Reinscriptions of the 1899 U.S.-Philippine War in Filipino American Fiction

Oscar V. Campomanes

In a future and further development of this project,* I seek to discuss characteristic forms of reinscription of the 1899 U.S.-Philippine War in a range of Filipino American texts, from Ninotchka Rosca's historical novel *State of War* and Jessica Hagedorn's *Dogeaters* to a little-noticed story by Cecilia Manguerra-Brainard, "The Black Man in the Forest" (I had originally intended to train the focus on Brainard's text in this essay, but have shifted it, for now, to Linda Ty-Casper's novella *Ten Thousand Seeds*). By "reinscription" here I simply mean the use of the medium and power of fiction-making by certain Filipina-American writers to intervene in the historiography of a major event in the birthing of U.S. imperialism and Philippine neo/colonial modernity: the 1899 U.S.-Philippine War (which historians now periodize as extending beyond the 1902 termination date prescribed by official and U.S. imperialist historiography on this event and the "Benevolent Assimilation" of the Philippines by the United States, as its first and major colony, to which this war of American conquest and Filipino resistance ultimately led).

First, I make the point that the 1898-99 colonial encounter between the Philippines as an emergent nation and the U.S. as a New Empire on the rise, which escalates into one of the bloodiest conflicts in the annals of modern colonialism (and becomes the object of a reciprocal amnesiac

politics and the subterranean persistence of popular memory concerning its key events and agents in both countries) is both "allegorized" and "localized" in these fictional narratives (in the case of Brainard's story, for example: in the fateful encounter between a band of starving Filipino guerillas and a straggling African American soldier in an imagined jungle setting typifying the theater of war associated with this conflict; with Ty-Casper's novella: in the quest of an American colonial-prospecting couple, the Rowbothams, to find their way clearly through the thickets of the conflict in the Philippines, on the trail of the American expeditionary and occupation forces, and as they engage/encounter their assertive Others/natives).[2] Second, I show how the fictional yet patently historiographic lens through which these narratives sieve a major historical event for its more marginal or minor aspects (such as the historic deployment of African American soldiers, some of whom eventually defected to the Aguinaldo-led guerrilla resistance, a neglected aspect of the history that Brainard's text speaks to; and the vaunted ambivalence of Americans of the time—for example, those tagged as "anti-imperialist"—about their otherwise unconsidered identification with an imperialist project, an aspect of this history that Ty-Casper obliquely alludes to) functions to help readers imagine potential kinds of solidarity and empathy across the sharp polarizations among "local" belligerents of this war (polarizations that official and professional historical accounts tend to foster in often depicting the U.S.-Philippine conflict in broad imperialist/nationalist strokes). I hope to conclude, in a later and more elaborated version, with the critical point that the creative allegoresis and localization of the War accomplished by these narratives, each in its own turn (and chosen angles of vision, again here, focally, in Ty-Casper's case), significantly refigure some of the questions most often debated but never quite radically addressed by theoretical discussions of the fictionality of history and the historicity of fiction, especially when considered in the context of war/s and war "memories."

Naming and "Titling" as Marginal yet Major Forms of Reinscription

"What do you want from this poor country of ours when yours is so big and rich? Why will your President not receive Señor Agoncillo whom our President sent to tell him about our aspirations?" These words assail Edward Rowbotham, the male American protagonist of Linda Ty-Casper's

Ten Thousand Seeds (1987), on his visit to Malolos, the capital of the Philippine revolutionary government. (The novel chronologically sets this incident during the crucial month of October 1898.) The two-part question is raised by a Filipino soldier-sentinel in the dialect. Edward is thus unable to understand a single word. What clues him to "the question [that] he could have not answered," were it linguistically accessible to him, is the "earnest voice" of the Filipino guard.[3]

Edward searches through his deepest thoughts after the unidentified Filipino poses the question with a hint of rebuke. Because the question is rendered in the vernacular, Edward is merely compelled to attend to its earnestness. Instead, he reframes it into a quasi-philosophical rumination that elides its specific and pressing valences: "Why are we here?" (*We*, in this case, encompass his wife Calista, and the Americans as an invading presence in the Philippines at the time). Failing to find any answer to this abstractive reformulation, he aimlessly moves on to his next set of encounters with all sorts of characters in American-occupied Manila. "Edward wanted the answer to drop out of the sky," which is a response that typifies his and Calista's gropings toward the meaning(s) of their decision to head for the Philippines on the heels of the American expeditionary and occupation forces.

