

TRANSPACIFIC FILIPINAS, MADE AND REMADE

The women who grace the cover and center spread of the July–December 2006 issue of *Wedding Essentials*, a magazine designed for Manila’s most fashionable brides-to-be, initially seem like any other cover girls (figures 1 and 2). Four beautiful Filipinas dressed in gauzy white stand with their arms entwined. They model dresses made of delicate piña fiber and luminous satin, hybrid haute-couture creations inspired by traditional Filipina formal dresses, Western wedding gowns, and Japanese kimonos. Yet these bodies on display are charged with a weighty nationalist task. Titled “The Four Faces of Maria Clara,” the spread—advertised on the cover as a calling for Filipina brides to “embrace your heritage, celebrate your culture”—publicizes Philippine wedding gowns that incorporate “native” materials to enhance the Filipina bride’s unique beauty.¹ The models, the magazine tells us, represent different types of Filipina femininity: *mestiza*, *morena*, *chinita*, and *dusky*. Accompanying captions divide and categorize their essential characteristics, with observations about each model’s presumed ancestral origin, class position, and defining personal qualities. Culled from the sleek pages that document Manila high fashion, “The Four Faces of Maria Clara” makes the contemporary Filipina, distilled into four containable and ostensibly replicable versions.

The cover and center spread are even more remarkable because of the text that accompanies the women’s photos. The title alludes to the lead female character in José Rizal’s Spanish-language novel *Noli Me Tangere* (1887), a beloved work of literature that has long been read as one of the foundational texts of Philippine nationalism. Rizal’s character Maria Clara was a tragic



1. “The Four Faces of Maria Clara,” center spread of *Wedding Essentials* 2, no. 2 (July–December 2006). From left to right: mestiza, morena, chinita, and dusky.

and beautiful mestiza, the illegitimate, fair-skinned daughter of a Spanish friar and an *india*, a woman native to the Philippines.² As the love interest of the male hero, Crisóstomo Ibarra, she remains steadfastly and sacrificially loyal, even through grave illness, accusations of betrayal by her lover, and relentless pursuit by a lecherous friar. In the book’s closing pages, she is rejected by Ibarra and confined to a convent, where she faces unspeakable violations.

Why would this nineteenth-century literary figure have pop-cultural saliency for the contemporary Filipina bride over a century after Rizal’s work was published? Why choose this tragic, violated woman as the face of a twenty-first-century bridal publication? Although Maria Clara’s horrific fate makes her a dubious symbol for a magazine that celebrates the blush and bloom of wedded bliss, *Wedding Essentials* nevertheless continues a long-standing tradition that casts her as the epitome of virtuous Filipina femininity. The magazine offers an explanation that draws on her enduring importance in the Philippines as “the image of the ideal Filipina for decades.”



2. Wedding Essentials 2, no. 2 (July–December 2006), cover.

“She may have succumbed to depression and death in Rizal’s novel,” the writer of the article, Evangeline Lazam, acknowledges, “but the heroine Maria Clara was reborn in every Filipina woman who is both delicate and strong, graceful and able, compassionate and courageous. The present-day Maria Clara is a woman of substance who treasures the heritage left by her ancestors, heroes, and heroines. Proud of the color of her skin, she has confidence in her identity and is certain of her role in the family as well as in the larger areas of society” (163). This recent version of Maria Clara elides the novel’s obsession with the original character’s skin, which is “blanca, demasiado blanca tal vez” (white, perhaps too white), her sighs and trembles, and her sacrificial devotion, even as traces of the nineteenth-century original linger.³ The new Maria Clara’s strength and confidence are still circumscribed by what is not so new: her awareness and acceptance of her place in the family and in the nation.

Although the intent of the spread may be to celebrate diverse iterations of

Filipina beauty, the captions, photos, and layout reinforce troubling constructions of race and class difference in the Philippines. Each caption divides the contemporary Maria Claras along hierarchical lines. Mestizas, the “daughters of Spanish and Filipino parents . . . belong to the more powerful upper classes” (164). Despite their position at the pinnacle of Philippine class hierarchy, the text also acknowledges the mestiza’s instability; although “confident and adventurous,” “sophisticated and stylish,” these women are also “thought to be egotistical and snobbish” (164). Next to the mestiza is the *morena*, described as having “pure Filipino blood” and thus “often equated with *Inang Bayan* [Mother of the Nation], or the Philippines as a Mother. A true Filipina, the *morena* is passionate yet sensible. The bronze-skinned *morena* is the kind of woman who is strong enough to take care of herself, yet she remains honest and down-to-earth” (164). On the other side of the fold are two women characterized as outliers. The *chinita*, a term that, according to the caption, stems from “the characteristic small eyes of the Chinese,” is a woman who hails from “old and wealthy families,” an “imperial beauty,” “conservative, calm, and stately, yet wrapped in mystery” (165). The final woman is the only one whose name does not stem from a Spanish-language derivative. Hailing “from the very first ethnic group that set foot on Philippine shores,” the “dusky” or “dark-skinned Filipina lives a simple and quiet life in the mountains. A gentle and innocent being, she always wears a smile on her face. Even without superfluous adornments, she can stand out by just being natural. Unpretentious and friendly, she can win the hearts of many with her charm and warmth. The likes of her is not a usual sight in an urban setting, and that is what makes her even more interesting” (165).

The *Wedding Essentials* spread locates the four women within a site shaped by intimate connections among continents—the eddies and flows of multiple migrations, trade relations, and imperial conquests.⁴ But while naming the Spanish and Chinese influence in the Philippines, the editors also suppress the importance of two other imperial forces and their regimes, the United States (1898–1946) and Japan (1942–45).⁵ The layout nevertheless reproduces a racial hierarchy shaped by the Philippines’ contact with Spain, China, the United States, and Japan. Proceeding from left to right, the order of photographs privileges Spanish aristocracy and lighter types of native Filipinas, while Chinese and darker women appear on the other side (see figure 1). Both of the women who are of mixed race are identified as such by names that underscore their racial ancestry (*mestiza* and *chinita*), while the women who are supposedly more indigenous to the Philippines or of pure

blood are identified primarily by color (morena and dusky). Descriptions of physical attributes such as skin color and eye shape bleed into character assessments. The article pits the morena's honesty against the mestiza's selfishness. It also contrasts the chinita's Oriental mystery with the primitive innocence of the dusky woman, whose description identifies her as similar to the people once called *negritos* during the Spanish and American regimes. The magazine's writers and editors, certainly aware of the lasting negative connotations of the term *negrita*, contain this darker woman within the status of happy primitive, far from the urban centers.

The center spread of a contemporary magazine may be different from the texts that make up the rest of my archive, but this image of elite, cosmopolitan, modern Filipina brides nonetheless illustrates some of the central interests of this book. Representations of "the Filipina" remain shifting, uncertain, and fraught even today, and the ontological underpinnings of such contemporary versions have long, tangled roots in debates recurring throughout the twentieth century over who and what made a Filipina. The women found in the sleek layout of *Wedding Essentials* originate in the now-yellowing newspaper articles, periodicals, literary magazines, novels, memoirs, essays, and studies that make up my archive. These four women are preceded by the representations of romantic heroines, uncaring coeds and fellowship students, fearless guerrillas, and feminist academics who are my subjects. Moving backward over the course of a century, *Transpacific Femininities* unravels such connections.

