizal’s purposes well. The ancestors were not found in the first migration wave comprising Negritos and were also not found in the second wave, which, although composed of “Malays,” had taken to the mountains. The “ancient Filipinos” with whom Rizal and other ilustrados deciphered a racial and cultural affinity were found in the third migratory wave of “Malays,” who settled in the lowlands. In conformity with the prevailing ideas of the time, the plot underpinning the migration-waves theory was one of progress, with the last wave as the bearer of civilization.¹³ Rizal viewed Spanish colonialism’s intervention in this linear plot with ambiguity. When he was not thinking about how the friar establishment obstructed progress, Rizal appreciated the access to European civilization and modernity that the colonial relationship with Spain made possible. But when friars occupied his gaze, Rizal saw the Spanish conquest as nothing but a scourge that alienated him from his descent and deprived him of history and identity. Such overpowering moments drove him to recuperate the past. His “nostalgia for lost origins,” however, did not encompass all of the three hypothesized migration waves but was partial to the third.

The First Wave

Akin to previous and later suppositions, Blumentritt painted Negritos as constituting the first wave of migrants.¹⁴ Of a distinct “race,” Negritos were “the original owners of the land,” who had been pushed into the forested interiors, except in the remote northeastern coast of Luzon, where they were “still in possession of their

¹³The paradigmatic narrative of immigration as progress is not restricted to European thought. In Flores Island in eastern Indonesia, the descendants of Sumatran migrants assert their dominance vis-à-vis aborigines by claiming to be the bearers of civilization (Erb 1997).

¹⁴De los Reyes doubted the view that Negritos were the aboriginal inhabitants of the Philippines (1889, 16), a point repeated a century later by Scott (1992, 8–12). Against those who saw Negritos as descended from Papuans of Melanesia, de los Reyes preferred the view of their descent from “the black race,” which included the Sakai of the Malay peninsula (1889, 3–4). For a succinct statement on current views of Southeast Asian prehistory, see Bellwood 1992.

old native land" (Blumentritt 1980, 18).¹⁵ In Antonio de Morga's account, Negritos figured as "natives who are of black complexion," whom he described as "barbarians of trifling mental capacity, who have no fixed homes or settlements" (Rizal 1962, 243; 1961c, 259). These nomadic "barbarians," according to Morga, were dangerous because they pillaged the settlement of "the other natives." On these characterizations Rizal made no comment in any of his annotations, as he was wont to do when he felt that the Spaniards demeaned his people. His silence implied that Negritos were not his people and did not deserve his defense. His reticence was even more notable in that Blumentritt defended Negritos as "a lively and talented people contrary to the report of the Spaniards who have described them as being without any form of intelligence" (1980, 24). Combating the Negritos' fearsome image, Blumentritt stressed that their isolation made them "almost powerless to resist their enemies" (1980, 30–31).

Overlooking Blumentritt's point of view, Rizal conformed with the standard colonial practice, which, Scott notes, routinely excluded Negritos from the rubric of *indio* (1994, 8). Denigrated by Spaniards and their lowland subjects, Negritos were strangers, an alien race that the Europeans and "Malay Christians" placed beyond the reach of civilization. Even the most "enlightened" considered Negritos inherently primitive.

In reviewing a pamphlet authored by conservative Spanish mestizo Eduardo P. Casal y Ochoa, an ilustrado using the pen name Bagong-Tauo (New Man) criticized the author for exculpating Spain from responsibility for conditions in the Philippines (Schumacher 1973, 53–55, 70–70). Bagong-Tauo, however, conceded Casal's point about the Negritos' racial inferiority in this passage from the March 15, 1889, issue of *La Solidaridad*: "But, we shall render enthusiastic praise to Señor Casal for these declarations: 'From the Tagalog to the primitive Negrito, there is a descending scale of culture, which induces some learned ethnographers to believe in the inferiority of races. In Oceania as well as in civilized Europe, there exist social hierarchies of knowledge and culture.' This is also our belief, and therefore, with due impartiality, we shall not begrudge him our praise" (Fores-Ganzon 1996, 1:60, trans. author). Despite differences in political sentiments, critic and author shared the universalist view concerning civilizational hierarchies. In the Philippines, that hierarchy was unabashedly race based: Tagalog held the highest rank, "primitive Negritos" the lowest. Although not all ilustrados agreed on the status of the Tagalog, agreement converged on Negritos as lying at the bottom. This notion of primitivity defined the outer limits shared by ilustrado thought.

The anatomy of Negritos, as members of a "wild race," was taken as evidence in itself of their incapacity for civilization. They were outside the ilustrados' sphere of legitimate knowledge and pursuit of justice. None felt any pang of conscience that "ancient Filipinos" might have unfairly dislodged Negritos from their "original possession" of the land. After all, they were not ancestors. Moreover, their dispossession was attributed by Blumentritt to the second wave, who also were not "ancient Filipinos."

The Second Wave

In Blumentritt's schema, "invading Malaysians" composed the second migration wave.¹⁶ They came from the south and gradually moved north, settling initially along

¹⁵Although Negritos have dwelled in various lowland areas around the country, the widespread impression, then and now, is that they are a mountainous people.

¹⁶Beyer popularized this wave's composition as "Indonesians," with A and B subcategories.

the coasts and displacing Negritos. In turn, they would be driven to the interiors by the next wave of migrants but not before their biological constitution was altered. The second-wave Malayans “arrived in the Philippines during the time when there were still many Negritos” with whom they intermarried, resulting in “the strong Negrito racial elements found among them” (Blumentritt 1980, 13). Blumentritt adduced this racial mixing with Negritos rather than with Chinese and Japanese, as other scholars at that time had claimed. Evidently, the second wave’s retreat to the mountainous interior and subsequent resistance to Spanish rule and culture were consistent with racial concepts of *métissage*, which would envisage intermarriage with “inferior” Negritos as diluting the intrinsic attributes of these “Malayans,” rendering them susceptible to displacement by the next wave. Their descendants, according to Blumentritt, were the “Igorots, Ifugaos, Guinanons, Apayaos, Zambals, Abacas, Isinays, Italonons, Ibilaos, Ilongots, and Kalingas” (1980, 13).

“Contamination” by the Negrito removed second-wave “Malayans” from consideration as ancestors. However, they still fitted Rizal’s broad category of *sociedades malayo-filipinas* and the specific subcategory of “mountain tribes.” As Scott would stress a century later (1982, 28–41; 1992), Blumentritt’s description of the Igorot highlighted many practices similar to those of the Tagalog at the time of the Spanish conquest (1980, 66–85). Not impressed that the Igorot and the Tagalog shared something fundamental, Rizal suggested in his annotations that resistance to Spain set back “mountain tribes” as primitives, unlike the Tagalog, who became “civilized Filipinos.” Their backwardness was virtually inherent in their alleged nature as second wavers. In colonial society, the Spanish-era word “Igorrotes” was applied to all sorts of mountain dwellers and became synonymous with primitivity and savagery. As Blumentritt noted even from a distance (he never set foot on the Philippines), “Together with the name Igorots much nonsense is attached” (1980, 66). The early nationalists generally shared in such “nonsense.”

Only during the 1887 *Exposición de las Islas Filipinas* (Exposition of the Philippine Islands) did the youthful patriots have a chance to see themselves as linked to “tribes” whose members were brought to Madrid for display. This delegation consisted of eight Igorots, eight Moros, two people from the Marianas, two from the Carolines, and about twenty-four others (including Negritos) from the Philippines (López Jaena 1951, 152–53; Schumacher 1973, 53–73; Scott 1974, 275–79; 1975, 12–13).

That “mountain tribes” were made to represent the Philippines was distasteful and offensive to *ilustrados*, who were stirred by the appalling accommodation and treatment of the human exhibits—mirroring the way that Spain dealt with the whole colony. In addition to the affront to basic human dignity, the exposition was unacceptable precisely because “savages” embodied the Philippines. Encapsulating *ilustrado* feeling, Graciano López Jaena wrote, “[t]he Exposition does not represent those Islands with dignity or, at least, with decency; it shows nothing but the backwardness of the Philippines. Everything modern, related to its progress, has not been brought to the Exposition” (1951, 151–52). Long before the actual exhibit, word circulated about the impending fiasco. In November 1886, Rizal reported to Blumentritt: “According to the newspapers and the information I have, it will not be an exposition of the Philippines but, rather, an exposition of Igorrotes, who will play music, cook, sing, and dance” (1961b, 22; 1961a, 30; trans. author). As would be replicated in St. Louis in 1904 (see Rydell 1984; Vergara 1995; see also Afable 2004; Buangan 2004), in Madrid Igorots became emblematic of Philippine backwardness.

The Madrid Exposition was wide ranging and did not feature only Igorots. Paul Kramer has observed that it was meant “to reinforce colonial ties to the Pacific, through promotion of investments, and in addition, greater study and symbolic affirmation of Spanish dominion,” in light of which “several Filipino *ilustrados* received awards for their art and scholarship” (1998, 21–22). Among the awards was a silver medallion for Isabelo de los Reyes’s *El Folk-Lore Filipino* (Philippine Folklore, 1994). But confirming the apprehension of *ilustrados* such as Evaristo Aguirre, who wrote Rizal about official preparations in Madrid for the exposition (NHC 1963, 2:66–70, 76–78), the exposition failed to capture the attention of authorities in Spain. It did succeed in giving prominence to the Igorot as the prototype of the “backward” Philippines. The word “Igorrote” even acquired currency in Madrid (Scott 1974, 277–78). Overwhelmed by the Madrileños’ taunts, Rizal and other *ilustrados* were caught in the frenzy of counterreaction.