Ty-Casper's novel coextends the couple's Philippine sojourn—their story of innocence, missionism, enterprise, and eventual disillusionment in respect to the U.S. colonial venture—with the 1899 U.S.-Philippine War that inaugurates the fitful genesis of Philippine-American neo/colonial relations. The novel structures their quest by reference to the swift developments that unfold between September 1898, after the United States installs a military government in the Philippines (and the 1898 Treaty of Paris negotiations between the U.S. and Spain begin), and March 1899, after the Philippine-American war erupts (with the ratification of the Treaty in the U.S. Senate by a close margin of one vote). Through these allegorical, even heuristic maneuvers, the novel signally intervenes in the history-writing about the initial phases of turn-of-the-century Philippine-American encounters as these were fatefully ushered by a nearly-genocidal American war of conquest and nearly-suicidal Filipino war for independence.[4] Of particular interest to us is Ty-Casper's decision to make the imaginary lives and thoughts of her American protagonists propel the narrative and the action of the novel. It recalls her strategy of handling her Spanish characters

rather than Filipino characters as the narrative screens for her novel on the 1750s Philippines, *The Peninsulars*.[5]

Ty-Casper recalls being frequently asked "why there are more Spanish than Filipino characters [and] why there are good Spaniards" in that work of historical fiction. She replies,

> The Spaniards held the reins of power all throughout 377 years of our history. In a novel recreating the 1750s and the political ferment of the times—meant to serve as background for two other novels in a trilogy about the rise of our national consciousness—I could not ignore the fact that the Spaniards were numerically ascendant in the exercise of power. Similarly, much as I wanted to have all the Filipino characters wise and good and selfless, facts show that we have always been capable and willing to oppress one another, as lustily as though foreign to each other. To deny this is to blind ourselves to a danger constantly facing us from within... The Spaniards oppressed each other as well. I thought we were the only victims. But if there were *caciques* [in the Philippines], so were there in Spain... If the Spaniards threw our dead onto bone piles and unconsecrated grounds, they also dishonored *their* dead: in the frenzy of the wars among themselves, they danced in the streets with the disinterred bodies of their nuns and priests.[6]

This disquisition may be read as a statement of interrelated acts in critical historiography assayed by a U.S.-Filipina writer concerned with the exploration of the complexity of colonization and war that both entangle and divide peoples with opposing interests. Firstly, an attempt is made to break down the exteriority of colonial power and to redraw its tangled lineaments. There is an other "history" to the specter of colonialism, Spanish (and American), that is occluded from the gaze of the colonized. What remains unexamined, Ty-Casper seems to be saying, is the toll exacted by the colonial venture on its own Euroamerican exponents and executors. Along with the certitude and power that colonialism assumes

on its own behalf is a dynamic of ambivalence and powerlessness, an unremitting terror in the face of its own historical traumas.[7] Secondly, the ambiguous virtuality of Filipino nationalism is raised, and Filipinos are urged to explore its puzzling, even self-conflicted, dimensions. Filipinos also have to examine the history of their own complicity in their oppression by foreign aggressors. The seeming dubiety or weakness of Filipino nationalism might merely be the obverse to a self-abusiveness that lies in wait for its moments of emergence.[8]

Ten Thousand Seeds, however, only leaves the call to interrogate the problematics of Filipino nationalism implicit. Instead, the lives of the Rowbothams provide the occasion for a critical and in-depth scansion—in terms of allegoresis, the ways in which these protagonists are made to function, not so much as multi-dimensional characters, but as social and representative types, although "local" too—of turn-of-the-century American imperialist politics and rhetorics against the Filipino nation-building project. To the extent that contemporaneous Filipino nationalism gets some exposition in the novel, it is only as a series of pronouncements made by liminal Filipino and expatriate European characters who make their entry into, and egress from, the novel's scenes and episodes when convenient. Their discursive mediations of Filipino sentiments prompt the American couple's fitful awakenings to the paradoxes of the United States' venture into the archipelago and the dramatic rise of the USA as a global power at the expense of Asia's first republic. Powerful historical revisions are nonetheless registered in this seeming displacement of one nationalist discourse by another. (The novel posits imperialism as the penultimate expression of American nationalism at a fortuitous historical juncture.) The most telling is the invocation, in the question posed by the Filipino soldier, of Felipe Agoncillo's unavailing attempts to represent the political aspirations of Filipinos to an indifferent William McKinley on his 1898-1899 diplomatic missions to the United States.