Tying English literary production to the imagining of new Philippine identities and communities, I argue that Filipina and Filipino writers rearticulated transpacific femininities throughout the first half of the twentieth century, in dialogue with models of Spanish, American, Japanese, and indigenous (india) femininities. Filipina and Filipino elites used the venue of English literature to contest, question, and imagine the modern Filipina. In so doing, they took care to delineate the differences between the bourgeois, transpacific Filipina and others. I document this process primarily in Philippine literature in English produced by Filipina and Filipino writers from the early to the mid-twentieth century, when defining the Filipina woman became a cultural obsession.⁶ The rapid development of English literature in the Philippines is itself a phenomenon worthy of study (authors were publishing in English only two decades after the U.S. occupation began), but the creation of a national literary tradition was seriously entwined with elites' attempts to define the Filipina—as a writer and reader of English, as a

representative model for other women, and as a citizen whose actions and behaviors determined the future of the Philippine republic and the Filipino and Filipina community in the United States. The figure of the Filipina crops up repeatedly in multiple forms and in wide circles: romance novels, memoirs, and short stories; essays, newspaper articles, and letters to the editor; heated debates on the floor of the Philippine Constitutional Convention; conduct manuals for young girls; and studies devoted to the feminist movement. She appears and reappears again and again in sources as diverse as Philippine literary periodicals, magazines in the United States, small publishing operations in both countries, and a major publisher in the United States, Macmillan. While these appearances coalesce in the form of some key cultural icons, they are also incredibly divergent. The transpacific Filipina is notable precisely because, unlike the women of the *Wedding Essentials* spread, she cannot be contained in singular types.

The making and remaking of the modern Filipina is a process that, while a consistent feature of the first half of the twentieth century, is also a complicated cycle. Making the Filipina centers on debates over what I call transpacific femininities, that is, women who are influenced by the contact between the Philippines and the United States, Spain, and Japan. While some of these women are mestizas, they also exhibit a different form of *mestizaje* in that they draw from a long history of colonial contact in the Philippines. They speak multiple languages, travel, and receive advanced degrees from American and Philippine universities. They are cosmopolitan tourists, college coeds, writers, nurses, teachers, doctors, and lawyers. They are inspired by Hollywood starlets, global modern girls and new women, and American university undergraduates. They are defined against or via other versions of the feminine—the girls and maidens of the barrios outside of Manila, the Malay high priestess, and notions of Oriental and indigenous femininity—the same influences that reappeared in the *Wedding Essentials* spread. They are created by men and women who critique government regimes, question normative constraints on women's lives, and become politically active. They are imagined as the mouthpieces of conflict and resolution, the agents of resistance, the means of rethinking the Philippines as a modern, independent nation. But at times they also reinforce dominant versions of normativity, unquestioningly embrace the supposed modernizing benevolence of the United States, and relegate indigenous and rural peoples to the margins.

While I compare how the transpacific Filipina was produced between the United States and the Philippines, I pay close attention to protean dynamics

that connect these two countries to Spain and Japan. The chapters that follow analyze these shifts and examine how questions about the modern Filipina responded to the circulation of Orientalist, indigenous, Americanized, and Spanish models. Makings and remakings of the Filipina coincided with and were linked to developing definitions of what it meant to be Filipina and Filipino during three imbricated regimes; to the emergence of middle-class, heterosexual identities and the elite's attempt to control these definitions; and to the marginalization of indigenous peoples and rural or working-class Filipinas and Filipinos. I trace multiple moments of both colonization and decolonization: the transition between Spanish and U.S. regimes in the 1890s, the independence movements and the granting of commonwealth status in the 1920s and 1930s, the Japanese occupation of the 1940s, and the renegotiation of the relations between the new Philippine republic and the United States as well as other Asian nations during the Cold War. With each changeover, elites had to reconstruct their relationship to one empire and project their future with another.

Throughout these imperial and national transitions, the dialogue surrounding transpacific women intersected with international suffrage movements and women's rights campaigns, as Filipinas and Filipinos participated in these larger global debates. Transpacific Filipinas, as figures of representation and as bodies who crossed and transgressed social boundaries, became focal points of tension in elite communities. As a response to persistent anxieties over transpacific women who represented the destabilization of class, gendered, and sexed hierarchies, elites solidified masculinist and nationalist narratives and reinforced idealizations of women as representative of the nation. Working against the presumed stability of these icons, my close readings track the construction of these iconic women and compare them with alternative versions imagined and enacted by Filipina authors. Although not all of the texts advocate or further women's equality or destabilize normative femininity, they all recognize, even in sometimes complex ways, the transpacific Filipina as crucial to national definition, to identities and communities at home and abroad, and to the reformation of the Philippines' changing interactions with other nations.

Transpacific Femininities does more than recover this untapped archive of Philippine literature in English and the previously undiscussed history of transpacific Filipinas. My version of the transpacific builds on previous scholarship on the migration and movement of individuals, communities, and cultures across oceans. Transpacific is a formation that acknowledges

the role of the nation-state (and relations among different countries) but also underscores complex relations that are not necessarily bounded by the nation. Inspired by scholars in Pacific and American studies and by critics who have examined the importance of the Atlantic to the African and African American diaspora, I view the Pacific as a region that was crucial to how the United States, and other Western nations, perceived Asia during a moment of tumultuous geopolitical transition.⁷ Indeed, if during the sixteenth to nineteenth centuries the Atlantic was central to the spread of European empire in the Americas, from the late nineteenth century to the twentieth century, the Pacific was both a new site of and thoroughfare for global expansion, as the United States and other countries vied for control of Asia and the Pacific Islands.

While the phrase *transpacific femininities* certainly indexes the shuttling of bodies and texts from the Philippines to the United States, ultimately, I rethink the transpacific—a framework that, as I discuss in more detail below, has a complex history in Asian American and Pacific studies—such that the term encompasses more than a geographic location on the map or oceanic crossings. Indeed, the prefix *trans-*, contends Aihwa Ong in *Flexible Citizenship: The Cultural Logics of Transnationality*, “denotes both moving through space or across lines, as well as changing the nature of something” (4). Building on this capacity of *trans-* to describe not only movement across borders, but also states of transition and change, the concept of transpacific femininities is a critical cartography that energizes the book’s analysis of the imbrications of class and gendered hierarchies, changing imperial and national dynamics, cultural representations, and authorial strategies. Merging archival recovery with feminist analysis, the conceptual map of *Transpacific Femininities* charts what chapter 1 details as the byways and midways of Philippine literature in English, the untraveled routes and uncrossed intersections that reveal the cyclic importance of transpacific Filipinas. In this book, these unexplored byways—primarily unstudied texts by Filipinas and Filipinos—are examined through their midways, a critical reading practice that combines literary history, cultural critique, and feminist analysis.

