

Global Political Thinkers

Series Editors

Harmut Behr

School of Geography Politics & Sociology

Newcastle University

Newcastle, UK

Felix Rösch

School of Humanities

Coventry University

Coventry, UK

This Palgrave Pivot series presents ground-breaking, critical perspectives on political theory: titles published in this series present influential political thinkers on a global scale from around the world, with interpretations based on their original languages, providing synoptic views on their works, and written by internationally leading scholars. Individual interpretations emphasize the language and cultural context of political thinkers and of political theory as primary media through which political thoughts and concepts originate and generate. The series invites proposals for new Palgrave Pivot projects by and on authors from all traditions, areas, and cultural contexts. Individual books should be between 25,000 and 50,000 words long according to the Palgrave Pivot format. For more details about Palgrave Pivot, an innovative new publishing format from Palgrave Macmillan, please visit www.palgrave.com/pivot. Emphases shall be on political thinkers who are important for our understanding of: - the relation between individual and society and conceptualizations of both; - forms of participation and decision-making; - conceptualizations of political deliberation and discourse; - constructions of identity; - conceptualizations of the 'human condition' of politics; - ontologies and epistemologies of the political/of politics; - conceptualizations of social and political change and/or tradition; and - conceptualizations of political order, their rise and fall

More information about this series at
<http://www.palgrave.com/gp/series/15014>

Lisandro E. Claudio

Jose Rizal

Liberalism and the Paradox of Coloniality

palgrave
macmillan

Lisandro E. Claudio
De La Salle University
Manila, Philippines

Global Political Thinkers

ISBN 978-3-030-01315-8

ISBN 978-3-030-01316-5 (eBook)

<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-01316-5>

Library of Congress Control Number: 2018958886

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s) 2019

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are solely and exclusively licensed by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use. The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Cover pattern © Melisa Hasan

This Palgrave Macmillan imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature Switzerland AG

The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

For Christine

PROLOGUE

Contemporary liberalism is synonymous with moderation. It is a philosophy of mainstream governance and compromise, often challenged by more radical beliefs from populists, socialists, neo-fascists—agitators from all sides of the political spectrum. But this same philosophy was the key radical idea of the nineteenth century, a century birthed in revolution—a time when memories of the French and American revolutions served as calls to liberty across continents and oceans.

To conjure the revolutionary *élan* of the period, we may visit the cradles of these calls to liberty, places like the United States and France. But doing so would not only be a tired project but also fail to grasp the extent of liberalism's appeal. Liberalism spread much farther than Eurocentric versions of its history assume, and the goal of this work is to find liberalism in an unlikely place. Recent work has traced the movement of liberal thought to various places in the Caribbean (Polasky 2015). But how about Asia?

The polymath intellectual Jose Rizal was a novelist, poet, physician, naturalist, essayist, artist, linguist, and historian. His writings inspired the anti-Spanish Philippine Revolution of 1896—the first anti-colonial revolution in Asia. For his nationalism, he is revered as his country's national hero, appearing on the country's money, its monuments, its street signs, its schools. The law requires all Filipino students to read his novels. And debates about the minutiae of his life make nationalist historians apoplectic. Whether or not he retracted his anti-Catholic writings before death, whether or not he supported the revolution—these questions remain central to how historians and citizens of the Philippines view their nation.

Some scholars—the historian of nationalism Benedict Anderson to name the most prominent—have championed Rizal’s relevance to global political thought, and the recent publication of Rizal’s novels as part of the Penguin Classics series has broadened his English-speaking audience. Slowly, Rizal is being ensconced in the world republic of letters.

Within the “Malay” world of Indonesia and Malaysia, Rizal commands a modest following for being a “pride of the Malayan race” (he was a Chinese mestizo).¹ Such a reading of Rizal has expanded his relevance outside the Philippines, but can remain tied to racialist conceptions of politics that, at least in Malaysia, dovetail with Malay state formation.² In any case, Filipinos themselves rarely think in terms of racial categories like Malay, even though Rizal was, at times, prone to racialist, even racist, conceptions of nationalism.