Suggestive inversions—reinscriptions, if you like—already ensue in giving emergent and resurgent Filipino nationalism a proper name ("Señor Agoncillo") and in reducing William McKinley to a "title" ("your President") in the soldier's question. Indeed, the significative and discursive order installed by imperialist-nationalist American historiography consigns Agoncillo to an infrequent footnote and strips him of his representative status/power while *naming* McKinley as the metonymic medium for the

trajectories of the American dream of a Pacific/Oriental empire.[9] Too, the apposite metonymy of General Emilio Aguinaldo in American rhetorical and historiographical constructs undergoes a different but related reversal. The same question ascribes to Aguinaldo the title that he claimed ("our President") and thus "legitimates" the fledgling republic that he had helped to secure before its demise under the hands of American interventionism. Inversely, contemporary imperialist rhetorics and later historical accounts reduce Filipino nationalist resistance to the proper name of "Aguinaldo" while ridding Aguinaldo of his political purchase and delegitimating the first Philippine republic as "the Aguinaldo government."

Ty-Casper thus implicitly engages the tendency of historians to write out the inscriptive ploys of American imperialist discourse itself in available accounts of the Filipino republican experiment. She infuses what may seem as innocuous cues of naming and titling with a powerful narrative charge. She demotically explains, for example, that in "refer[ring] to government officials by their rank, not their names [in this case, in *The Peninsulars*], I wanted to imply the power and authority which positions give to individuals who wielded them." Although she adds that "it is natural to refer to officials by their rank, out of respect, and with no confusion in mind about exactly who is indicated," we are already cued to the political effects that official symbolisms perform in imperialist rhetorics or history-writing and in their revisioning by postcolonial texts.[10]

Figurations of Felipe Agoncillo and Filipino Revolutionists in Imperialist Historiography

Felipe Agoncillo, the diplomat sent by Gen. Emilio Aquinaldo and the Comité Central Filipino to the USA and France between September 1898 (the beginning of the Treaty of Paris negotiations) through February 1899 (the moment of the U.S.-Philippine War's eruption), did indeed figure as a central actor in this historical war (and the "history wars" that followed it)—although U.S. diplomatic and international relations historiography would not reflect this fact and actively minimize his agency in its conventional accounts—and so Ty-Casper's specific allusion to his diplomatic campaigns in the soldier's question, no matter how minor or marginal, is quite crucial.

If Ty-Casper chose to train her novel's focus on fin-de-siècle American imperialist discourse, Felipe Agoncillo (among the Filipino nationalists) singularly advocated for an exacting interrogation of its various claims over the Philippines and Filipinos. If Agoncillo inhabits the margins of historical accounts for reasons that this essay cannot, on account of space limitations, dwell on, the specific allusion to Felipe Agoncillo in the encounter or exchange between the Filipino soldier and the novel's American hero is telling precisely because it seems extraneous to the hero's quests.[11] Thus is how we are behooved to regard Filipino nationalism in its states of siege/crisis as a discourse about, and from, the margins of turn-of-the-century American imperialist politics and discourses. Hence, Ty-Casper extends, as she invokes, in this historical novella the stance adopted by Agoncillo and other Filipino leaders to contest American enunciations about their struggle for national independence from a marginal locus. (It is locus, a non-place, to which circumstances and extreme disadvantage consigned the Filipino revolutionary leaders and fighters; just as, respectively, it is a dis/location that constrains and contains the Filipino-American fictionist herself, owing to a peculiar and related institutional invisibility common to U.S Filipino writers and intellectuals until recently, given the self-denial of U.S. imperialism as already extensively discussed by critical historians and scholars, including myself in previous work).[12]

Marginality in the case considered in this essay belongs, more generally and strikingly, as a stance to the representational protocols of both Filipino and American actors, who figure thus as contemporary protagonists or as subsequent writers/historians. This shared marginality of Filipino and American political-cultural discursive relations generates different effects and outcomes even as it may exemplify what Sara Suleri once called the "mimicry between the strategies of the colonizer and those of the colonized."[13] Recall that even critics like Edward Said had tended to slight American imperialism/orientalism, especially as they developed around East Asia and the Philippines, as derivative of European antecedents. This dismissal of the American variant as an uncultured clone of Eurocentered models of high-humanist intellectualism is itself an odd effect of American historiographical amnesia, or, at the very least, is the very predicate for the continued and powerful prevalence of the latter. It does not help matters any that historians or scholars of American empire-building in its own peculiar and particular Orient (the Philippines and the

Asia-Pacific), like contemporary imperialist American pedagogues and ideologues, substantially endorse it as an exceptional, if self-abnegating, enterprise.