At one level, because the Igorot did not exhaust what the Philippines stood for, the young nationalists saw them as unrepresentative of their homeland, but the Igorot were also seen as atypical in that they were not “the best” that the Philippines could parade before civilized Europe. The Igorot were “rare *individuals*” (Rizal 1961b, 106; 1961a, 190; emphasis in original). In stressing the word “individuals,” Rizal might well have been suggesting that the Igorot were a numerical minority, a rarity whose condition should be concealed rather than exposed to stain impressions of the Philippines. They were an oddity undeserving of public attention. These “rare individuals,” said Rizal, served no purpose other than to entertain the busybodies of Madrid. In fact, Rizal and his friends would have favored an exposition on the Philippines that displayed its manufacturing, hence “progressive,” aspects—as if these would exhaust what the country stood for and as if Europeans would be impressed. Plans were afoot precisely for such an exhibit. Rizal intimated to Blumentritt in June 1887: “Five years ago we wanted to hold an exhibition of Filipino workers, weavers, etc., and we still want to hold one. . . . We want an industrial exposition, but not an exposition of human beings. . . .” (Rizal 1961b, 106; see also 1961a, 190–91). Because Rizal was unaware of the artisanal and hydraulic-engineering skills of the Igorot, he thought that a display of craft and proletarian workers would showcase to the modern capitalist world system the Philippines’ best. At the same time, he implied that displaying industrial workers would no longer be “an exposition of human beings,” suggesting that, under the sway of mechanical philosophy, such workers cease to be human beings. With industrialization as the ideal, *ilustrado* thinking was plainly in line with social evolutionism, which held science, technology, and modern industry as the pinnacle of civilization (Adas 1989).

In the bosom of Mother Spain, however, the chasm that separated the “civilized” from the “uncivilized” in the Philippines was bridged, as Schumacher (1973) has noted. The sympathy for and glimmers of identification with the Igorot were quite genuine for some *ilustrados*. In August 1885, de los Reyes published in Madrid “Terminología del Folk-Lore” (Terminology of Folklore), which began by declaring himself, an Ilocano, as “brother of the jungle dwellers, the Aeta, the Igorot and the Tinguian and born in this remote Spanish colony, where civilization shines but with a very faint light” (1994, 20; trans. author). This stunning opening line would cause the Manila press “to lampoon him for years afterwards” (Scott 1982, 251). Directed at Spanish folklorists, this opening sentence, which continued with the author’s “confession” of his lack of knowledge of the new field of folklore, was written tongue

in cheek, as de los Reyes went on to debate with European folklorists.¹⁷ Other ilustrados could not comprehend de los Reyes's mischievous style and claim to brotherhood with the "forest dwellers." About two years later, the outrage sparked by the exposition prompted Evaristo Aguirre, Rizal's creole friend who considered himself "purely Filipino," to write a newspaper article referring to the dehumanized persons on display at the Retiro zoological garden as "our brothers" (Schumacher 1973, 53, 67). Rizal also referred to the persons on exhibit as "my compatriots" and "my countrymen" (*mis paisanos*). In a moment of inclusiveness, López Jaena referred to the "simple folks" (*sencilla gente*) collectively as "Filipinos" (1951, 155–59). In their humanism, the ilustrados felt a fraternal bond with the individuals whom they believed were demeaned and exploited by the exposition.

What did this inclusiveness imply? In his compassion for "compatriots" on display, Rizal embraced the Carolines and Marianas, along with the areas whence "tribal" persons came. The territorial expanse of Rizal's *pais* (country) matched the inclusion of these Pacific islands in the Philippine Exposition. Although the Carolines were a budgetary drain (Fores-Ganzon 1996, 2:360–61), many ilustrados considered the islands an integral part of the Philippines. Attachment to the Carolines was probably created by the banishment of indios to these far-flung islands (Fores-Ganzon 1996, 2:538–41, 575–76). In 1891 Nicolas San Pascual asserted in *La Solidaridad* that Mindanao "is less important compared with the Carolines" (Fores-Ganzon 1996, 3:490–91). Similarly, the Marianas were deemed part of the Philippines and, like the Carolines, loomed larger than Mindanao. In the 1890 proposal to create electoral districts for the hoped-for representation in the Cortes, Marcelo H. del Pilar defined the district of Cebu as including the "Marianas and the districts of Mindanao"; the other electoral districts were those of Manila, Ilocos, Camarines, and Iloilo (Fores-Ganzon 1996, 2:242–43)—the proposed five electoral districts apparently based on the extant ecclesiastical divisions.¹⁸ Sympathies at the Madrid Exposition revealed the territorial boundary of the ilustrados' Philippines, which was broader or more malleable than the geographic limits later drawn by American colonialism (see figure).

Unlike their inclusion of the Marianas in the political community and notwithstanding the avowals by a few, however, rare was the ilustrado who prized "mountain tribes" in deep comradeship—except possibly de los Reyes, if his avowal of brotherhood with "jungle dwellers" is taken at face value. Although some ilustrados

¹⁷To Scott, the opening statement was "a confession—or boast" (1982, 251). Reprinted in *El Folk-Lore Filipino*, the claim to brotherhood with Aetas, Igorots, and Tinguianes was not supported by a reasonable discussion of their folklore. Igorots figured in the "administrative folklore" centered on the fictional character Isio, who was driven by the corrupt system to flee to the mountains, where he deluded Igorots with magic even as he uplifted them with his civilizing mission. The tale was "a naughty exposé but one rendered so subtle by its comic dialogue" (Scott 1982, 258). Integral to its comic success were cheap shots at Igorots, which did not aid in rectifying prevailing stereotypes. For a different view, see Anderson 2000.

¹⁸This was pointed out to me by Father John Schumacher. The dioceses that were in place in the Spanish Philippines based on a ruling of 1595 were Manila, Cebu, Nueva Caceres (centered in Naga in the Camarines), and Nueva Segovia (with its capital in Vigan in the Ilocos officially since 1758). The diocese of Jaro was created in 1865 to include the provinces of Iloilo, Capiz, Antique, the Calamianes, Negros, Zamboanga, and the present Davao provinces. Until Jaro's establishment, the diocese of Cebu had been the most extensive, covering the Visayan Islands, Mindanao, and the Mariana Islands. No Spanish bishop of Cebu ever visited the Marianas, however, until the bishopric of Romualdo Jimeno (1847–72) (see Fernandez 1979, 28–35). In effect, after 1865 northern Mindanao and the Marianas were part of Cebu; southern Mindanao belonged to Jaro (Iloilo).

That this wave supposedly drove away the settled population of “Malays” from the lowlands did not disturb the ilustrados. The “higher civilization and milder morals” that they brought to the Philippines justified their invasion. Conquest of the third wave was successful. By the time Spaniards set foot in the Philippines, people of the third wave were said to have “occupied all the coastal plains of the archipelago” (Blumentritt 1980, 14). This physical domination of the lowlands and coastal plains also marked the social separation and distinctiveness of the third wave, which Blumentritt and the ilustrados could not imagine as intermarrying with the first and second waves. Because they grew up with “ethnic” identities such as Bicolano, Capampangan, Ilocano, Tagalog, Visayan, and so on—isomorphic with old colonial administrative divisions—ilustrados could see themselves grouped into a single entity, “the third wave,” and recognize their putative ancestors: the last-wave “Malays” were the “ancient Filipinos.”

Morga had written that the people of “Manila and its surroundings were not natives of the island [of Luzon], but immigrants, who populated it in past times, they being Malayan natives or natives of their islands and remote lands” (Rizal 1961c, 258–59; 1962, 243; trans. author). To that statement, Rizal appended a note which claimed that “[a]ncient traditions had made Sumatra the place of origin of Indios Filipinos” (1961c, 259; 1962, 243; trans. author). Rizal was probably influenced by Francisco Colín’s assertion in the seventeenth century that the people of Sumatra had a “tradition” of migration and of peopling other islands and that the Pampangos of central Luzon spoke the same language as Sumatrans (1663/1900, 1:16).¹⁹ Evidently, the “Indios Filipinos” whom Rizal had in mind belonged to the third wave, and he wanted to rekindle their “higher civilization and milder morals”; however, “[t]hese traditions were completely lost as well as the mythology and genealogies that old historians tell us about, thanks to the zeal of the religious in extirpating every national, gentile, or idolatrous memento” (1962, 243; 1961c, 259). Rizal’s lament was immediately followed by the advice to the reader to consult Blumentritt’s “most interesting work,” *Versuch einer Ethnographie der Philippinen*. Ethnological science, Rizal was confident, affirmed the ancient civilization of Tagalog and other “Indios Filipinos.”

Ethnological knowledge also served to accentuate seemingly inherent differences between “Indios Filipinos” and the earlier arrival of “savage Malays.” In contrast to the latter, third-wave “Malays” possessed a civilization comparable, if not superior, to that of Europe. In his later work *Las Razas Indígenas de Filipinas* (Indigenous Races of the Philippines, 1890), Blumentritt dignified ilustrado sentiment by cataloging the Bicol, Bisaya, Ilocano, Pampango, Pangasinan, and Tagalog as *raza malaya de antigua civilización* (Malay race with an ancient civilization). In contrast, the Negrito and groups of second-wave provenance were not honored with such a description.

That lowland indios of the “Malayan race” possessed an “ancient civilization” seemed completely self-evident because the ilustrados could see in themselves their incontrovertible capacity for Hispanic civilization. Yes, there were many of their kind who had not been “enlightened,” but this was not of their own making but that of Spanish friars. All they needed was the light of modern education, which was what ilustrados sought to impart. As Rizal intoned, the imperative was “enlightenment, enlightenment, the education of our people, education and enlightenment” (1961a, 580; 1961b, 306; trans. author).

¹⁹Father Schumacher informed me that Rizal’s source was “undoubtedly” Colín.

“Indios Filipinos” were not to be placed at par with “mountain tribes,” who were believed to be devoid of ancient civilization. To equate them was an insult to ilustrados. Blumentritt’s observation that many Igorot practices were similar to those of the ancient Tagalog was conveniently ignored (1980, 66–85). To counter the views of *La Oceania Española* (Spanish Oceania), *La Solidaridad* featured an article titled “The Philippines before the Blood Compact” (“Filipinas antes del pacto de sangre”) in its issue of December 31, 1891. It asserted: “Our colleague is gravely mistaken if he believes that the Spaniards found the Filipinos of the coast in the same state as the Igorot of today, because they, according to Chirino, Morga, Colin, San Antonio, San Agustín, and others, were already organized into large towns and not small settlements (*rancherías*)” (Fores-Ganzon 1996, 3:632, 634; trans. author). The article proceeded to list the hallmarks of the “ancient civilization” of “Indios Filipinos”: their own alphabet and widespread literacy; silk clothing, Indian cotton, costly jewelry, and a fine taste for clothing; cannons and fortifications; porcelain plates; a legal system based on gentle (*suave*) customs; a primitive religion “highly respected by modern Orientalists and philosophers”; and a form of slavery that was better than what the early Spanish settlers were said to have established (Fores-Ganzon 1996, 3:633–34). The article’s final rebuttal extolled the thirst for knowledge and learning of “the indigenous (*el indígena*) or Tagalog.” Unwittingly signaling differences among ilustrados, the article made “indigenous” and “Tagalog” commensurate and interchangeable. Symptomatically, other ethnolinguistic groups were excluded from indigeneity and nativeness.