Despite the growth of Rizal scholarship, his influence has by and large been limited to his country, especially in the area of political philosophy. This limited influence is hardly surprising for someone who, by the 1890s, had decided to jettison European readers, seeking to speak directly to his *patria*. Audience mattered to Rizal. His novels—so specific in their setting, lexicon, humor, and political concerns—must be read as Filipino texts. They remain vivid introductions to life in late nineteenth-century Philippines, with Rizal serving as a satirical tour guide of a new nation teeming with revolutionary energy. Through his books, one learns about the hypocrisy of the friar orders, the fecklessness of reforms, and the resentment of a people ready to revolt. These novels also conjure the Philippines as definite place—with its distinct cultural practices, cuisine, patois—albeit centered on Manila and the Tagalog-speaking provinces. How do we draw universal lessons from a man focused on local issues?

Rizal had specific concerns, and his commentary was drawn from a unique milieu: the earliest pro-independence nationalist movement in Asia that was also the last pro-independence nationalist movement within the Spanish empire. It is tempting to view Rizal and his country as exceptional: neither Asian nor Latin American. And nationalist Filipinos may even

¹ Malaysia’s Anwar Ibrahim, both as a member of the administration UMNO Party and as an opposition leader, has spoken fondly of Rizal as a Malay leader.

² This racialist thinking is partly reflected in the thought of Indonesian nationalist Tan Malaka who saw Rizal as part of a “Greater Indonesia” torn asunder by colonialism (Guillermo 2017). But Tan Malaka’s vision of Rizal, unlike those of the Malay nationalists in Malaysia, places more emphasis on anti-colonial solidarity.

entertain some form of pride in the unique nature of the life and times of their national hero. Yet specific need not mean parochial. Rizal was an Enlightenment figure, and while he commented almost exclusively on the events in his country, his ideas drew from a wellspring of transnational political thought.

Rizal's ideas were anchored on the traditions of Republican Spain, the place where the current usage of the term "liberalism" was born. The Spain of the nineteenth century was a center for liberal internationalism, where secret organizations, Masonic lodges, and various conspiracies theorized what were then subversive ideas about Enlightenment. Spanish liberals were inspired by the French Revolution, but they also developed their own liberal heritage.

Rizal's writings, primarily his novels, drew from the world of French Enlightenment: from Voltaire, Dumas, and Hugo.³ And his conception of rights was anchored on the major declarations of the time, from the French Declaration of the Rights of Man (a document he translated from French into Tagalog), the American Declaration of independence, to Spain's liberal Cadiz Constitution. But he was no mere copycat. Despite acknowledging the derivative quality in some of his writings, Rizal was confident that his context gave him a unique voice. Rizal knew that his works would not share the aplomb of authors like Hugo, and he felt a nagging sense that his work lacked the artistic merit of those penned by European masters. His insecurities notwithstanding, he knew that his books were special because they rehearsed the themes of liberty and freedom in a colonial context.

My goal in these pages is to view liberalism obliquely, from a vista rarely explored. What would liberalism look like when seen through the eyes of liberals in the colony? Rizal is one of colonial/postcolonial liberalism's earliest and most prescient thinkers. He may also well be Asia's pioneering liberal. Prior to Sun Yat-Sen or Nehru, Rizal was already thinking about what freedom, liberty, and rights meant in colonial contexts. In Southeast Asia, Rizal would not have an equivalent until the 1930s. Perhaps his closest analogue is the Vietnamese novelist and journalist Vũ Trọng Phụng, who melded the liberal and republican ideals of the French third republic with anti-colonialism (Zinoman 2014). Like Rizal, Vũ Trọng Phụng has

³Rizal was likewise inspired by European (particularly German) ethnology, anthropology, historiography, and linguistics. His ideas on these matters have been discussed in other work (see Thomas 2012; Ocampo 2013, 75–117; Mojares 2013, 126–137; Aguilar 2005).

been belatedly recognized as an exemplary realist novelist, whose use of satire exposed the contradictions of colonial rule.