We now turn to representative strains of the history-writing on these key events and agents of the war, first to be able to hold Ty-Casper's minor or marginal reinscriptions or narrative strategies (as a historical fictionist) in bold relief against (and by comparison with) it; and second, as a consequence, to be able to show how, with such exemplary reinscriptions, she closely yet subtly engages some of the most problematic and radically unproblematized staples of established historical wisdom on this momentous war. We shall see then how even the most unlikely scholars to reproduce American imperialist *marginalia*—if we can call its often orientalist and reductive strategies of minoritizing Filipino historical agency and agents as such—tend to fall prey to its hegemonic sway at precisely the moments when they seem to be aspiring to produce more critical history-writing than is available or than what exists.

Emphasizing the twin strategies of resistance and self-marginality adopted by the Filipino revolutionaries and their republican experiment certainly risks valorizing what, as its leading scholars would argue, was an abortive and deeply flawed nationalist movement. But a representative review of the historiographical fate of the Philippine Revolution/republican experiment, would make one see that Ty-Casper's reinscriptive strategies in her fiction-making—the ways in which the Filipino aspiration to self-determination of the time are refracted by and through an allegorical and local story of an American couple's inability, in their own aimless colonial prospecting, to appreciate their ambivalence about it, and unwitting complicity in its defeat—are of no small moment, and even in their most minor and marginal significations are highly transformative and productive interventions in history-writing and a "poetics" of historical knowledge ("memories" and their contestations).

Such a historiographic critique would show how, when understood only in terms of the patriarchal cast, political ambitions, and ethnic/class-specific interests of some of its leading factions, the Filipino republican experiment could only but be dismissible as a pathetic parody of its 18th-19th century American and European predecessors. What Ranajit Guha divines as the "mediocre liberalism" of the Indian upper classes under

and after the Raj—"a caricature of the vigorous democratic culture of the epoch of the rise of the bourgeoisie in the West"—may have been an immanent feature of its Filipino (and élite-led) counterpart,[14] as, in fact, has generally been asserted by leading American Filipinologists of all stripes or persuasions. Viewed from the postcolonial and transnational moments, this revolution and its republican/post-Enlightenment project can and does seemingly appear to be just another "naturalizing" discourse that adverted (while acceding) to Europe as the "habitus" of modernity, rationality, and normative humanism.[15] In the interrogative terms of Nicholas Dirks, was it one more and tardy variant, perhaps, of "the same old histories, increasingly tired and belatedly Whiggish stories of national self-determination and the unfolding of freedom?" With much import for the present discussion, Dirks asks: "how can we avoid caricaturing history the second time around; must we always consign the 'other' to farce?"[16]

Indeed, caricature and parody have been the historiographic lot of the Filipino nationalist upsurge of the 1890s even in the most empathetic revisionist accounts. When not ignored altogether in recountings of similar struggles before and after its time,[17] it is dismissed as an ephemeral (if vexed) attempt at nation-building by "semi-civilized" peoples who are culturally diverse and hopelessly divided. Consider these typically sardonic passages from Benedict Anderson's otherwise perceptive digest of current Philippine studies wisdom on the period:

> In 1899, a Republic of the Philippines was proclaimed under the leadership of 'General' Emilio Aguinaldo, a youthful caudillo from the province of Cavite... It was, however, a fragile republic, with more than a few similarities to Bolivar's abortive Gran Colombía. It had no purchase on the Muslim southwest; parts of the Visayas seemed likely to go their own independent way; and even in Luzon mestizo leadership was contested by a variety of religious visionaries and peasant populists... Moreover, the mestizo generals themselves (who included the grandfathers of both Ferdinand Marcos and Benigno Aquino, Jr.) began to follow the pattern of their American forbears, by setting themselves up as independent caudillos. Had it not been for William McKinley, one might almost say, the Philippines

> in the early twentieth century could have fractured into three weak, caudillo-ridden states with the internal politics of nineteenth-century Venezuela or Ecuador.[18]

The "fragility" of the republican experiment is explained solely in terms of its tenuous hold on its intended subjects and on its projected territorial scope. In turn, this unsecured sovereignty is attributed to ethnic/class differences among the populace and the unbridled political ambitions of "mestizo generals." The "General" himself (note the qualifying quotation marks) is representable only as a "youthful caudillo" or a poor Asian copy of his hemispheric "American forbears." Worse, Aguinaldo's generals contest his authority by being insubordinate or "independent" and by supplying more variants of his own example. In this context, McKinley's, or American, intervention in the Philippine revolution against Spanish colonialism can somehow be upheld as both fortuitous and desirable.