Despite his open disagreement with Rizal on the portrayal of preconquest times, de los Reyes held the view that “[w]hen the Spaniards arrived in the Philippines in 1521, it was no longer a savage pueblo. Its inhabitants were already grouped into pueblos” (1994, 288, 290; trans. author). In his *El Folk-Lore Filipino*, de los Reyes listed several indicators of civilization, such as mercantile relations with neighboring polities in Asia, the use of firearms, a not-so-backward religion, a system of writing, and customary law. But while his portrayal of the pre-Hispanic past suggested that Luzon and the Visayas shared the same cultural heritage, de los Reyes boldly declared the Ilocos as his *patria adorada* (beloved country [fatherland]) (1994, 18). Although he claimed to have changed his earlier view that “Ilocanos were a distinct race from Tagalog,” his catalog of Ilocano customs asserted that “Ilocanos are the equal of the rest of civilized Filipinos” (194). In terms of physique, industriousness, frugality, and self-confidence, the Ilocano was even better than the Tagalog (de los Reyes 1994, 194–97). In the “faraway” Ilocos existed cultural authenticity, for there Ilocano practices and beliefs had been “preserved with great purity, and closely approximated those at the time of Conquest” (de los Reyes 1994, 192, 194). The defense of Ilocanos in the Ilocos was perhaps called forth by the low status of Ilocanos in Manila, many of whom worked as domestic servants and drivers of horse-drawn carriages (de los Reyes 1994, 202; Rizal 1961a, 106; 1961b, 61–62). De los Reyes’s unremitting “my-beloved-Ilocos’ stance” (Scott 1982, 270) gained Rizal’s ire as an attempt to “Ilokanoize the Philippines” (Fores-Ganzon 1996, 2:506; see also Rizal 1961a, 288; 1961b, 167). Thus, the third wave was not a cohesive group; competition between the Ilocano and the Tagalog prefigured what would later be decried as “regionalism” that, dragging in “the rest of civilized Filipinos,” coexisted in a fraught relationship with nation building throughout the twentieth century (see Aguilar 1998b).

The contest over Tagalog or Ilocano supremacy, however, did not enfeeble the concept of “native”—indio—whose meaning was bounded and restricted. When ilustrados appropriated the term *indio* in nationalist fashion, they had in mind specifically the Catholicized “Malays.” That the natives were not included in the

Inquisition led Rizal to remark in his edition of Morga: “A wise foresight, for otherwise the Indios might have fled away from Christianization” (1962, 313; 1961c, 334). Thus, *indios* designated those who underwent religious conversion, with the Tagalog as the exemplary indio. By implication, those who “fled”—mountain tribes and Muslims, for example—were not indios. In an article in the September 15, 1889, issue of *La Solidaridad* (Fores-Ganzon 1996, 1:352), Rizal used the phrase *igorrotos é indios* (Igorot and indio) which confirmed the link at the same time that it demarcated the discursive boundary between these two categories. In critiquing the 1887 exposition, López Jaena was adamant that “genuine Filipinos, those of the autochthonous race” (*los genuinamente filipinos, los de la raza autóctona*), were not given a “place of honor” (1951, 155, 164); indeed, “genuine Filipinos” were excluded from its organizing committee. But in the same breath he used the phrase *igorrotos y filipinos* (Igorot and Filipino) (López Jaena 1951, 166). One could not help but suspect that López Jaena considered ilustrados such as himself as the “genuine Filipinos” who should have been involved in planning the exposition. Apparently, for Rizal and López Jaena, “Igorot” and *indio* represented dichotomous entities. In the aftermath of the exposition, Antonio Luna was even more forthright in chiding Madrileños for ignorantly failing to make the all-important distinctions: “To these people Chinese, Igorots and Filipinos are one and the same” (Fores-Ganzon 1996, 1:444–45). Luna’s point was unmistakable: Filipinos should not be confused with Chinese—neither should Filipinos be confused with Igorots, for the Igorot was not an indio and not a Filipino. López Jaena cited Luna’s statement, making the further claim that Filipinos all over Spain were being “shamelessly mortified” by even educated persons with epithets such as “*chinos, chinitos, negros, igorrotos*” (1951, 171). The ilustrados were enraged: Why do these Spaniards not comprehend that “Chinese, Chinks, blacks, and Igorots” are not Filipinos?

The Campaign for Assimilation and Its Exclusionary Politics of Numbers

Despite the furor surrounding the 1887 exposition, the ilustrados essentially excluded Negritos, highland peoples, and Muslims from the national community that they had begun to imagine. This exclusion can be seen in José Rizal’s blueprint for a Philippine studies conference to be hosted in Paris by the fledgling Asociación Internacional de Filipinistas (International Association of Philippinists). Drafted in early 1889, the program (which did not materialize) included panels on the “origin,” “classification,” and “civilization” of the islands’ inhabitants “before the Spanish arrival” and panels on “the influence of Spanish civilization on the social life of the Philippines” (Rizal 1961a, 429–39; 1961b, 229–32; trans. author). On Ferdinand Blumentritt’s suggestion, a new section was added to discuss “[r]azas y regiones independientes in which we shall include the sultanates and independent tribes (Moros, Negritos, and so on)” (Rizal 1961a, 454; 1961b, 237; trans. author). If not for Blumentritt’s intervention, Rizal’s cognitive map would not have included the “independent races and regions” within the same territorial area supposedly designated by las Islas Filipinas, or “the Philippines.”²⁰ Moreover, the added section’s title

²⁰This omission is interesting because in chapter 45 of *Noli Me Tangere*, as Ben Anderson has pointed out to me, the aggrieved Elias speaks of his desire to flee to the north and “live

contained the insidious suggestion that Moros, Negritos, and others represented “races” distinct from and inferior to indios. While the indio lived under Spanish hegemony, non-indio tribes existed in regions unsubjected by Spain. Implied were two divergent historical experiences and two unrelated political projects that fell along a well-demarcated racial divide and civilizational ranking. Evidently, Rizal’s ilustrado thought had been influenced by European racial evolutionism, backed by “purportedly scientific evidence that innate intellectual and moral differences made cultural exchanges between ‘superior’ and ‘inferior’ races impossible” (Adas 1989, 319). Blumentritt’s intervention might not have alerted in Rizal the necessity to overcome such a dichotomy actively, merely the need to “fill in the gaps” that would be created by excluding non-indios who lived in spaces encompassed by the name “the Philippines.”

Sensitive that other Europeans were scoffing at them as “owners only of the littoral,” Spanish authorities in Manila from the 1880s onward sought to conquer the archipelago’s mountainous interior and subjugate the peoples there in a second *reducción*, the forcible creation of settlements that was attempted at the start of conquest (Aguilar 1998a, 157–58). The ilustrados did not value this late imperial goal, however, and readily detached themselves from the social and physical spaces occupied by “independent tribes” and “wild races.” The ilustrados’ imagined community was restricted to the already-colonized lowland inhabitants of third-wave ancestry, those whom Spain had designated as *indios*. It excluded, as Scott notes, the “mountain peoples of northern Luzon, . . . whether called Igorots, Tinguians, or Zambals,” whom Spaniards “collectively referred to as *tribus independientes* [independent tribes] rather than *indios*” (1974, 3). Molded by the nomenclature and reach of the Spanish colonial state, the ilustrados found it difficult to think otherwise. Thus, the early nationalists laid claim to the same sphere over which the colonial state exercised its authority, and excluded the zones that had eluded the state’s incorporative advances. The embryonic nation was conceived, perhaps unavoidably, in the hearth of colonial society. Within the cradle of the state’s delimited space was reared the consciousness of being native or indigenous—the indio identity—despite a supposedly ancestral immigrant past. Corollarily, descendants of “older” immigrant groups beyond the state’s reach were denied the status of rootedness and ultimately of being “genuine Filipinos.”

In addition to the mold of the colonial state, the genesis of Filipino nationalism was also entangled with the appropriation and internalization of a high-minded imperialist agenda. The ilustrados’ campaign for “assimilation” was influenced by the French colonial dictum of assimilation, a logical outcome of France’s *mission civilisatrice*. France’s seeming imperial liberality impressed the ilustrados. Rizal appreciated that “the French spirit does not shine in zeal for colonization” (Fores-Ganzon 1996, 2:37), while Antonio Luna honored French colonies with the superlative description as places where “the road to a genuine policy of assimilation of the most beautiful of civilizations” had been paved (Fores-Ganzon 1996, 1:358; trans. author). Ilustrados became enthusiastic admirers of the French idea of a “civilizing mission”—unaware of the injuries that were being inflicted upon the Khmer and Vietnamese (Barnett 1990; Marr 1971). Imperial France marked a standard which, in their view, Spain failed miserably. In France itself, questions were raised in Parliament concerning

among the infidel and independent tribes (*las tribus infieles e independientes*)” (Rizal 1887/1995, 250), giving the autonomous status of those groups (but not the Muslim and other groups in the south) some positive connotation. The novel was completed in Europe in 1886. A few years later, the campaign for assimilation would appear to have required a different kind of political imagination.

the cultural assimilation of “natives,” but assimilation in French imperial thought indisputably meant representation of the colony in the legislature of the imperial country (Lewis 1961). Legitimated by the French model and inspired by the recollection that Spain’s Cadiz Constitution of 1812 (revoked in 1815) once made for such provision, Philippine representation in the Cortes became a central plank of the Propaganda Movement’s campaign for assimilation.