Transpacific femininities refers to representations of women and actual Filipina authors, but the term’s multiplicity also encompasses three entwined aspects of my methodology. First, I identify the Philippines as a unique site in the Pacific for exploring the overlap of the Spanish, U.S., and Japanese empires, all of which vied for imperial control of the Pacific region

and used the Philippines as a strategic location. Second, I counter notions of a passive, feminized Asia (and Asians) by exploring how elites used the venue of Philippine literature in English and constructions of the transpacific Filipina to redefine the terms of national identities, communities, and transpacific relations. Third, and most important, I underscore the previously unacknowledged importance of femininity in the elites' responses to imperial transfers of power and to transformations in the Philippine nation-state. Highlighting these multiple and overlapping layers, the plurality of transpacific femininities emphasizes instabilities and contradictions in these texts (not all of which advocate feminist practices), marks my recovery of an archive created by Filipina authors, and indexes my analysis of representational and political strategies through a feminist lens.

This book has some limits, again illustrated aptly by the *Wedding Essentials* layout. The magazine's audience is similar to the writers and readers of Philippine literature in English in the first half of the twentieth century. The magazine is marketed to those who have or fancy having a connection with the fashion-forward and the cosmopolitan, the wealthy women who lunch regularly in Makati's posh restaurants, the coiffed and well-heeled attendees at Fashion Watch. The writers examined here were also part of a privileged group, those who lived in Manila, who had access to a university education and travel abroad, who spoke and read English. "The single most important demographic fact about Filipino women writers in English," notes Edna Zapanta Manlapaz, "is that they belong to the elite class."⁸ I do not aim to recover the lost voice of the indigenous, working-class, or rural woman. Neither can I account for all of the many vibrant literary traditions in the Philippines. Instead, I emphasize fluctuations in representing the Filipina during the early twentieth century to reveal how elites used the English-language essay, the short story, the novel, and the literary article to construct lines of difference that would separate the elite from indigenous and working-class citizens and to reveal how the elite was problematically complicit in the marginalization of these others. While this approach is feminist in its inception, the politics behind these versions of the Filipina are not always so clearly defined. They are not all resistant or subversive. Indeed, as a process that normalized the elite, cosmopolitan, and heterosexual Filipina, the making of the modern Filipina depended on vilifying, romanticizing, and, most often, eliding those who did not fit the model. I thus pay close attention to constructions of rural, working-class, and indigenous women to stress how

literary representation and cultural production were linked to the crystallization of an ethnic, racial, and class hierarchy that unfortunately still continues in the Philippines today.

.....

Philippine literature in English presents a unique and previously unaccessed print archive that documents the history of transpacific relations. Since the publication of Amy Kaplan and Donald Pease's *Cultures of United States Imperialism* (1993) there has been much U.S.-based critical interest in the intersections between literary endeavors and U.S. empire.⁹ Yet these scholarly attempts have remained strikingly bound by the borders of publication within the United States.¹⁰ Even though U.S. scholars of empire might include the Philippines as a site or literature in English as an object of critical analysis, works produced in the Philippines have remained unstudied. Until recently, these trends have been influenced by a lack of attention to elites, in part because of their uneasy ties to the U.S. imperial regime and their questionable affiliation with evolutions of Filipina and Filipino American communities.¹¹ Building upon and extending these archival parameters, I draw attention to the literary production of the elite precisely because these texts uncover a new plot, one that centers on the transpacific Filipina as its main protagonist.

In the early to mid-twentieth century the roots of Philippine literature in English were grounded in transpacific geopolitical shifts, as Spain, the United States, and Japan fought to establish control over the Pacific region. The story of Philippine literature in English begins with the importance of education to both the U.S. and Japanese imperial regimes. Although each administration adopted oppositional stances toward English—the Japanese, for example, attempted to diminish the importance of American influence by encouraging the use of Nippongo or Nihongo and Tagalog instead of English—fundamentally each administration's interest in language acquisition, retention, and education was quite similar.¹² As a result, the emergence of Philippine literature in English and its conflicted history are tied to how changing imperial and national dynamics affected the creation of a new class of elite men and women. As the Philippines experienced one wave of colonization after another, these elites would consistently turn to making and remaking the transpacific Filipina as a means of defining the boundaries of race, nation, class, gender, and sex.

That a Filipino or Filipina author of English literature was a product of

the U.S. educational system is without question. “Our writer,” blithely observed A. B. Rotor forty years into the occupation, “is only as old as the public school system.”¹³ The rise of literature in English was heavily influenced by the U.S. regime’s rigorous implementation of a multitiered strategy of colonial tutelage, which included instruction in English, the establishing of English as the national language, and the large-scale creation of a new public school and university system. After the United States acquired the Philippines in 1898 as part of the treaty terms that ended the Spanish–American War (and in exchange for \$20 million), English became the islands’ official language in 1901. English-language instruction was crucial to American policy in the Philippines and one of the marked differences between the Spanish and U.S. administrations.¹⁴ The use of language itself as a strategy for rule was closely tied with the rhetorical packaging of the American presence in the Philippines as a magnanimous civilizing enterprise. From the early days of the occupation the United States espoused a mission of colonial tutelage, what President William McKinley famously called benevolent assimilation. With the objective of properly educating the archipelago’s inhabitants, who were supposedly not fit for self-government, the expansion of educational opportunities in the Philippines was meant to churn out a new generation of Filipinas and Filipinos indoctrinated in the ideologies of well-meaning American democracy.¹⁵

American imperial education depended on transpacific interchange, not only through the importing of teachers and textbooks, but also through the implementation of exchange programs. Passed almost immediately after the annexation, Act 74 (1901) launched the public education system and was immediately followed by the massive recruitment of American teachers.¹⁶ The Philippines had a private university, the University of Santo Tomás, founded in 1611, long before Harvard University was established, but the American regime extended public education at the collegiate level and inaugurated the first coeducational institutions. In 1908 the U.S. Philippine Commission established the University of the Philippines (UP), modeled after public state universities in the United States.¹⁷ The UP English department and its creative writing program would eventually train many of the nation’s authors. The colonial administration encouraged the best and brightest students to travel to the United States to undertake graduate work. In 1903 the Pensionado Act funded students from the Philippines for educational opportunities at universities in the United States. Initially, the first pensionados were those who had already matriculated through private school-

ing in the Philippines, an advantage that was limited to the rich because of educational restrictions imposed by Spain. Even after the program formally ended in the 1920s, those who had the financial means or who were recognized by American institutions as being exceptional were still able to take part in special opportunities that included graduate degree and creative writing programs.¹⁸