More significant is the ways in which the varied genealogical strands of this republic make its "failures" attributable to the racial/cultural or ethnological traits of its advocates and agents. For John Farrell, for example, the historical significance of the abortive Filipino republican enterprise lay in its mimetic character in relation to its Western—specifically American—progenitor/s.

> Americans draw too much upon their own national experience when they see every revolution or civil war as an independent movement. Actually, and a close study of events in the Philippine Islands in the 1890s supports this view, what really happened was that an Asiatic people began against Spain and after an interval resumed against the armed forces of the United States, a revolt which, at least in some respects, resembles other national and racial uprisings against the West which have occurred since that time and in other parts of the Far East. It is always a disadvantage in reporting these events that they are more easily appreciated as independence movements; western sympathizers have always been readily enlisted for that reason; and in their origins these revolts may indeed,

> invariably, have had something to do with misrule or the failure to rule properly. But when these rebellions culminate in violent revolution, certain evidences of what are more like conflicts of culture, or race wars, have become more or less standard; the self-appointed leaders speak for Asiatics, but they echo an ideology borrowed from Europe. This serves to get them an audience and a body of sympathizers abroad, while at home they use the same propaganda to exploit racial and religious antagonism. The attempt to grab power may involve prolonged warfare, featured by numerous atrocities, and not only against one or more European governments; there may be also internecine conflicts, and repeatedly there has been warfare carried on against large segments of the population who are either loyal to the West or have responded poorly to propaganda for lack of comprehension.[19]

Familiar orientalist tropes pockmark this homogenizing excursus by Farrell. A historically specific revolutionary moment (in which "an Asiatic people began against Spain and after an interval resumed against the armed forces of the United States") becomes the invariant elaboration of other "national and racial uprisings against the West." The inaugural singularity of that movement ("since that time") is strained through the customary reflex to locate it in the "Far East" and thence render its characteristics predictable *en avance*. Its nationalism, while acknowledged, is marked with a "racial" (read: "irrational") accent. Although labeled a "revolution" it could have only begun as a series of "rebellions," with both such forms characterized by atrocious violence. Once unleashed by its perpetrators, revolutionary violence itself would not discriminate between colonizer and colonized. The former is punished for "misrule" or "failure to rule properly" and "large segments" of the latter suffer punitive actions for loyalism or poor comprehension of revolutionary propaganda. "Internecine conflicts," due to power-hunger among the "self-appointed leaders," punctuate the consequent and retributive orgies of bloodletting.

The sardonic streak in Anderison's critique stems from an effort to make continuous the contemporary political atrophy in the Philippines

and the historic collusions between colonists and indigenous élites. Farrell, in fact, has been credited with bringing to light in a U.S. context (and by the 1950s) the U.S.-Philippine War, after half a century of American historiographical neglect of it as a major historical event in the making of U.S. imperial modernity. But if Filipino revolutionists become farcical facsimiles of Western/American models even in accounts like Anderson's and Farrell's, then we are not surprised about how they figure—if at all—in official or master American historical narratives of the period.

NOTES

* *This essay could not have germinated without the exciting opportunity and generous invitation extended to me for two years, and most recently, in the 2011 War Memories international conference and book writeshop, by the Institute of European and American Studies of the fabled Academia Sinica of Taiwan, via its Director Dr. Te-hsing Shan, its junior research fellows Dr. Andy Wang and Dr. Gregor Wu, and most especially, the Academia's Distinguished Research Fellow and Professor at the IEAS, Dr. Yu-Cheng Lee. My gratitude to them for their support, collegiality, and kindness at my two stints in the Academia in 2010 and 2011 knows no bounds; and it is to them that I dedicate this partial fruit of my collaborations with them and other scholars from the Asia-Pacific and USA.*

1 I am grateful to Dr. Cynthia Marasigan, professor at Binghamton University, for educating me about this little-known dimension of significant African American presence and participation in this first ever war fought by the USA beyond its borders, as I supervised her fieldwork in the Philippines for her outstanding dissertation on the subject a few years ago. See her "Between the Devil and the Deep Sea: Ambivalence, Violence, and African American Soldiers in the Philippine-American War and Its Aftermath," Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Michigan, 2010.