This campaign was meant to convince Spain that it ought to be a “proper” imperial power—lest “Spain perjure herself” by renegeing on pledges made in the “blood compact” (Fores-Ganzon 1996, 1:380–81).²¹ In their view, Filipinos deserved fair treatment because they *were* Spaniards. On legal grounds and by patent cultural affinities but not on biological terms, ilustrados deemed themselves Spaniards.²² When the Pangasinan provincial governor ordered that indios take off their hats to show respect when meeting peninsular Spaniards, Graciano López Jaena countered that it was preposterous because “the indio is as much a Spaniard as a peninsular” and stressed that indios need not concern themselves with “greetings nor kissing hands (*besamanos*), but in fulfilling their duties as good Spanish citizens (*ciudadano español*)” (Fores-Ganzon 1996, 3:502–3). Having internalized the ideology of empire, the Propagandists found nothing odd in claiming equal entitlement to citizenship rights like “other” Spaniards. They were also at ease in talking about “our African possessions” (Fores-Ganzon 1996, 1:322–23), as if Filipinos were co-rulers in “savage” Africa.

In the campaign for assimilation, however, the “primitive races” were reckoned as a hindrance because they seemingly overshadowed the indios and conveyed the message that the Philippines had not reached “the stage of enlightenment that would merit the concession of political rights” (López Jaena 1951, 151). This perception, the ilustrados believed, had to be rectified by placing primitivity in quantitative perspective. Blumentritt’s prologue to Rizal’s edition of Morga contains a most telling statement of the boundaries of the ilustrados’ imagined community. In response to Spanish objections, Blumentritt wrote:

La inmensidad de las razas salvajes no importa, porque cuenta con un pequeño número de almas, y los Filipinos no pretenden la extensión de las libertades de la vida constitucional sobre las tribus salvajes.

[The magnitude of the savage races does not matter because they constitute only a small number of souls, and the Filipinos do not demand the extension of the liberties of constitutional life over the savage tribes.]

(Rizal 1961c, xvii; trans. author)

²¹As in other histories, a critical juncture in the nationalist narrative emplotment of the past was the conquest. The question of why the islands fell to Spanish hands called for a satisfactory answer. The ilustrado solution to this issue reached Katipunan members through Andres Bonifacio’s 1896 manifesto, “Ang Dapat Mabatid ng mga Tagalog” (What the Tagalog Should Know), in which he declared that the Spaniards deceived “our leaders” with “enticing words,” making them believe that the Spaniards would “[g]uide us toward increased betterment and awakening of our minds” (Ileto 1979, 832). Spain must be held accountable, however, because its leader, Legaspi, made an oath with Sikatuna, a native chief, by “taking blood from each other’s veins, mixing and drinking it as a sign of genuine and wholehearted sincerity”—the “blood compact” (Ileto 1979, 83). Spain’s failure to comply with the terms of this agreement eventually justified separation from Spain, a view shared by the ilustrados and the peasant-based Katipunan movement.

²²In Europe, however, they realized that being a Spaniard meant to be backward, even in fashion. For instance, Máximo Viola inquired from Rizal, “if the suits I use in Spain can be worn there in winter, or if, by wearing them, I would be looked upon in Germany as a Spaniard, that is, backward. . .” (NHC 1963, 2:65). In a letter by Aguirre to Rizal, the creole ridiculed peninsular male Spaniards as *subputs* (uncircumcised) (NHC 1963, 2:68).

Too few in number, the “savage races” were so insignificant as to form a stumbling block to assimilation. Implied was the opinion of racial science that “savage races” had no future: with their supposed incapacity for “moral progress,” they would remain forever primitive—except for Negritos, who were destined for extinction, as Blumentritt believed (1900, 15). With such tacit admission, “primitive tribes” should not mark out the Philippines as unworthy of Europe’s civilizing mission, for they were, for all intents and purposes, not “Filipinos.”

Blumentritt’s statement was not merely his own invention. Rizal had requested his friend to write an honest and candid prologue to show his compatriots the fruits of intellectual debate. Rizal perused Blumentritt’s draft and with the latter’s permission expunged portions that he found objectionable (Rizal 1961a, 579; 1961b, 305). Obviously, the decisive statement gained Rizal’s approval as neither it nor the whole segment of which it was a part was deleted. Blumentritt’s introduction received high praise from ilustrados such as Mariano Ponce, who described it as “truly excellent” (NHC 1963, 2:415). Appearing in 1889, the new Morga edition showed few hints of the fraternal connection with the “rare individuals” whose display a couple of years earlier had rankled ilustrado nerves. The budding of a possible comradeship in 1887 was smothered by the politics of assimilation.

This was not the first time that Blumentritt made the assertion. On the editorial page of *La Solidaridad* of October 15, 1889, he wrote:

Yes, the Philippine archipelago is a land with an “immensity of savage races,” but I do not believe that the Filipinos wish to extend suffrage to the infidels but advocate representation only of Christian Filipinos. Moreover, I have to add that the “great number of wild races” in reality consists of only a few individuals and forms but a tiny fraction of the population, accounting for at most 15 percent of the total, if the official and friars’ statistics we are referred to are accurate.

(Fores-Ganzon 1996, 1:400–403; trans. author)

This statement passed the editorial scrutiny of López Jaena, despite his exceptional assertions made in 1887 that “savage races” were civilizable. During the exposition, López Jaena expressed pleasant surprise that the Igorots, Muslims, and those from the Carolines and Marianas who went to Madrid spoke perfect Spanish. He declared that “Igorots are neither savage nor irrational” and that “they are susceptible to modern civilization” (1951, 156). He admired “Tek, the Negrito, whose race has long been considered incapable of receiving the gifts of civilization, [but who] is the living protest against such erroneous asseveration” (1951, 153).²³ By late 1889, however, other graver concerns had superceded the exposition. With the campaign for assimilation in high gear, López Jaena gave editorial nod to Blumentritt’s statement, paving the way for its repetition in the Morga prologue. Blumentritt’s recurring assertion on the exclusion of “wild tribes” from political representation and from the imagined community of “Filipinos” thus articulated not only his personal view but also the sentiment of Rizal, López Jaena, and other ilustrados.

²³According to Scott, de los Reyes stated that “[t]here are Aetas who surpass the Tagalogs in intelligence, and it is recognized that the Tagalogs are at the same intellectual level as the Europeans” (1982, 283). De los Reyes’s upholding of the Aeta or Negrito, however, was compromised by his ill feelings toward the Tagalog. Among the ilustrados, López Jaena made the clearest and most favorable statement about the Negrito.

The “savage races” were clearly outside the framework of justice and liberty sought by the early nationalists because their concept of nation was one that was modern, cultured, civilized, Catholic, industrial, and progressive—all conformable with European notions. In addition, none of the ilustrados (except possibly Isabelo de los Reyes) had lived outside the pueblos in a way that would have allowed direct and sustained relations with those whom they had excluded from the nation. Although members of “wild tribes” would occasionally visit Manila and some provincial centers, most ilustrados had no personal contact with them, save for the 1887 exhibition. Only during his exile in Dapitan, Zamboanga, did Rizal finally come into close and repeated exchange with one such group, the Subanon. Only then did he appreciate their humanity and character: “I have known them here, and *really* they are a peaceful people, very honest, industrious, and faithful in their transactions, not renegeing on their word” (1961a, 817; 1961b, 461; emphasis added; trans. author). But, martyrdom prevented him from expounding what might possibly have been an alternative vision of nationhood based on firsthand understanding, a patria adorada that went beyond a mere inversion of colonial racism.

The ilustrados’ majoritarian view made population numbers—all rough estimates in any case—a crucial ingredient in the politics of assimilation.²⁴ To conjure the insignificance of “primitive races,” they tended to underestimate the population count of these groups. Responding to the charges made by a Franciscan friar, an ilustrado countered in the October 15, 1889, issue of *La Solidaridad* that there were not “seven or eight million inhabitants who still, he says, live in the impenetrable forests” (Fores-Ganzon 1996, 1:415). The ilustrado proceeded to list “the entire population of the Philippine archipelago” which he placed at 5,065,952 Christians and 1,144,117 non-Christians, for a total figure of 6,210,069. These figures indicated “non-Christians” as accounting for 18.4 percent of the total. Interestingly, these numbers appeared in the same issue of *La Solidaridad* in which Blumentritt calculated the “few individuals” as constituting “at most” 15 percent of the population.

In the segment of his famous essay “Filipinas Dentro de Cien Años” (The Philippines a Century Hence) that appeared in the December 15, 1889, issue of *La Solidaridad*, however, Rizal wrote, “Spain cannot claim even in the name of God himself that six million men should be brutalized, exploited, and oppressed. . .” (Fores-Ganzon 1996, 1:510–11; trans. author). Rizal’s demographics disingenuously included over one million non-indios—the “independent races” that he had elsewhere marginalized. Spain’s inhumanity seemed all the graver if six, rather than five, million were involved. A year later, Marcelo H. del Pilar quoted the figure of seven million in relation to failed attempts to obtain Philippine representation in the Cortes (Fores-Ganzon 1996, 2:112–13). The seriality that made the nation imaginable as a delimited community was also the same seriality that counted those excluded from within. Thus, when it served ilustrado purposes, the excluded were added to pad the statistics.

Since its original enunciation by Blumentritt, the assertion that “primitive races” constituted a numerical minority would remain a sticky issue when the United States began to impose its own imperialist designs. The proannexation side in the U.S. debate used the diversity of Philippine cultures and ethnolinguistic groups to make the case that the Philippines was not “a nation” and therefore needed American tutelage. Anti-imperialists, in tandem with Filipino nationalists, stressed the numerical smallness of

²⁴Since the advent of the modern census, the manipulation of demographic statistics for explicitly political purposes has been a pervasive phenomenon (see Alonso and Starr 1987).

tribal peoples. Always the Filipinos' loyal supporter, Blumentritt endorsed the translation to English of his monograph to aid the anti-imperialist drive. Not surprisingly, it contained the statement that "the Negritos, the mountain pagans and the Moros have no part in the Philippine question" (Blumentritt 1900, 21). Sixto Lopez, secretary of the Philippine mission to the United States, wrote a political tract reiterating that "so-called tribes" were a small minority and were analogous to the "Indian tribes still inhabiting certain parts of the United States" (Kramer 1998, 119–21). The figure advanced by Lopez was a mere 5 percent. From the time of Blumentritt and Rizal into the American colonial period (Salman 2001), variants of the same nationalist discourse that embedded racial science wished away "tribes" and the "uncivilized" by reducing them to numerical insignificance.