Fueled in part by these developments in U.S. government policy and education, a generation of English-literate Filipinas and Filipinos came of age in the 1920s and 1930s, and the capital, Manila, became the epicenter of literary production in English.¹⁹ Filipina and Filipino writers published furiously in literary periodicals, university journals, pamphlets, and newspapers.²⁰ Weekly sections of newspapers and magazines such as the *Graphic* soon had substantial readerships in Manila, and the first books of fiction and poetry written by Filipinos followed.²¹ But who was reading this literature? The projected audience for English material was undoubtedly an elite population—those who worked in government, politics, or education; who lived in urban centers like Manila; or who studied at universities in the Philippines and the United States. Many publications were edited by expatriates and geared in part toward the American community. Literary critics and historians have previously examined the circulation of English works and the question of readership in the Philippines via census report data, anecdotal evidence, and increased subscription rates in English-language periodicals. Not surprisingly, the areas with the highest rate of English literacy coincided with spaces of transpacific interactions. “English,” observed Joseph Hayden in his 1942 study of national development in the Philippines, “is widely employed in transactions between Filipinos and Americans or foreigners, between Filipinos of different language groups, and in polylingual centers such as Manila or Baguio. It is the chief language of national conventions, such as those of the National Federation of Women’s Clubs. . . . Highly important, too, is the use of the English in the periodical press and the contemporary literature of the Islands, a subject which leads to a discussion of the degree and character of the literacy which has been achieved in the Philippines.”²²

Although writers in the Philippines enjoyed the relative luxury of developing close associations and affiliations, the American market for Filipina- and Filipino-authored literature was quite different. Publishing opportunities in the United States were scattered and variable. Articles, essays, and pamphlets written by Filipinas and Filipinos first began circulating in the early years of

the twentieth century, when the U.S. Anti-Imperialist League disseminated pleas for Philippine independence crafted by activists such as Sixto Lopez, who wrote in Spanish but whose work was translated into English. Newspapers and magazines in the United States featured work devoted to the debate, including articles republished from Philippine periodicals, letters to the editor or opinion pieces by students in the United States, and first-person accounts of life there. Not all of the material published for an American audience, however, advocated independence (indeed, some of these texts, especially those published in the first decade of the occupation, favored U.S. sovereignty), but many authors addressed what they saw as misconceptions about themselves or the islands. As the numbers of Filipinas and Filipinos in the United States increased in the 1910s and 1920s, the growing critical mass of authors soon started circulating their work via independent presses and smaller periodicals targeted specifically at migrants and expatriates. Venues included the *Filipino Students' Magazine*, a student-produced serial at the University of California, Berkeley; the newsletter-like *The Filipino People*, a bilingual publication produced in Washington, D.C., by the office of Manuel Quezon, the future president of the Philippines; and the smaller, community-based, often short-lived papers that cropped up in California, Washington, and other sites on the West Coast.²³ Only a few writers were recognized by mainstream publishing venues like *Story* and *The New Yorker* and publishers like Charles Scribner's Sons and Doubleday and Doran.²⁴

The circumstances of Philippine literature in English would soon be dramatically altered. From the 1930s to the 1950s tremendous turmoil gripped the Philippines, as nationalist movements for independence reached their peak and were interrupted by the outbreak of the Pacific War and competing attempts by the United States and Japan to control the islands. Once again language was crucial to geopolitical transitions. As I detail in chapter 1, after decades of struggle for independence, the Philippines finally gained commonwealth status in 1935, with a ten-year transitional period to full independence. English was soon after contested and then reclaimed as one of the commonwealth's national languages, in part because of controversies over which of the more than 170 indigenous Philippine languages and dialects should be prioritized. In 1941 the Japanese bombing of Manila and the resulting occupation interrupted the commonwealth period, completely altering the literary scene in the Philippines and in the United States. As I discuss in chapter 4, the Japanese regime severely restricted and supervised the production of English materials and attempted to institutionalize Nippongo and

promote literary production in Philippine languages in order to encourage Filipinos and Filipinas to break ties with the United States. After the Pacific War and after formal independence from the United States was finally recognized in 1946, English continued as the medium of instruction in Philippine schools and in government and official documentation. Even today, especially in city centers like Manila, Philippine English is still spoken, a practice that represents both the continuing neocolonial influence of the United States and how citizens have interwoven English into the fabric of life and culture in the Philippines.²⁵

Although English is still spoken, written, read, and taught in the Philippines, its presence in the islands has been freighted with political and ideological complexities. English literary texts present the material traces of contact and conflict in the Philippines, negotiated through imaginings of transpacific femininities. As each chapter details, this body of literature is important not just because of the crucial and contested status of English in the Philippines throughout much of the twentieth century, but also because the complicated status of both English literary production and the transpacific Filipina is a marker of fluctuations in class hierarchy, and symptomatic of the Spanish, U.S., and Japanese empires and their lasting vestiges. As these texts document again and again, the transpacific Filipina was consistently at the center of these controversies.

.....

In drawing attention to how and why elites turned to the figure of the transpacific Filipina and the venue of print culture to respond to overlapping empires, *Transpacific Femininities* also imagines new intersections among U.S. and Philippine studies, Asian American studies, and transnational American studies. Scholars in Asian American studies have been especially prescient in questioning the exclusivity of such terms as *nation* and in encouraging transnational models that might account for the movement of Asian Americans across U.S. borders.²⁶ For while in the American academy transnational turns have become increasingly popular, and the recognition of the United States as an empire has now become a regular feature of academic discourse,²⁷ in the case of U.S.–Philippine relations, the predominant critical impetus remains one that examines the two in terms of a binational relationship.²⁸ Recent works by Allan Punzalan Isaac, Julian Go, and others have furthered alternate methods of examining the Philippines itself along different longitudinal and latitudinal lines: such modes of analysis map the

larger geographic connections of the tropics or chart connections between the Philippines and Hawai'i, Puerto Rico, and Cuba.²⁹ These broader linkages offer an analysis attuned to the ebbs and flows of multiple empires.

Although analytically the rubric of the transpacific presents great potential, ideologically it presents deep challenges. By employing the transpacific, this book also navigates still-unresolved tensions between Asian American and Pacific studies. This long-standing debate reached greater institutional visibility in 2004, when the Association for Asian American Studies (AAAS) considered renaming the organization to include the term *Pacific Islander*. As Vicente Diaz, J. Kēhaulani Kauanui, and Amy Ku'uleialoha Stillman have suggested, the solution to longtime conflicts between the two disciplines requires more than the simple, categorical addition to an organization.³⁰ Some rightly feared that the inclusion of Pacific Islanders would be in name only, or that while a coalition might exist between them, the tendency would be for Asian American studies to eclipse Pacific Islander studies. While AAAS eventually kept its original formation, what presumably resulted from these conversations was a greater awareness of Pacific cultures, histories, and peoples and greater attention to the continued marginalization of indigeneity.