2 Linda Ty-Casper, *Ten Thousand Seeds* (Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1987), 62.

3 For an exemplary discussion of how a literary text successfully aspires to recast historical narrativity, see Robert Lee's "Maxine Hong Kingston's *Woman Warrior* as an Intervention in Asian American Historiography," Shirley Geok-lin Lim, Ed. *Approaches to Teaching Kingston's "The Woman Warrior"* (New York: Modern Language Association, 1991).

4 *The Peninsulars* (Manila: Bookmark, 1964).

5 Ty-Casper, "Literature: A Flesh Made of Fugitive Suns," *Philippine Studies* 28 (1980), 63. The projected trilogy that she mentions in this essay is completed by *Ten Thousand Seeds*. The second volume, *The Three Cornered Sun* (Quezon City: New Day, 1979) does focus on the Filipino side of the Philippine Revolution against Spain in 1896. (This mo-

ment figures in Philippine political and cultural historiography as the fullest expression of Filipino nationalism at the epochal end of Spanish colonial rule, although crushed at the precise moments of its possibilities with the arrival of the United States as a new colonial power. Its reinvigoration thus paradoxically consists in the U.S.-Philippine War that broke out in 1899, after the Filipino nationalists resisted the American imperial advance that was defined by its ideologues as a disinterested intervention against Spain, on behalf of Cuban and Filipino "insurgents.") In thus refocusing on the American side with her concluding volume, Ty-Casper frames the rise of Filipino national consciousness between the two colonial discourses/projects and closes the triangle. Her reference to *caciques* in Philippine history may be contrasted to constructive genealogy of the ascent of this social class to political leadership through the Spanish/American colonial and Filipino postcolonial periods, offered by Benedict Anderson, "Cacique Democracy and the Philippines: Origins and Dreams," *New Left Review* 169 (May/June 1988), pp. 3-33.

6 Sara Suleri, *The Rhetoric of English India* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 1-6. Suleri detects a "dynamic of powerlessness underlying the telling of colonial stories" and an "ensuing terror that must serve as the narrative's interpretive model." Part of colonialism's deceptive face that requires postcolonial disfigurement for Suleri is its terrorist/terrifying aspect before its subjects (which masks the colonizer's own nameless terrors when confronted with the other's "cultures"). Suleri adds: "Such terror suggests the precarious vulnerability of cultural boundaries in the context of colonial exchange. In historical terms, colonialism precludes the concept of 'exchange' by granting to the idea of power a greater literalism than it deserves. The telling of colonial and postcolonial stories, however, demands a more naked relation to the ambivalence represented by the greater mobility of disempowerment. To tell the history of another is to be pressed against the limits of one's own—thus culture learns that terror has a local habitation and a name (p. 2)."

7 See Neil Lazarus, *Resistance in Postcolonial African Fiction* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990), 1-26, for an excellent discussion of the aftermath of decolonization in African countries like Ghana where "great expectations" for national freedom and progress were frustrated by the "violent uncoupling of the diverse strands" that anticolonial and independence movements had harmonized without regard for "the mo[u]rning after." These coalitions, which limited their goals to the attainment of nationhood, did not address the tasks of social reconstruction and the class/other stratifications that colonialism installed/bequeathed. As a consequence, independence "has paradoxically borne witness to stagnation, elitism, and class domination, and to the intensifying structural dependence—economic, political, cultural, and ideological—of Africa upon the imperial Western powers." Lazarus locates the middle-class "messianism" in the rhetorical politics of African nationalists and intellectuals as a fount both for their overvaluation of "the emancipatory significance of independence" and for the resulting tropes of disillusion and despair in later postcolonial African writings such as those by Ayi Kwei Armah. Although concerned with mid- to late-20th century histories and cultures of nationalist struggles in another context, Lazarus's formulations are relevant to any assessment of the trajectories of Filipino nationalism against/under the American colonial regime and after de/neo-colonization in 1946. When read with caution, especially in terms of its privileging of certain notions of "historical facticity," David Joel Steinberg's "An Ambiguous

Legacy: Years at War in the Philippines," *Pacific Affairs* 45.2 (Summer 1972), 165-190, is extremely suggestive on the forms of self-empowerment that ironically weakened Filipino nationalist politics from the time of Emilio Aguinaldo through the postcolonial regimes in the immediate aftermath of World War II.