Prevarications on Race and Nation

After publishing his edition of Morga and reading further scholarly works, José Rizal began to doubt the idea that indio forebears had emigrated from Sumatra. In his letter to Ferdinand Blumentritt dated April 17, 1890, he argued that the cultural similarities of Sumatra and the Philippines did not warrant the conclusion that one derived from the other, and he doubted whether it would ever be possible to know the origin of the Malay race. His reexamination of this issue echoed the thoughts of Isabelo de los Reyes, who had raised similar questions regarding the origin of Malays in the Philippines, be it Borneo, Sumatra, or some other land (de los Reyes 1889, 9–12). De los Reyes also asserted that "the Malay race in the Philippines is not pure," there being "three subraces" based on admixture with Negritos, Chinese, and "Indonesians and Arabs" (1889, 4). Although de los Reyes resorted to the concept of a "subrace," Rizal pushed the issue further. Hinting at the inherent instability of racial categories, Rizal questioned the very notion of a "Malay race": "It appears to me that Malayans should not be considered the original race or the type of race (*die Typen von der Rasse*); the Malayans have been exposed to many foreign and powerful factors that have influenced their customs as well as their nature" (1961a, 652; 1961b, 350; trans. author).²⁵ Overtly, Rizal was questioning the validity of Malay as a racial type, perhaps following the theory that "types" were permanent and that deviations from which were believed to be kept by nature within bounds (Banton 1983, 43–44). Deviations among Malays, however, seemed out of control, making the category meaningless. Based on his own "customs" and "nature," Rizal might well have been expressing a deep-seated anxiety about his own hybrid ancestry, which did not fit neatly into the migration-waves framework. Was Rizal in search of purity?

Blumentritt admitted in *Versuch einer Ethnologie der Philippinen* that the Malay Tagalog "have plenty of foreign blood flowing in their veins, not only Chinese and Spanish but also Japanese (16th and 17th centuries) which mixtures have bettered the race as a whole" (1980, 57). Presumably the "foreign bloods" were of superior quality such that métissage led to racial improvement, but Blumentritt's classification implied that Malays with "foreign blood" remained Malay. At what point would intergroup unions produce offspring beyond the boundary of Malayness? This was Rizal's question. The potential answer in *Versuch* was no more than a residual category of "Chinese, Chinese Mestizos, Japanese" and a last category of "Whites and Other

²⁵I am grateful to Mrs. Lisl Mathew of Townsville, Queensland, for helping clarify the relevant passages in the original German letter of Rizal to Blumentritt.

Population Groups” (Blumentritt 1980, 141–50). Although Blumentritt mentioned that the “next group after the Malays that are worth our attention are the Chinese” and the Chinese mestizos, dubbed “new arrivals” on the Philippine scene (1980, 17), these were not viewed as representing a distinct migration wave. In Blumentritt’s *Las Razas Indígenas de Filipinas* (1890), Chinese mestizos did not merit any mention at all. In effect, Chinese and Chinese mestizos designated alien entities. The temporal cutoff point for determining indigeneity was drawn teleologically at the “arrival” of the third wave. Blumentritt had been influenced inexorably by his close association with ilustrados, such that by 1890 his framework did not account for the realities of colonial society. Suffering erasure from his work were Chinese mestizos, who by the 1740s, had formed a classifiable and legally distinct group from whom most ilustrados could trace their ancestry (Wickberg 1964).

Rizal might well have classified himself as a “Malay Tagalog,” but he could also have placed himself with Chinese mestizos. To which category did he belong? As Edgar Wickberg has shown, a mechanism existed for changing one’s legal status (1965, 33–35). Depending on circumstances, one might prefer to be listed in the roster of mestizos or in that of *naturales* (natural, original, or homegrown), although both categories were considered by the state as indigenous. Rizal was a fifth-generation Chinese mestizo, but his paternal grandfather had been able to use wealth to transfer from the mestizo tax register to that of the *naturales* (Wickberg 1965, 33–34). From his maternal side, Rizal allegedly inherited Japanese and Spanish “blood” (Craig 1933, 22–23). His family’s connections with Chinese and Chinese mestizos appeared strong, as both of Rizal’s parents spent their last years and died in Binondo, where these two ethnic groups predominated (Go and See 1987, 94). In the 1880s, however, the abolition of the tribute also erased the legal distinction between mestizos and *naturales* (Wickberg 1964, 95). By then, wealthier Chinese mestizos had been Hispanized and “ostentatiously rejected Chinese culture” (Wickberg 1965, 32). In their anti-Sinicism, Rizal (1961a, 781; 1961b, 423), who placed “Chinese and savages” on the same level, was the exact match of de los Reyes (1889, 6), who denigrated Chinese for their “consummate avarice” and condemned their presence as “anticivilization” (U.S. National Archives, record group 350, entry 5, file 370.86). Tutored by Spanish prejudices, the ilustrados’ denial of their Chinese heritage was a racial strategy that ensured the exclusion of Chinese as aliens and the hegemony of a Malay template.

Although Rizal designated himself as an *indio*, his mixed background might not have escaped him. Antagonisms extant between mestizos and nonmestizos did not easily conceal the former’s liminality (Aguilar 1998a, 80). But regardless of what Rizal knew and felt about his Chinese mestizo heritage, he was emphatically keen to efface differences in the spirit of forging national solidarity. When the Spanish governor-general passed a decree in 1888 giving preferences to mestizos over *naturales*, he fumed, “it is sheer folly to make this distinction between mestizos and *naturales*; it is offensive to the majority and fosters stupid antagonisms” (Rizal 1961a, 407; 1961b, 218; trans. author). Rizal raised the concept of a “majority,” which in this context referred to *naturales* who were the “pure” *indio*. Indeed, *indio* was often used in lieu of *natural*. Who, then, were in the minority? Not Negritos, Muslims, and mountain peoples, for Rizal’s implied “minority” referred to the “impure” *indio*, that is, the mestizo. Rizal and his fellow ilustrados might well have confronted their minority status.

Rizal was unquestionably conscious of the multiracial composition of his imagined community, particularly the activists of the Propaganda Movement. As he

told Blumentritt in April 1887: “They are creole youth of Spanish descent, Chinese mestizos, and Malayans; but we call ourselves solely Filipinos” (Rizal 1961a, 131; 1961b, 72; trans. author). Race was not to take precedence over an emerging collective identity—especially in an overseas context where social marginality accentuates such identities. Rizal was emphatic especially because, about a month or two before he wrote Blumentritt, acrimonious debates concerning strategies of political journalism divided the youthful “colony” in Madrid along racial lines.²⁶ Skin color threatened to become the basis for identifying “genuine Filipinos”—“the genuine or pure Indios” in contrast to mestizos and Kastila (Spanish, mainly creoles) who acted like “aristocrats” and were not “pure and genuine Filipinos” (NHC 1963, 2:99, 102, 624). Rizal was said to have deplored “not having in [his] veins all the blood that could serve as a common bond” (NHC 1963, 2:99). A common race was seen as a basis of unity. Rizal had even dreamed of mingling “all the blood” of his compatriots in his body, perhaps to incarnate the national corpus founded upon total hybridity. The fantasy of racial fusion, however, faced the reality of a grand political project shared among a group divisible into indios, mestizos, and Kastila. All were to be deemed “genuine Filipinos,” as Rizal enjoined fellow ilustrados, thus the import, in the wake of the goings-on in Madrid, of Rizal’s reassurance to Blumentritt, an outsider who was almost an insider: “[W]e call ourselves solely Filipinos.”

The precise relationship between Rizal’s multiracial “Filipinos” and the third-wave “Malays,” whom he regarded as “ancient Filipinos” or “Malayan Filipinos” (*los malayos filipinos*) (Fores-Ganzon 1996, 2:341–42), however, was not confronted. What did Filipinoness consist of for the ancient “Malays” and for the modern, multiracial Filipinos? Or, did the concept of Filipino float freely through history? Blumentritt’s racial schema, while useful in the search for origins to enable the imagining of a national biography and a putative line of descent, appeared concomitantly to undermine the nation by systematizing, if unevenly, the vocabulary of its internal differences. But, forming a national consciousness required going beyond racial science through the negation of racial differences. There would be no majority or minority. In this case, there would be no myth of descent, for the binding element would be territory: las islas Filipinas.²⁷ Race, in this instance, would not be constitutive of the nation.

Territory had its internal borders, for the “interiors” and “fringes” occupied by the “primitives” were excluded from the nation-space. The physical inside, the hinterland, was outside the nation’s moral community. The spatial frontiers occupied by “pure types” stood out in their unambiguous identity as the land of “wild men” who were beyond recuperation and national honor. In contrast, the settled lowlands were a frontier area of sorts; when their children congregated overseas, their hazy

²⁶López Jaena used the phrase *manga insic* (the *intsik* or “Chinese”) in deriding his cohort, who organized the periodical *España en Filipinas* (Spain in the Philippines) along lines that he disparaged as political timidity (NHC 1963, 2:85). Although *insic* was used as an ironic device by young Filipinos in Madrid to refer to themselves in a couple of letters to Rizal in 1886 (NHC 1963, 2:44, 46)—probably in reaction to taunts by Madrileños—the term subsequently went into disuse. Under a cloud of divisions, it reappeared in López Jaena’s letter to Rizal in March 1887. Although of apparent Chinese mestizo background, López Jaena asserted, “we the genuine or pure Indios are not the ones who foment disunity but the *mestizos*” (NHC 1963, 2:102). But by June 1887, López Jaena was cooperating with the periodical, although the Filipinos in Madrid remained deeply fractured.

²⁷A native language could not be a unifying force because of the profusion of native tongues, while the ilustrados’ lingua franca, Spanish, was spoken by only a tiny elite.

identities could be submerged into one nation: “[W]e call ourselves solely Filipinos.” The oppositional relations between indio lowlands and “savage” interiors denoted an uncertain cartography, but it was left unresolved. Despite the imagining of a world of plurals and the abstraction of society in Rizal’s *Noli Me Tangere*—emblematic of the nation’s spatial coordinates, as Benedict Anderson has argued (1991, 22–30)—in the end the territory of Filipinas was indeterminate and beyond mapping. With the disjuncture between the expanse of an imagined homeland and the excluded zones occupied by internal Others, the nation’s geo-body had no solidity.