In the field of Pacific studies, critics have long contended that studies of Asian America must acknowledge the Pacific and its peoples. And why not? Historically, the routes of travel to the United States would necessarily and literally have gone by way of the Pacific Islands. Hawai'i was not only a stopover and the first point of entry to the United States from Japan, China, Korea, and the Philippines; the Hawaiian islands also served as the first recruitment site for Asian migrant laborers.³¹ Pacific studies scholarship also questions the dominant categorization of the Pacific Islands and of indigenous peoples as not only marginalized but also landlocked, bound in stasis—a characterization of indigeneity and the Pacific that undoubtedly has its roots in imperial and martial history. By contrast, scholars of the Pacific champion alternate ways of viewing this region and, more importantly, indigeneity as dynamic, mobile, active, and engaged.³²

In using the term *transpacific*, I do not mean to claim that the experiences of Filipinos and Filipinas are interchangeable with those of native peoples of the Pacific Islands and Oceania. Pacific Islands peoples experienced imperialism and militarization quite differently, still live in islands claimed as military zones and territories by other nations, and remain marginalized within academic and mainstream discourse, policy, and memory. My model of transpacific scholarship, however, does attend to representations of the

indigenous and to issues of indigeneity, which are often lost in the sweep of the transnational. Making visible some of the earlier, historic origins of the divide between Asian American and Pacific studies scholarship, I also underscore how representational structures both created and dismantled the myths, constructs, and symbols of indigeneity and femininity.

Even applying the terms *indio* and *indigenous* to this period must be done with great care, for variable historical definitions of these terms illustrate the nuances and ruptures in how Filipinas and Filipinos constructed national identity. The early twentieth century saw the careful restructuring of race, class, and religious distinctions and terminology in the Philippines. In that period, as Benedict Anderson, Vicente Rafael, Michael Salman, and Paul Kramer have documented, the term *filipino* itself had shifting meaning.³³ Filipinos and Filipinas struggled with their prior connections to indigenous peoples, as Hispanicized Filipinos and elites attempted to distinguish themselves from non-Christian peoples. In the Spanish colonial context *filipino* had referred to Spanish creoles, those of Spanish ancestry born in the colony. *Indio* and *mestizo* represented larger, more complex categories. From an American perspective in the early twentieth century, the word *indigenous* might have been used to categorize people from the Philippines writ large. The Bureau of Indian Affairs, for example, had a hand in the organization and administration of Philippine policy. In the Philippines most lowlanders were identified as *indios*; these people, many of whom were considered to be successfully evangelized by Hispanic Catholicism, were thought to be different from the *infeles*, that is, animists who lived in the Luzon Highlands and Muslim peoples in the South (grouped under the category *Moros*).³⁴ Filipinos also distinguished between highland peoples and those they identified as Malay. The term *mestizo* could refer to someone of Spanish and *indio* birth but more often meant Chinese-*indio* ancestry, and, later, in the American period, could also apply to someone with an American and Chinese racial mixture. The early twentieth century was a period in which these racial categories underwent reorganization, as Filipinas and Filipinos helped reinforce or create a new hierarchy, one that separated their national identity from that of indigenous peoples.

In Philippine literature in English, this nationalist redefinition was dramatized through the bodies of women and their iconic identification with the land. I use the Philippines as a case study to examine how and why such versions of women became important. Scholars of postcolonial studies, American studies, ethnic American studies, and diaspora studies have ana-

lyzed the dominant cast of the feminine, one that, especially in the early twentieth century, continues to be that of a woman who is bound to the home and the homeland, who functions as the signifier of nationalist foundation in soil or earth. In postcolonial literature, women become the symbols of the violated land, or *patria*, both the impetus and the inspiration for the male nationalist's need to reclaim normative masculinity as central to the formation of nationalist consciousness. Such narratives—what Doris Sommer calls “foundational fictions”—represent consistent patterns that extend across multiple disciplinary trajectories and cross geographies that range from the Philippines to Aztlán, Latin America, India, and the African diaspora.³⁵ Normative versions of cultural nationalism also depend upon such tensions between a male-coded cultural nationalism and the unruly actors—be they feminists or queer women of color—who do not fit within its bounds. Feminist scholarship in postcolonial studies, Chicana and Chicano studies, African diaspora studies, Asian American studies, and indigenous studies has worked hard to reveal these dynamics and their repercussions and to move beyond them.³⁶

The pivotal literary figures Carlos Bulosan and Jessica Hagedorn illustrate some of the above critical ossifications and their manifestation in Filipina and Filipino American and Asian American studies. These two iconic authors are the pillars of the canon, and what they have come to represent has troubling ramifications, especially for Filipina femininity: Bulosan is now a stand-in for the male cultural nationalist narrative that dominates Asian America in the first half of the twentieth century; Hagedorn is viewed as the voice of the late twentieth-century's feminist, queer, and transnational liberation from these earlier constraints. While Bulosan and Hagedorn are not central to this book, they do signify both the cementing and polarization of how Filipino and Filipina American experience has been defined and ultimately limited by intersecting boundaries of chronology, gender, and geography.³⁷

Best known for his autobiographical novel *America Is in the Heart* (1946), Bulosan today stands as the representative figure of Filipino migrant labor history and of the Filipino exile's difficulties in the United States. The first-person narrator of the novel, Allos, leaves his mother and family behind in the Philippines to work in the United States. The novel tracks his growing disillusion with his new home, as he encounters racism and injustice, and his pivot to nostalgic memories of the Philippines, represented by his hardworking and suffering mother. Because *America Is in the Heart* follows Allos's in-

volvement with socialist labor and antiracism movements and the formation of his own brand of Filipino cultural nationalism, Bulosan's text has become the Filipino American (and, to a larger extent, Asian American) nationalist narrative par excellence, one that is easily packaged, distilled, and taught. The influence of the novel is widespread; it appears on syllabuses in disciplines ranging from literary studies to sociology, Asian American studies to history.³⁸ The popularity of the novel and Bulosan's valorization of his mother have had long-standing gendered and sexed implications for how literature from the Philippines has been read in the United States. Studies of the early twentieth century have thereby been predominantly concerned with the figure of the male migrant laborer, while women remain within the homeland.

If *America Is in the Heart* has become representative not only of early American experiences of Filipinos and Filipinas but also of a certain kind of male cultural nationalism, allegorized as a coming-of-age narrative, Hagedorn's *Dogeaters* (1990) is the exemplary text of the late twentieth century. Hagedorn's novel, with its multiple narratives, postmodern structure, and transnational geographies, symbolizes everything Bulosan's does not. Set entirely in the Philippines, *Dogeaters* centers on the long history of U.S. colonial and neocolonial influence and its damaging repercussions. Whereas *America Is in the Heart* focuses on the developing nationalist consciousness of a single man, *Dogeaters* moves back and forth between multiple points of view; this back and forth itself works to destabilize the trajectory of Filipino patriarchy and American hegemony. In comparison to Bulosan's work, *Dogeaters* is often read as a quintessentially resistant text, one that puts forth a model of transnational queer feminism as part of its incisive critique of U.S. imperial historiography and American neocolonialism.³⁹

This treatment of Bulosan and Hagedorn is emblematic of some general tendencies in the broader characterization of Filipino and Filipina literature within Asian American studies.⁴⁰ Just as Bulosan's text is "about" narrating the life of a Filipino migrant, so the early twentieth century is read primarily through the lens of Filipino migration and labor and cast as a period ultimately "about" the development of male cultural nationalists. In part, this characterization has stemmed from archival limitations, since material about the lives of Filipina women has only recently become much more accessible.⁴¹ With *Dogeaters* as a prime example, scholarship on later or contemporary Philippine–U.S. dynamics turns to feminist, diaspora, and queer studies as primary rubrics. Bulosan and Hagedorn represent a split between

the first and second halves of the twentieth century and the critical narratives that have shaped their contours. The limitations of the bounds of geography (meaning that works produced in the United States remain the primary focus) and chronology (meaning that the early twentieth century has been characterized as the realm of male literary cultural nationalism) have had troubling results: Filipinas have had only a marginal role in discussions of early twentieth-century U.S.–Asian relations. They are relegated to the status of a statistic, a blip on the larger screen either of male migration to the United States or of male-dominated independence debates and nationalist movements.