8 As an actor and symbol, McKinley unaccountably absorbs the contradictory meanings of a "reluctant" or "calculating" drive of the United States to world power at the advent of the 20th century according to Marilyn Young, "The Quest for Empire," Ernest May and James Thomson, Eds., *American-East Asian Relations, A Survey* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1972), 131-142. An informative but problematic account of this basic tension (or such fascinating oscillations) in the historiographical representations of McKinley is Joseph Fry's "William McKinley and the Coming of the Spanish-American War: A Study in the Besmirching and Redemption of an Historical Image," *Diplomatic History* 3.1 (1979), 77-98.

9 *"Fugitive Suns,"* 69.

10 On Felipe Agoncillo's abortive but semiosically effective diplomatic campaigns on behalf of the fledgling Filipino republic given the "insoluble crisis" of legitimacy that his efforts were able to institute in the very bosom of American imperialist discourse and politics of the time (and thereafter), see Oscar V. Campomanes, "The Japanese Analogy as Limimal Crisis-Effect in Initial Filipino-American Encounters, 1898-1899)" in Kiichi Fujiwara and Yoshiko Nagano, Eds., *The Philippines and Japan in America's Shadow* (Singapore: National University of Singapore Press, 2011).

11 On this self-marginality in an age of, and between, empires, as revolutionary strategy and tactic advocated by both Agoncillo and the premier ideologue of the Philippine Revolution Apolinario Mabini, see Oscar V. Campomanes, "*La Revolución Filipina* in the Age of Empire," *Japanese Journal of American Studies* 18 (2007), 87-105; Special Issue: "American Studies in Trans-Pacific Studies." On institutional Filipino American invisibility (and inaudibility) in American public and academic/literary cultures, see Oscar V. Campomanes, "Filipinos in the United States and their Literature of Exile" in V. Rafael, Ed., *Discrepant Histories: Translocal Essays on Filipino Cultures* (Pasig City, Phils.: Anvil Publishing, 1995 [1992]); NVM Gonzalez and Oscar V. Campomanes, "Filipino American Literature," in King-Kok Cheung, Ed., *Interethnic Companion to Asian American Literature* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997); and Oscar V. Campomanes, "Filipinos, Filipino Americans, and U.S. Imperialism" [interview with A. Tiongson Jr.], in A. Tiongson Jr., et al, Eds. *Positively No Filipinos Allowed: Building Communities and Discourse* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2006; Pasig City, M. Manila: Anvil Philippine edition, 2008). For the invisibilization of Philippine English and Filipino American writers in American literary and institutional cultures, see Oscar V. Campomanes, "Cecilia Manguerra-Brainard, Scenographer," in *C. M. Brainard, Vigan and Other Stories* (Pasig City, M. Manila: Anvil Publishing, 2012).

12 Suleri, *Rhetoric of English India*, 15.

13 "Dominance without Hegemony and its Historiography," in Guha, Ed., *Subaltern Studies VI* (Delhi and New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), 214. Here it may be said that Filipino and American historians substantially agree on a similar character/cari-

cature of the élite leadership of the revolution. See Anderson, "Cacique Democracy," and Steinberg, "Ambiguous Legacy," for terse condensations of these historians' slightly variable (they would say, "nuanced") representations of the national and local élites as always-already compromised political opportunists and half-Enlightened despots.

14 Dipesh Chakrabarty, "Postcoloniality and the Artifice of History: Who Speaks for 'Indian' Pasts?," *Representations* 37 (Winter 1992), Imperial Fantasies and Postcolonial Histories Special Issue, 20-21; Vincent Rafael, *Contracting Colonialism: Translation and Christian Conversion in Tagalog Society under Early Spanish Rule* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1993 pap.), ix-xi; David Lloyd, *Anomalous States: Irish Writing and the Postcolonial Moment* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1993), esp. 46-47.

15 "History as a Sign of the Modern," *Public Culture* 2.2 (Spring 1990), 26.

16 *The World Atlas of Revolutions*, for example.

17 "Cacique Democracy," 9-10.

18 John Farrell, "An Abandoned Approach to Philippine History: John R. M. Taylor and the Philippine Insurrection Records," *The Catholic Historical Review* 39.4 (January 1954), 388-389.