The internal exclusion was related to the ilustrados’ idea of the nation as a temporal project. They envisaged an educated future in which liberty and justice could be enjoyed, but only those of the third migratory wave were included in this vision. And even they, with their “lost civilization,” needed to be (re)civilized. To reconnect with “civilization” (a seemingly eternal concept with no historical moorings, as “ancient Filipinos” possessed a “civilization” but their descendents needed to be “civilized”²⁸), indios had to get out of the friar-constrained present. They had to go to “free Europe” and remigrate to the motherland as agents of change and modern education. As Rizal observed on his first trip to Europe in 1882, “[w]hat a revolution takes place in the ideas of the man who for the first time leaves his native land and travels around through different countries!” (Craig 1933, 253–54). Armed with knowledge gained from the outside, “a wise traveler carries to his own country the good usages he has seen and tries to apply them there with the necessary modifications.” Rizal’s laudatory view of travel was strikingly similar to the established practice of *rantau* among the Minangkabau of Sumatra, which entailed leaving one’s home area and returning someday to enrich it. However, Rizal’s cosmopolitanism, as he referred to it, was applied only to himself and to others who could lay claim to being indio and therefore of the third wave. Evidently he did not see the “rare individuals” who traveled to Spain for the 1887 exposition as learning something that they could use on their eventual return. Unlike López Jaena, who deplored that the persons in the exposition could not tour Madrid (including a seamstress who eagerly wanted to witness Singer sewing machines in actual use) (1951, 157–58), Rizal was silent about the possibility that travel to Europe for the “uncivilized” sojourners might have brought them some benefit.

Travel, education, and civilization would appear to be the exclusive domain of indios. In this respect, national solidarity was strengthened overseas and even cut across class lines, but only for an exclusive circle of compatriots. In “Filipinas Dentro de Cien Años,” Rizal noted: “The journeys to Europe also contribute much to strengthen the bonds, for abroad the inhabitants of the most widely separated provinces are drawn together in patriotism, from sailors even to the wealthiest merchants. . . . [T]hey embrace and call each other brothers” (Fores-Ganzon 1996, 1:436–37). Victims of colonial misrule, migrant seafarers had left the homeland unlettered, but overseas they embraced “the wonders of civilization,” as López Jaena noted with pride of those beneath their social class but safely within their racial ambit (Fores-Ganzon 1996, 1:30–31). Thus, nationhood as exemplified in the overseas community excluded “mountain tribes” but included lower-class third-wave indios, who were civilized and civilizable. Because civilization encompassed a racial boundary, the ilustrado concept of the nation depended on a mythology of descent.

²⁸On the history of the word “civilization,” see Braudel 1993, 3–8; Williams 1983, 57–60.

Filipino As Race/Nation

At one level, race would appear to be not fundamental to the nation because of the ilustrados' self-awareness of their own racial diversity. In this respect, the broad structure of racism would not provide the basis for the fictive unity of the nation. But at another level, race was an elemental dimension of nationhood. For ostensibly cultural and civilizational reasons, the Malayness of the third migration wave was imputed upon the emerging nation, in which case a racist structure formed the basis of a fictive commonality. Thus, nation flirted dangerously with race. Rizal had glimpsed the inherent contradictions of a racialist template in questioning "Malay race" as a category. Adding to the muddle was Marcelo H. del Pilar's insistence that "[t]he Japanese are Malay and the inhabitants of the Philippines are Malay" (Muñero 1996, 6). Products of European thought, Rizal and other ilustrados were too deeply immersed in racial thinking—colonial oppression was voiced and experienced as the indios' racial degradation—for them to transcend a race-based discourse. Notwithstanding some questions, they had no alternative to the racial paradigm. Perhaps nationalism was the answer. But from the vantage point of their class, their concept of the emerging nation was inseparable from race. In addition to repressing the issue of (internal) ilustrado creole-mestizo racial ancestry, national consciousness was marshaled to resolve the problems of (internalized external) Spanish racism, the (externalized but internal) Chinese, and the (internal but exteriorized) "primitive races." To gain respectability from the civilized world, the nation had to be delineated from a multitude of besieging and contaminating internal and external Others. Paradoxically, all these "excesses," as Caroline Hau (2000) calls them, and their seemingly distant geographies have been internal to and constitutive of the nation.

In a semantic slippage that dreamed away these excesses, ilustrados also began to talk of "the Filipino race" (*la raza filipina*). José Rizal did so in his 1889–90 essay "Filipinas Dentro de Cien Años," arguing that without assimilation "the Philippines would have to declare itself, some fatal and inevitable day, independent" and any retaliation by Spain would not "exterminate the Filipino race" (Fores-Ganzon 1996, 2:32–33). Attacking the opponents of assimilation, del Pilar declared erroneous the view that "the Filipino race is anthropologically in a state of inferiority" (Fores-Ganzon 1996, 1:379–380; see also Fores-Ganzon 1996, 2:538–39). Rizal, del Pilar, and other ilustrados might well have been using "race" as a substitute for "nationality." Race, in this instance, might have anticipated full nationhood. In 1886 Rizal explained to Ferdinand Blumentritt that, apart from the five main racial types, he used race to refer "to pueblos of more than half a million souls, those whom you call *nations*, but we do not call *nations* pueblos that are not independent, for example, the Tagalog race, the Visayan race, and so on" (Rizal 1961a, 57; 1961b, 33; emphasis in original; trans. author). The term "Filipino race" was a collective designation for Filipinos who otherwise would have been referred to separately as the Tagalog race, the Visayan race, and so on. The term also circumvented the nascent regionalism that distanced the Ilocano from the Tagalog. The prefiguring of nationhood would have been consistent with the practice in the English-speaking world, where, before the mid-nineteenth century, "race" and "nationality" were interchangeable. In that period, both "race" and "nationality" referred to a group of people sharing a common ancestry, despite perhaps some differences in physical appearance and culture (Banton 1983, 32–59; Hirschman 1987, 567–68).

By the 1880s, however, “scientific” theory had pegged the idea of race to inherent differences in appearance, culture, and mental capacities. In this sense, many Spaniards vituperated the indios. Although he used race as an ordering principle in ethnology and despite a hint of eugenics, Blumentritt resolutely objected to racism. In the context of the assimilation campaign, however, the use of phrases such as “savage races” and “primitive races” implied a hierarchy of intrinsic biological-cultural differences, for which reason non-indios were excluded from the ilustrados’ demand for political and civil liberties. In the context of assimilation discourse, the term “Filipino race” was racist: it applied only to indios who were deemed assimilable and civilizable. The third wave—comprising the “races” Tagalog, Visayan, Ilocano, and so on—was transmogrified into “the Filipino race.” Disregarded were the “uncivilized races” of Mindanao, Luzon, and the Visayas as well as the “civilized” multiracial community of those who claimed to “call ourselves solely Filipinos.”

The ilustrados’ self-definition of “Filipino” was ontologically compromised from the start. A slippery concept, Filipinoness often demanded the certification of “genuineness.” The fear of counterfeits was emblematic of the racist fear of contamination that could blur cultural-cum-class boundaries. At the same time, as exemplified by Rizal’s martyrdom, many ilustrados overflowed with political love for the nation, their self-sacrifice inseparable from their heroism. Facing death, Rizal made one last assertion of his “pure” identity: “When the document [of his impending execution] was shown him, he drew attention to the fact that he was incorrectly described as a Chinese mestizo, . . . saying that he was an *indio puro* [pure indio]” (Coates 1968, 312). In their search for a narrative of identity, their politics of imperial assimilation, and their ultimate dream of national dignity, the ilustrados left a legacy of nationhood full of ambiguities, gaps, silences, and excesses. The “Malayness” of Filipinos has been reified—Rizal is “the pride of the Malay race,” as Roman Ozaeta made popular in titling Rafael Palma’s (1949) biography of the man—and a myth of origins based on race has endured. Today every child in the Philippine school system recites, after singing the national anthem, the “Panatang Makabayan” (Oath to the Nation) in which the promise is made to “love the Philippines,” the homeland of “my race” (*aking labi*). The existence of a “Filipino race” (*ang labing Pilipino*) is taken as a certainty. Still, somatic and ethnic differences cannot be denied. The hope is in the continuous intermingling of racial waves—akin to Rizal’s fantasized body—to create a “Filipino Blend” that “will ultimately come to include the majority of the population,” as popularizers of the migration-waves theory have expressed (Reyes et al. 1953, 12–13). But despite frequent references to *moreno* or *kayumanggi* (brown) as its own color, the “Filipino race” is an ambiguous, unstable, and even empty signifier. The nationalist rhetoric simply asserts that Filipinos are a “nation” (*bayan*) and a “race” (*labi*), conflating race and nation in Filipino/Pilipino. The mestizoneess—Asian and European—of the very same intellectuals who articulated the national idea has been suppressed in the interest of national homogeneity. As Palma’s biography declares in its opening paragraph, Rizal’s father was a “pure Filipino” (1949, 1). The claim to purity flags an invented history of Malayness that shrouds the dominant elite’s ethnicities. At the same time, ethnic groups such as Negritos, Chinese, and Indian, although accorded formal citizenship (Aguilar 1999), are pressurized by notions of a Filipino nation-race. The citizenship rights and national ties of Filipinos born to Filipina mothers and American fathers, especially those of African heritage—a legacy of the U.S. military bases—are diminished because they do not “look Filipino” (Eric Jimenez, “Amerasians Hit DFA for Discrimination,” *Philippine Daily Inquirer*, May 17, 1999; Tonette Orejas, “Gapo’s Amerasians Bear Discrimination,” *Philippine Daily*

Inquirer, April 11, 2000). Challenged by class and ethnicity, the fictive unity of the nation has remained problematic. The nation's ontological narrative has not come to terms with the givenness of a hybrid, plural, and stratified Philippines. With the burdens laid on the national idea at its inception, it is understandable why no closure has yet been found to the perennial question "Who is the Filipino?"