But what if such foundational patterns in nationalist literatures were, at least for a site like the Philippines, not quite so edified? What if one could track and witness these fluctuations? In the English-language press, in developing literature, and in the venues frequented by elites the dominant representation of the Filipina was not that of a woman bound to the land, but that of a transgressive woman who flouted norms, spoke multiple languages, traveled, and was both the product and producer of a nation and culture in flux. The book's chapters investigate the fuzzy overlap, the blurred messiness of writers' construction of transpacific women—representations that were sometimes contentious, often troubling, at times laudatory, and at still other times deeply critical. Demonstrating that it is possible to trace the continuous development of icons of femininity as well as their solidification and their contestation, the Filipinas in this study exemplify movement over stasis and instability over reification.

Moreover, because of the geographical, chronological, and gendered boundaries that separate the treatment of a novel like Bulosan's from a work like Hagedorn's, it has become difficult to imagine intersections between the interests of nationalism and transnational feminism during the early to mid-twentieth century. Narrating the story of the making and remaking of the modern Filipina calls attention to earlier forms of transpacific feminism, such that this critical practice becomes more than a Western import, more than a politics and scholarly approach that exists solely within the Western academy or other circles of privilege.⁴² How does Philippine literature in English attempt to promote an entwined version of both nationalism and transnational feminism? And what might the treatment of this literature tell us about our own critical desires to separate the two? The following pages seek to both illuminate and disrupt these separations and to examine their eventual calcification in the years immediately after the Pacific War, when

Cold War relations that triangulated the Philippines between Asia and the United States led to their reconfiguration. Ultimately, the figure of the transpacific Filipina becomes the site through which these differences might be held up and contained.

.....

That Filipina and Filipino writers would return to the transpacific Filipina is no surprise, especially since this period coincided with the emergence of the women's suffrage movement in the Philippines, increased support for Filipina rights in the 1920s and 1930s, and assessments of its effects in the 1950s. In 1905 Concepcion Felix and other elite women founded the *Asociación Feminista Filipina*, which was dedicated primarily not to suffrage but to issues like regulating women's and children's labor and to lobbying for the inclusion of women in municipal and provincial boards of education.⁴³ The initial years of the occupation saw the expansion of educational and professional opportunities for Filipinas, as they began graduating from universities, formed women's associations, and entered the workforce. Women soon began campaigning for the vote. Momentum for suffrage propelled the cause forward, and Filipina and Filipino independence activists and politicians began questioning whether or not Filipina suffrage should be included as part of independence efforts. As Mina Roces has documented, the nationalist movement presented a complicated problem for Filipina suffragists, for they were asked to support (and even vote in favor of) a government that would not validate their enfranchisement. Suffragists struggled with the knowledge that their affiliation with American women activists meant they were aligned with a cause that was preventing their nation from gaining independence.⁴⁴ Filipino nationalists also worried that the attachment of women's suffrage to their calls for independence might prolong the debate. The issue was not fully resolved at the time the Philippines achieved commonwealth status, and, after a plebiscite determining whether or not women were interested in suffrage, Filipinas were finally granted the vote in 1937.

The women's suffrage movement in the Philippines had definite connections to corresponding initiatives in the United States and around the globe. Indeed, many Filipina feminists increasingly saw themselves as part of a worldwide call for attention to women's rights. In this period, women's clubs formalized links across the nation and between countries. Events and developments for women in the United States paralleled similar happenings across the Pacific. In 1890 the General Federation of Women's Clubs was

founded in the United States, followed by the National Association of Colored Women in 1896. In the Philippines the first two decades of the twentieth century saw the creation of more women's organizations, and the National Federation of Women's Clubs embraced the cause of suffrage in the Philippines in 1921.⁴⁵ And just as rising numbers of women began attending universities in the Philippines, the same period saw a dramatic increase in university attendance by middle-class white women in the United States.

Even though similar developments for women were occurring on both sides of the Pacific, as Kristin Hoganson has argued, the white, middle-class women's suffrage movement in the United States had an uneasy relationship with the Philippines. Alliance and coalition between Filipinas and white American women were, for the most part, confounded by the contradictory pull of the goals of the anti-imperialism movement in the United States, Philippine independence activists, and U.S. women's suffrage. Notable suffragists like Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony did not reject the principles of U.S. imperialist expansion. The debate in the United States was already complicated by tensions between white women and women of color. During the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, white, middle-class women who campaigned for suffrage "increasingly cast their lot with those who wielded political power—the men of their race and class."⁴⁶ At their worst, women's rights activists in the United States who voiced objections to Philippine independence based these contentions on racist premises. Some suffragists angrily resented the notion that brown men could have more rights than white women. Some championed the cause of suffrage for Filipinas but not Filipinos, arguing that the women were more intelligent and more capable of the political responsibilities attached to enfranchisement. And while Carrie Chapman Catt visited the Philippines to encourage Filipinas to mobilize for women's rights, Hoganson notes the overwhelming failure of white American women to capitalize on the potential for transnational coalition with women in the Philippines.⁴⁷

Filipina and Filipino authors also engaged in the wider, global spread of the new woman and her later counterpart, the modern girl, as pop icons. Although it is difficult to pinpoint exactly when and where the new woman originated, scholars have recently traced her rise to the years immediately preceding the Spanish–American War, which coincided with the rising momentum of the suffrage movement.⁴⁸ The Modern Girl Around the World Research Group has analyzed the ways in which the flow of global capitalism

resulted in the circulation of images that were strikingly similar in locales ranging from Shanghai to Bombay, London to New York, Okinawa to Sydney. These scholars document how a global interest in representations of a certain kind of woman, made visible by repetitive and iconic visual characteristics (“bobbed hair, painted lips, provocative clothing, elongated body, and open, easy smile”), and her reappearance in diverse sites across the globe during the period between the First and Second World Wars were influenced by increased economic interdependence, the rapid spread of global capitalism, and the resurgence of nationalist movements as colonized nations across the world increased their efforts to gain independence.⁴⁹ At the same time, the flows of global capital, the consumption of American and British commodities, and the marketing of the Hollywood film industry in other nations—linked to corporate advertising that banked on the image of the twentieth-century woman conceptualized as modern—contributed to the almost simultaneous worldwide arrival of modern girls.⁵⁰

But these women, as this scholarship demonstrates, were not always merely influenced by a dominant West. Indeed, the same studies that focus on the concurrent creation and circulation of modern women and their connection to developments in global capitalism and commodity advertising also rightly caution against characterizations of these women and their reputation as Westernized or, perhaps more explicitly, Americanized, a move that overestimates the reach of Western imperialism and capitalism. More important, though, these scholars draw attention to how across the globe modern women and their representations incorporated local elements—what the Modern Girl Around the World Research Group has called “multidirectional citation” or “the mutual, though asymmetrical influences and circuits of exchange that produce common figurations and practices in multiple locations.”⁵¹ While certain elements of modern girls and women might be mapped in various sites, representational practices also drew from local cultural context; the meaning and use of the modern girl did not always imply an acceptance of the West.