Paramount in the nation's founding myth were civilizational hierarchies, invidious comparisons, and confounded assertions of status. In effect, "Filipino" stood for the internally superior and dominant "race" led by an "enlightened class," whose members, although charged as inferior by racist outsiders, were equal to Europeans in their being civilized and civilizable, deserving liberty and indeed their own independent nation. They were not pagans who lived close to nature and by brute force, without law and legal institutions, and were superior to the spatially distant "savages of Africa" and the temporally and socially distant "savage races" epitomized by Igorots. Rather, they were educated and educable; they believed in religion or reason; they were peace loving, with "mild morals" and the art of law and governance; and they could debate in the Cortes or better yet in their own legislature. They were industrializing and growing in mastery over nature, although they were acutely aware of the need to "catch up," lest they be left behind by progress. A child of modernity and the capitalist world system, ilustrado national consciousness impelled them to demand equality with the colonizer but concomitantly eschew "savages" from their imagined community. Seeing themselves at the helm of "native" society, the ilustrados were sworn to uplift the lower classes with their political and educational leadership. Ultimately, as Norbert Elias (2000) has shown, the preoccupation with civilization expressed the aspirations of a social class.

The ilustrados' proimperial-cum-anticolonial politics would be transposed into the politics of the Philippine ruling class. The "benevolent assimilation" of the United States built upon the pragmatics of ilustrado nationalism. As Michael Salman (2001) has elucidated, the American colonial state deployed racial science and deepened the divide between "civilized" Filipinos and "non-Christian" "wild tribes," the former as collaborators, the latter as ideal wards. American authorities overstudied Negritos until the state rendered them nonexistent and inconsequential (Rosaldo 1982). Initially, "non-Christians" were administered separately, but ilustrados and successor leaders sought to integrate them under "Filipino rule." Elites, especially among Muslim Filipinos, entered into mutual accommodation with central state actors (Abinales 2000). The class-based hierarchy of civilization and race/ethnicity persisted, and feelings of superiority hardened. When, in the 1940s, Carlos P. Romulo declared in *Mother America* that "Igorots are not Filipinos (1943, 59)," he was speaking as the legitimate heir of ilustrado nationalism.

Nationhood does not stand still, however, and is ever being reconstituted. In the 1960s, amid the resurgence of Filipino nationalism, the cry was raised in relation to "cultural minorities": *They Are Also Filipinos* (Clavel 1969). The Marcos regime added its share of primordialist rhetoric. In the 1980s, national and international movements for the rights of indigenous peoples gained momentum, eventuating in the embrace of "cultural communities" in the national fold or at least by intellectuals and officialdom. Despite implementation problems, a law recognizing the rights of "indigenous peoples" was enacted in 1997 (Castro 2000). Although the place of Muslims is still being contested on the battlefield and Negritos are no better than second-class citizens, the Philippines today has moved beyond the ilustrado concept of the nation. The role of the Igorot has been reversed, with many freezing them in their "unmodernity" as the static bearers of cultural authenticity. Since the 1980s, even the formerly

disparaging term “Igorot” has gained popularity on the Cordillera highlands as a badge of resistance against dominant groups in the Philippines (Labrador 1998, 243), yet everyday social practices on the basis of civilizational hierarchies persist. The town-based Mindoro man who calls out to a Mangyan as *sandugo* (of one blood) is convinced of his superiority over the mountain dweller, who may have set aside his G-string for a pair of trousers. On the Cordillera, as the Ibaloi to the Bontok, one ethnic group feels “more civilized” than the other (Labrador 1998, 207–9). We all are heirs to the dreams, achievements, and prejudices of the Enlightenment.

List of References

- ABELLA, DOMINGO. [1978?] *From Indio to Filipino and Some Historical Works*. Manila: Milagros Romualdez-Abella.
- ABINALES, PATRICIO N. 2000. *Making Mindanao: Cotabato and Davao in the Formation of the Philippine Nation-State*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- ADAS, MICHAEL. 1989. *Machines as the Measure of Men: Science, Technology, and Ideologies of Western Dominance*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.
- AFABLE, PATRICIA O. 2004. “Journeys from Bontoc to the Western Fairs, 1904–1915: The ‘Nikimalika’ and their Interpreters.” *Philippine Studies* 21(4):445–73.
- AGONCILLO, TEODORO A. 1956. *The Revolt of the Masses: The Story of Bonifacio and the Katipunan*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press.
- . 1960. *Malolos: The Crisis of the Republic*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press.
- . 1973. *The Revolutionists: Aguinaldo, Bonifacio, Jacinto*. Manila: National Historical Commission.
- AGUILAR, FILOMENO V., JR. 1998a. *Clash of Spirits: The History of Power and Sugar Planter Hegemony on a Visayan Island*. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press.
- . 1998b. “A Failure of Imagination? The Nation in Narratives of the 1896 Philippine Revolution.” *Pilipinas: A Journal of Philippine Studies* 31(Fall):31–45.
- . 1999. “The Triumph of Instrumental Citizenship? Migrations, Identities, and the Nation-State in Southeast Asia.” *Asian Studies Review* 23(3):307–36.
- . 2000. “Nationhood and Transborder Labor Migrations: The Late Twentieth Century from a Late Nineteenth-Century Perspective.” *Asian and Pacific Migration Journal* 9(2):171–98.
- ALONSO, WILLIAM, and PAUL STARR. 1987. *The Politics of Numbers*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- ANDERSON, BENEDICT. 1991. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Rev. ed. London and New York: Verso.
- . 2000. “The Rooster’s Egg: Pioneering World Folklore in the Philippines.” *New Left Review*, 2nd ser., 2(March–April):47–62.
- AZURIN, ARNOLD MOLINA. 1993. *Reinventing the Filipino Sense of Being and Becoming*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press.
- BALIBAR, ETIENNE. 1991. “Racism and Nationalism.” In *Race, Nation, Class: Ambiguous Identities*, by Etienne Balibar and Immanuel Wallerstein. London: Verso.
- BANTON, MICHAEL. 1983. *Racial and Ethnic Competition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- BARNETT, ANTHONY. 1990. “Cambodia Will Never Disappear.” *New Left Review*, no. 180:101–26.

- BELLWOOD, PETER. 1992. "Southeast Asia Before History." In vol. 1 of *The Cambridge History of Southeast Asia*, ed. Nicholas Tarling. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- BEYER, H. OTLEY. 1948. "Philippine and East Asian Archaeology and Its Relations to the Origin of the Pacific Islands Population." *National Research Council of the Philippines Bulletin* 29:1–130.
- BLUMENTRITT, FERDINAND. 1890. *Las Razas Indígenas de Filipinas* [Indigenous Races of the Philippines]. In vol. 28, pt. 1 of *Boletín de la Sociedad Geográfica de Madrid* [Bulletin of the Geographical Society of Madrid]. Madrid: Establecimiento Tipográfico de Fortanet.
- . 1900. *The Philippines: Their People and Political Conditions*. Trans. David J. Doherty. Chicago: Donohue Brothers.
- . 1980. *An Attempt at Writing a Philippine Ethnography: With an Appendix, the Spanish Maritime Discoveries in Philippine Archipelago*. Trans. Marcelino N. Maceda. Marawi City: Mindanao State University.
- BRAUDEL, FERNAND. 1993. *A History of Civilizations*. Trans. Richard Mayne. New York: Penguin Books.
- BUANGAN, ANTONIO S. 2004. "The Suyoc People Who Went to St. Louis 100 Years Ago: The Search for My Ancestors." *Philippine Studies* 21(4):474–98.
- CASTRO, NESTOR T. 2000. "Three Years of the Indigenous Peoples Rights Act: Its Impact on Indigenous Communities." *Kasarinlan: A Philippine Quarterly of Third World Studies* 15(2):35–54.
- CLAVEL, LEOTHINY. 1969. *They Are Also Filipinos: Ten Years with the Cultural Minorities*. Manila: Bureau of Printing.
- COATES, AUSTIN. 1968. *Rizal: Philippine Nationalist and Martyr*. Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.
- COLÍN, FRANCISCO, SJ. 1663/1900. *Labor evangelica, ministerios apostolicos de los obreros de la Compañía de Jesus* [The Labor of Evangelization, the Apostolic Ministries of the Workers of the Society of Jesus]. Ed. Pablo Pastells, SJ. Vol. 1. Reprint, Barcelona: Henrich.
- CONSTANTINO, RENATO. 1969. *The Making of a Filipino: A Story of Philippine Colonial Politics*. Quezon City: Renato Constantino.
- CRAIG, AUSTIN. 1914. *Lineage, Life, and Labors of José Rizal, Philippine Patriot: A Study of the Growth of Free Ideas in the Trans-Pacific American Territory*. Yonkers-on-Hudson: World Book Company.
- . 1933. *Rizal's Political Writings: Nation Building, Race Differences, Basic Principles of Good Government*. Manila: Oriental Commercial.
- DE LOS REYES, ISABELO. 1889. *Historia de Filipinas* [History of the Philippines]. Manila: Imprenta de D. Esteban Balbás.
- . 1994. *El Folk-Lore Filipino* [Philippine Folklore]. Trans. Salud C. Dizon and Maria Elinora P. Imson. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press.
- DIKÖTTER, FRANK, ed. 1997. *The Construction of Racial Identities in China and Japan: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives*. St. Leonards, NSW: Allen and Unwin.
- ELIAS, NORBERT. 2000. *The Civilizing Process: Sociogenetic and Psychogenetic Investigations*. Trans. Edmund Jephcott. Rev. ed. Oxford: Blackwell.
- ERB, MARIBETH. 1997. "Contested Time and Place: Constructions of History in Todo, Manggarai (Western Flores, Indonesia)." *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies* 28(1):47–77.
- FERNANDEZ, PABLO, OP. 1979. *History of the Church in the Philippines (1521–1898)*. Manila: National Book Store.

- FORES-GANZON, GUADALUPE, trans. 1996. *La Solidaridad* [Solidarity]. Vol. 1, 1889; vol. 2, 1890; vol. 3, 1891. Pasig City: Fundación Santiago.
- GO, BON JUAN, and TERESITA ANG SEE, eds. 1987. *Heritage: A Pictorial History of the Chinese in the Philippines*. Manila: Kaisa Para Sa Kaunlaran; Prof. Chinben See Memorial Trust Fund.
- HAU, CAROLINE SY. 2000. *Necessary Fictions: Philippine Literature and the Nation, 1946–1980*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- HIRSCHMAN, CHARLES. 1987. "The Meaning and Measurement of Ethnicity in Malaysia: An Analysis of Census Classifications." *Journal of Asian Studies* 46(3):555–82.
- ILETO, REYNALDO C. 1979. *Pasyon and Revolution: Popular Movements in the Philippines, 1840–1910*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- . 1998. "Rizal and the Underside of Philippine History." In *Filipinos and Their Revolution: Event, Discourse, and Historiography*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- JOCANO, FELIPE LANDA. 1975. *Questions and Challenges in Philippine Prehistory*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press.
- . 1991. "Questions and Challenges in Philippine Prehistory." *Historical Bulletin* 27–28:36–56.
- . 1998. *Filipino Prehistory: Rediscovering Precolonial Heritage*. Quezon City: Punlad Research House.
- KOHL, PHILIP L. 1998. "Nationalism and Archeology: On the Constructions of Nations and the Reconstructions of the Remote Past." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 27:223–46.
- KRAMER, PAUL A. 1998. "The Pragmatic Empire: U.S. Anthropology and Colonial Politics in the Occupied Philippines, 1898–1916." PhD diss., Princeton University.
- LABRADOR, ANA M. T. 1998. "The Representation of Bontok Identity in Museums and in Central Bontoc, Northern Philippines." PhD diss., Cambridge University.
- LEWIS, MARTIN DEMING. 1961. "One Hundred Million Frenchmen: The 'Assimilation' Theory in French Colonial Policy." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 4(3):129–51.
- LÓPEZ JAENA, GRACIANO. 1951. *Discursos y Artículos Varios (Selected Speeches and Articles), with Notes and Commentaries by Jaime C. de Veyra*. Manila: Bureau of Printing.
- MAJUL, CESAR ADIB. 1960. *Mabini and the Philippine Revolution*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press.
- . 1967. *The Political and Constitutional Ideas of the Philippine Revolution*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press.
- . 1973. *Muslims in the Philippines*. 2nd ed. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press for the Asian Center.
- MARR, DAVID. 1971. *Vietnamese Anticolonialism, 1885–1925*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- MONTANO, J. 1885. "Rapport à M. le Ministre de l'Instruction Publique sur une mission aux îles Philippines et en Malaisie (1879–1881)" [Report to the Minister of Public Education on a Mission to the Philippine Islands and Malaysia 1879–1881]. *Archives des Missions Scientifiques et Littéraires*, 3rd ser., 11:271–479.
- MOSSE, GEORGE L. 1995. "Racism and Nationalism." *Nations and Nationalism* 1(2):163–73.

- MUÑERO, LUIS, trans. 1996. *La Solidaridad* [Solidarity]. Vol. 7, 1895. Pasig City: Fundación Santiago.
- NAIRN, TOM. 1977. *The Break-up of Britain*. London: New Left Books.
- NATIONAL HEROES COMMISSION (NHC). 1963. *Rizal's Correspondence with Fellow Reformists*. Vol. 2, bk. 3. Manila: National Heroes Commission.
- OCAMPO, AMBETH R. 1998. "Rizal's Morga and Views of Philippine History." *Philippine Studies* 46(Second Quarter):184–214.
- ORDOÑEZ, ELMER A., ed. 1998. *The Philippine Revolution and Beyond*. 2 vols. Manila: Philippine Centennial Commission, National Commission for Culture and the Arts.
- PALMA, RAFAEL. 1949. *The Pride of the Malay Race: A Biography of Jose Rizal*. Trans. Roman Ozaeta. New York: Prentice-Hall.
- QUIBUYEN, FLORO C. 1999. *A Nation Aborted: Rizal, American Hegemony, and Philippine Nationalism*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- RAFAEL, VICENTE L. 1990. "Nationalism, Imagery, and the Filipino Intelligentsia." *Critical Inquiry* 16(3):591–611.
- . 2000. *White Love and Other Events in Filipino History*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.
- RAMBO, A. TERRY, KARL L. HUTTERER, and KATHLEEN GILLOGLY. 1988. "Introduction." In *Ethnic Diversity and the Control of Natural Resources in Southeast Asia*, ed. A. Terry Rambo, Kathleen Gillogly, and Karl L. Hutterer. Ann Arbor: Center for South and Southeast Asian Studies, University of Michigan.
- REYES, PEDRITO, MERCEDES GRAU-SANTAMARIA, H. OTLEY BEYER, and JAIME C. DE VEYRA. 1953. *Pictorial History of the Philippines*. Quezon City: Capitol Publishing House.
- RIZAL, JOSÉ. 1887/1995. *Noli Me Tangere*. Manila: Instituto Nacional de Historia.
- . 1890. "Sin nombre" [Without a Title]. In vol. 2 of *La Solidaridad*, trans. Guadalupe Fores-Ganzon. Pasig City: Fundación Santiago.
- . 1961a. *Cartas Entre Rizal y el Professor Fernando Blumentritt* [Correspondence between Rizal and Professor Ferdinand Blumentritt]. Manila: Comisión Nacional del Centenario de José Rizal.
- . 1961b. *The Rizal-Blumentritt Correspondence*. Manila: José Rizal National Centennial Commission.
- . 1961c. *Sucesos de las Islas Filipinas por el Doctor Antonio de Morga, obra publicada en Méjico el año de 1609 nuevamente sacada a luz y anotada* [Events of the Philippine Islands by Dr. Antonio de Morga, Published in Mexico in 1609, Recently Brought to Light and Annotated]. Manila: Comisión Nacional del Centenario de José Rizal.
- . 1962. *Historical Events of the Philippine Islands by Dr. Antonio de Morga, Published in Mexico in 1609 recently brought to light and annotated*. Manila: José Rizal National Centennial Commission.
- ROMULO, CARLOS P. 1943. *Mother America: A Living Story of Democracy*. New York: Doubleday, Doran.
- ROSALDO, RENATO. 1982. "Utter Savages of Scientific Value." In *Politics and History in Band Societies*, ed. Eleanor Leacock and Richard Lee. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; Paris: Editions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme.
- RYDELL, ROBERT W. 1984. *All the World's a Fair: Visions of Empire at American International Expositions, 1876–1916*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- SALMAN, MICHAEL. 2001. *The Embarrassment of Slavery: Controversies over Bondage and Nationalism in the American Colonial Philippines*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.

- SAUTMAN, BARRY. 2001. "Peking Man and the Politics of Paleoanthropological Nationalism in China." *Journal of Asian Studies* 60(1):95–124.
- SCHUMACHER, JOHN N. 1973. *The Propaganda Movement, 1880–1895: The Creators of a Filipino Consciousness, the Makers of Revolution*. Manila: Solidaridad Publishing.
- . 1979. "The 'Propagandists' Reconstruction of the Philippine Past." In *Perceptions of the Past in Southeast Asia*, ed. Anthony Reid and David Marr. Singapore: Heinemann Educational Books.
- . 1991. *The Making of a Nation: Essays on Nineteenth-Century Filipino Nationalism*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- SCOTT, WILLIAM HENRY. 1974. *The Discovery of the Igorots: Spanish Contacts with the Pagans of Northern Luzon*. Quezon City: New Day Publishers.
- . 1975. *History on the Cordillera: Collected Writings on Mountain Province History*. Baguio City: Baguio Printing and Publishing.
- . 1982. *Cracks in the Parchment Curtain and Other Essays in Philippine History*. Quezon City: New Day Publishers.
- . 1992. *Looking for the Prehispanic Filipino and Other Essays in Philippine History*. Quezon City: New Day Publishers.
- . 1994. *Barangay: Sixteenth-Century Philippine Culture and Society*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- SICHROVSKY, HARRY. 1987. *Ferdinand Blumentritt: An Austrian Life for the Philippines; The Story of José Rizal's Closest Friend and Companion*. Manila: National Historical Institute.
- SKEAT, WALTER W., and CHARLES OTTO BLAGDEN. 1906/1966. *Pagan Races of the Malay Peninsula*. 2 vols. London: Frank Cass.
- STEPAN, NANCY LEYS, and SANDER L. GILMAN. 1993. "Appropriating the Idioms of Science: The Rejection of Scientific Racism." In *The "Racial" Economy of Science: Toward a Democratic Future*, ed. Sandra Harding. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- STRECKFUSS, DAVID. 1993. "The Mixed Colonial Legacy in Siam: Origins of Thai Racist Thought, 1890–1910." In *Autonomous Histories, Particular Truths: Essays in Honor of John R. W. Smail*, ed. Laurie J. Sears. Madison: Center for Southeast Asian Studies, University of Wisconsin.
- TERWIEL, B. J. 1978. "The Origin of the T'ai Peoples Reconsidered." *Oriens Extremus* 25(2):239–57.
- . 1991. "Thai Nationalism and Identity: Popular Themes of the 1930s." In *National Identity and Its Defenders: Thailand, 1939–1989*, ed. Craig J. Reynolds. Clayton, Vic.: Centre of Southeast Asia Studies, Monash University.
- . 1996. "Foreword to the New Edition." In *The Tai Race: Elder Brother of the Chinese; Results of Experience, Exploration, and Research of William Clifton Dodd*. Bangkok: White Lotus Press.
- THONGCHAI WINICHAKUL. 2000. "The Others Within: Travel and Ethno-Spatial Differentiation of Siamese Subjects, 1885–1910." In *Civility and Savagery: Social Identity in Tai States*, ed. Andrew Turton. Richmond, Surrey: Curzon Press.
- U.S. NATIONAL ARCHIVES. Library Records of the Bureau of Insular Affairs, 1868–1940. National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Md.
- VERGARA, BENITO, JR. 1995. *Displaying Filipinos: Photography and Colonialism in Early 20th Century Philippines*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press.
- WICKBERG, EDGAR. 1964. "The Chinese Mestizo in Philippine History." *Journal of Southeast Asian History* 5(1):62–100.

- . 1965. *The Chinese in Philippine Life, 1850–1898*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.
- WILKINSON, R. J. 1975. *A History of the Peninsular Malays, with Chapters on Perak and Selangor*. 3rd ed. New York: AMS.
- WILLIAMS, RAYMOND. 1983. *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society*. Rev. ed. New York: Oxford University Press.
- YNGVESSON, BARBARA, and MAUREEN A. MAHONEY. 2000. “‘As One Should, Ought, and Wants to Be’: Belonging and Authenticity in Identity Narratives.” *Theory, Culture, and Society* 17(6):77–110.
- ZAMORA, MARIO D. 1967. *Studies in Philippine Anthropology (In Honor of H. Otley Beyer)*. Quezon City: Alemar Phoenix.