Similarly, the modern Filipina was not just an offshoot of these developments. Rather, her emergence was both product and project, both representational result and method. The new Filipina had her own heyday in the Philippines, as Filipinas and Filipinos responded to circulating constructs of femininity and incorporated their own manifestations. Like many other new women across the globe, the new Filipina incorporated some aspects of the West while retaining some of her own Philippine-specific traits. But these

versions were more than new women and modern girls with a Filipina face. As this book details, even though transpacific Filipinas may have had their hair fashionably bobbed, modeled themselves after Hollywood starlets, and worn Chanel No. 5, they also were drawn carefully from other types of femininity in the Philippines.

Although neither explicitly studied nor linked to these other modern women, the transpacific Filipina offers productive opportunities for teasing out these intricate connections between colonial and nationalist contexts. For the transpacific Filipinas of this period are not just negotiations of the West (the United States and Spain), but also a means of processing how those in the Philippines attempted to sort out their relation to (and in some cases to break connections with) other Asians, other peoples in the Philippines, and people of color in the United States. The new Filipinas, uncaring nurses, heartless coeds, and Maria Claras of this book have ties to the Chinese *nuxing*, the Japanese *moga*, and the British suffragette. They have their parallels in Hollywood, Indian, and Australian screen stars. They are connected to the development of the new Negro and new Indian women in the United States. Like these women, the transpacific Filipina becomes “an object of national scrutiny . . . a contested figure and image, either an object of celebration or of attempted control,” a means of producing, imagining, responding to, and, in some cases, reinforcing problematic ties not just to the West but also to other Asian nations.⁵²

.....

The Filipina as new, modern, global, and transpacific was a key cultural figure in the Philippines well before the editors of a twenty-first-century bridal magazine decided to choose four types of women to capture representative aspects of Filipina femininity. The threads that link transpacific femininities of the early to mid-twentieth century to the contemporary Maria Claras featured in *Wedding Essentials*, however, also fray and unravel. Although the image I began with points to transpacific Filipinas’ continued importance, the magazine spread illustrates some crucial departures. For while the *Wedding Essentials* layout contains and divides these women into distilled types, easily defined and stabilized, and glosses over the complex imperial interactions that produced them, this study zeroes in on important instabilities and dwells on the uncomfortable and uncertain, the questionable and puzzling. At the same time, I also examine repeated attempts to manage and monitor the Filipina. While some authors celebrated trans-

acific femininities and their unstable potential, many others were invested in containing this instability as a means of sharpening the borders of elite, heteronormative identities.

The chapters that follow demonstrate how Filipina and Filipino writers made and remade the modern Filipina to respond to fluctuating national identities, communities, and hierarchies and to the layered influences of multiple empires. In each chapter, the transpacific Filipina emerges as a central figure in national, transpacific, and even global relations. In the Philippines she becomes the cornerstone of English-literate elites' definition of what it meant to be Filipina and Filipino during the U.S. and Japanese periods and immediately after the Pacific War. For these writers, making the modern Filipina in turn made the nation and its citizens modern. In some cases, they drew on narratives of the West as a modernizing force, but they also turned toward versions of precolonial women to argue that the Philippines itself carried aspects of modern, liberated femininity well before the arrival of European, American, and Japanese imperial forces.

Undoubtedly, authors also wrestled with the question of how Filipina femininity was constructed by the Spanish, U.S., and Japanese regimes. But representations of Filipinas in imperial discourse—as an exotic other, a fascinating yet frightening spectacle, or a colonial subject who eagerly desired the benefits of empire—form only part of the story. Each chapter argues that imperial changeovers destabilized elite communities and that resulting class tensions coalesced in heated debates over transpacific Filipinas and their place in the Philippines. Filipina and Filipino authors turned to different representational and authorial strategies to reassert the terms of raced, classed, gendered, and sexed hierarchies. With some exceptions, such as Maximo Kalaw, whose work I discuss in chapter 3, Filipinos responded to the threat posed by transpacific women by attempting to reinforce male nationalist narratives, which depended on idealized Filipina icons.⁵³ Yet, as I argue in chapter 2, even the female icons of male nationalism are consistently marked by unresolved tensions. While the representational projects of imperialist discourse and elite Filipino nationalists attempted to contain transpacific Filipinas, Filipina authors constructed and enacted alternatives both on and off the printed page. In making and remaking the transpacific Filipina, these women crafted representations of Filipinas as central to the Philippines' past, present, and future. They also imagine forms of political coalition and transpacific networks that, although often complicated and unstable, depart from romanticized notions

of sisterhood between Filipinas or between Filipinas and white American women.

The first half of the book demonstrates the methods of archival recovery and feminist critique that ground *Transpacific Femininities*. Chapter 1 explores the unmapped routes and intersections—what I call byways and midways—of Filipina and Filipino literary history, its connections to elite constructions of transpacific femininity, and feminist alternatives to imperial and national narratives. In an analysis of two recovered archives of Filipina-authored literature, I chart how women countered dominant representations of Filipinas circulated by the U.S. colonial regime and elite male nationalists in the Philippines. Writing for an American audience during the first decades of the occupation, Filipinas contested racist constructions of women in the Philippines as either savage others or desiring colonial subjects eager for tutelage. In texts that reveal the lingering traces of Spanish influence on the elite, Hispanicized Filipinas carefully distanced themselves from indigenous peoples in the Philippines and other Asian and white, working-class women in the United States, and they imagine problematic alliances with white American women. The second half of the chapter moves across the Pacific to track the responses of Filipina authors to debates in the 1930s over the Philippines' official languages during the transition from occupied territory to commonwealth. To reinforce their place as elite literati, Filipino writers positioned themselves as architects of a national literature in English. To combat these intersections of male nationalism and the publishing world, Filipinas critiqued the dismissal of women's literary contributions and fostered a sisterhood of women writers.

Extending this discussion of the gendered dynamics of nationalist literature, chapter 2 analyzes four recurring icons of Filipina femininity that haunted the literary, cultural, and political landscape of Manila in the 1930s: the Spanish mestiza Maria Clara, the Westernized Filipina coed, the romanticized barrio girl, and the precolonial india. Weaving together an examination of Rizal's *Noli Me Tangere*, debates over Filipina suffrage, newspaper and periodical coverage, and conduct manuals for Filipinas, I track the dominance of each of these icons and the elite's recurring fascination with and anxiety over the specters of shifts in Filipina femininity, as a new generation of women graduated from the coeducational university system and destabilized former social and professional divisions and bourgeois definitions of normative Filipina femininity. Although they were frequently employed by elites as iconic figures, Maria Clara, coed, barrio girl, and india are neverthe-

less deeply vexed representations that belie the icon's presumed stability, and each recurs throughout the period under study. These unstable constructions are ghostly reminders of imperial and national transformations in the Philippines and their effects on the elite, and they continued to reappear in literary and cultural representations throughout the twentieth century.

The remaining chapters move from these larger cultural debates over transpacific Filipinas to their fraught manifestation in literature produced during three transitional moments: the 1930s, which was the height of the Philippine movements for independence and suffrage, the Second World War and the Japanese occupation, and the postwar period. Drawing on the earlier analysis of the elites' fascination with the coed and the barrio girl, chapter 3 compares two romances, Kalaw's *Filipino Rebel* (Philippines, ca. 1930) and Felicidad Ocampo's *The Brown Maiden* (United States, 1932), and their projection of the exceptional and elite transpacific Filipina's destiny. Kalaw and Ocampo were both connected to the U.S. regime, Ocampo as a nurse and later an employee for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and Kalaw as an independence activist, academic, and, later, dean of the University of the Philippines. Both novels maintain class divisions among the elite, indigenous, and working-class peoples of the United States and the Philippines. Yet they also present complicated interventions that counter an imperial narrative that idealized U.S. empire as benevolent and valorized the education of exceptional elites as evidence of the occupation's success. Rewriting this plot, *Filipino Rebel* and *The Brown Maiden* contend that the transpacific Filipina's future ability to entwine nationalism and feminism depends on her reeducation. For Kalaw and Ocampo, reeducation is linked not to the educational initiatives formally sponsored by the United States (although their heroines do participate in these ventures), but to the heroines' eventual awareness of the dangers of naïve idealization and their rejection of the drama that would cast the Filipina as eagerly accepting colonial subjectivity. The novels suggest further that coalitions between Filipinas and white American women are confounded not only by national and racial differences but also by divisions that separate the elite from the working class.

Chapter 4 examines the Second World War as a turning point in Philippine, U.S., and Japanese relations, in the status of Philippine literature in English, and in the corresponding constructions of gendered national identity. Focusing on material composed by Filipinas during and immediately after the Pacific War, the chapter analyzes the complex representational and authorial practices of women who reimagine domesticity and sisterhood to

claim the transpacific Filipina's importance to the Philippines' future and to critique the gendered divisions that persisted amid imperial and national transitions. The Japanese regime severely restricted publication in English, and some writers began producing Japanese-monitored propaganda pieces under considerable duress. The Japanese occupation created a new set of challenges for the elite, as those who were formerly enfranchised found themselves in the difficult position of choosing between various loyalties and allegiances. In a series of essays written during the occupation, elite Filipina authors reframe transpacific femininity in response to Japan's push for inter-Asian coalition against Western oppression. Rejecting the elite Filipina's prewar frivolity, they offer what one writer calls "practical patriotism" as a new model of domestic femininity, reconstruct a woman's return to the home and the hearth as a nationalist venture, and idealize precolonial indigenous femininity and pan-Asian sisterhood. They depart from the articles and essays written in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, which distance Filipina women from Japanese, Chinese, and Indian women. These constructions, however, are careful maneuvers in a climate of imperial supervision and censorship, and practical patriotism suggests a mode of critique that reads the charged politics of these pieces as a strategy of survival during the war.

The Second World War allowed for a reimagining of relations between the Philippines and the United States, now seen as being allied against the Japanese. The bombings of Pearl Harbor and Manila, which occurred within a few days of each other, as well as Filipinos' service in the U.S. military during the war and the joint experience of the soldiers of both nations during the deadly march of 1942 to the Japanese camp in Bataan, created a series of national traumas that advanced the reimagining of transpacific relations.⁵⁴ The people who were once "little brown brothers" in need of tutelage or decried as an immigration nuisance suddenly became crucial allies in the war against Japan. Popular constructions in mainstream media, from films to newspaper articles, overwhelmingly celebrated brotherly relations between U.S. and Filipino men. While men were valorized as united in a transpacific war effort, women were cast as the war's victims. This interest in the Philippines and the change in perceptions about Filipinas and Filipinos led to new opportunities for publication, and a greater number of books by authors from the Philippines circulated in the years after the war.⁵⁵ I end the chapter with a response to these rhetorical constructs in Yay Panlilio's memoir *The Crucible: An Autobiography of "Colonel Yay"* (1950), the first Filipina

text to be published by a major American press. In her account of her experience as a guerrilla resisting the Japanese, Panlilio presents a complicated politics that seeks to gain recognition for Filipina and guerrilla involvement during the Pacific War. To do so, she rejects pan-Asian sisterhood, grounds her ability to speak to an American audience in her mixed Irish American and Filipina ancestry, and validates a transpacific community between a Filipina author and her white American sisters.

Chapter 5 moves from the rapidly changing dynamic between the Philippines and the United States during the Second World War to revisions of transpacific Filipinas during the Cold War. Nineteen fifty-five was a landmark year for Cold War relations and feminism in the Philippines: it was the year of the Bandung conference in Indonesia, at which representatives of African and Asian nations met to declare themselves either aligned or non-aligned with the United States and the Soviet Union; and the year that marked the fiftieth anniversary of the formal beginnings of the Filipina feminist movement. In keeping with a larger turn toward sentiment that dominated U.S. relations with Asia, the question of the Filipina's heart became ever more important in the years after the Second World War. This chapter considers Cold War sentiment in postwar makings of the elite transpacific Filipina, from the iconic nurse and uncaring coed in *Bienvenido Santos's* short stories to studies about the development of the Filipina woman written by Filipina feminists, which marshal the sentimental rhetoric of the Cold War to champion women's rights, even as they manipulate an idealized indigenous past. These elite women strategically employ a discourse of the heart to assert the Filipina's importance not only to the Philippines but also to global relations.

The epilogue transitions from the printed pages of the early to mid-twentieth century to multimedia archives of the contemporary moment. I pair David Byrne's recent album *Here Lies Love* (2010) with the work of Filipina bloggers and website administrators who ask and answer the question, What makes a modern Filipina? I gesture toward links between earlier formations of transpacific femininities and the global circulation and consumption of their late twentieth- and twenty-first-century versions. These examples point to a lasting fascination with contemporary icons of transpacific femininity, such as the overseas Filipina worker, recently praised by the former president of the Philippines Gloria Macapagal Arroyo as the nation's most valuable economic export; the mail order bride, advertised as an idealized version of the dutiful wife; and even the frightening yet captivat-

ing spectacle of Imelda Marcos. While Byrne's *Here Lies Love* capitalizes on the global circulation of transpacific Filipina icons, Filipina feminist bloggers critique this persistent cycle of commodification. These women build upon and extend the work of previous Filipina authors, and they also offer new versions of online, global feminist networks that call for offline empowerment and cross-class coalitions. Rooted in the complex processes that I follow over the course of the twentieth century, these contemporary multimedia archives attest to the lingering and pressing importance of making and remaking the modern Filipina.