The tragedy is that many authors and readers neglect Rizal's liberalism, perhaps because postcolonial thinkers find it difficult to view liberalism alongside anti-colonialism. Postcolonial theory, as Vivek Chibber (2014, 618) has argued, exhibits a "boilerplate skepticism" against any forms of "Western" Enlightenment. Hence many recent works have identified the liberal cause with that of imperialism. In the Philippines, which has its own historiographical tradition that trades on the demonization of anything "Western,"⁴ Rizal is barely discussed as a liberal. For how could the national hero of an Asian country be an advocate of an idea as foreign as liberalism?

Although some writers from the Maoist Communist Party of the Philippines write of Rizal as liberal, they do so to point out his incomplete political development—his lack of a systematic class-based vision. For Communist Party of the Philippines founder, Jose Maria Sison (1966), for example, "the anticolonial and anticlerical writings of Rizal" stemmed from a "now outmoded liberal cast," despite its influence during his time.

We cannot deny the provenance of liberalism; it was born in Europe in an era of pan-Atlanticism. And the earliest liberal revolutions occurred in places like England, the United States, and France—polities that officially remain committed to liberal democratic governance. And we also cannot deny that many imperial crusades, aimed at spreading "civilization," drew from liberal ideas about linear progress. Yet because liberalism is a philosophy of openness and toleration, it is also the philosophy with the most myriad vectors: a philosophy of openness is likewise open to interpretation. The liberalism of Spain, and certainly that of France or America, would have been different from the liberalism of the Philippines. Rizal was aware of these differences, even as he acknowledged the common Enlightenment heritage of all liberalisms.

How was liberalism interpreted in colonial contexts? The answer is not obvious since liberal philosophy resonates with people advocating different causes. There were, indeed, Western, liberal colonizers who saw no contradiction between their liberal beliefs and imperialism (Mehta 1999). In fact, some of them believed that liberal rights could only be spread to non-Western societies through colonialism. On the other hand, there were liberals who saw colonialism as a contradiction of liberal values.

⁴ See Claudio 2017, 13–17, for a discussion of this movement, which I call the "Diliman Consensus." For an earlier take on the same phenomenon, see Claudio 2013.

I hope to show that the more ethical liberalism was articulated not by those who advocated imperialism, but by those who rebelled against it, by people like Rizal and his cohort of nationalist intellectuals, the so-called Filipino “*ilustrados*” of the late nineteenth century. Through Rizal, I seek to expand my analysis of postcolonial liberalism (see Claudio 2017), and to argue for this liberalism’s relevance in contemporary postcolonies, or what scholars sometimes refer to as “the Global South.” If my earlier work traced the role of liberalism in state formation in the early twentieth-century Philippines, this work looks at liberalism’s contribution to Filipino national imagination in the nineteenth. Both works contend that liberals in the colony understand something about liberty that liberals in empire do not. The experience of colonial oppression affords them special insight into the nature of freedom and rights. In this book, I argue that liberty is more precarious in colonies, and colonial liberals know that freedoms and rights have to be earned through suffering and pain.

Like my previous work, I wish to define liberalism through intellectual biography as opposed to didactic conceptual mapping. Therefore, I will only define liberalism in the broadest terms. I agree with Alan Ryan (2012, 28) who notes that liberalism, in all its guises, has been “a perennial protest against absolute forms of absolute authority.” But unlike anarchism, liberals have sought to find order in freedom. Walter Russel Mead (2013) distills liberal thought as such: “Even though humanity is imperfect and flawed, that does not mean we cannot have constitutional, political, and social arrangements that, given the limits on man’s nature, can at least provide a society where the individual is as unconstrained as possible.”

In other words, there are institutional arrangements that promote individual rights and freedoms. And it is the task of the liberal to scrutinize and test these various arrangements. The institution of colonialism was, of course, a failure in this regard. In the twentieth century, George Orwell would even view it as a form of totalitarianism, akin to the dictatorships of the Nazis and the Soviet Communists. Yet we need not rely on European thinkers for anti-authoritarian/totalitarian attacks on colonialism.

Rizal is the ideal thinker for our purposes, not only because of his prominence, but because he theorized liberty more than any of his contemporaries. Liberalism was the overarching lens through which Rizal viewed politics. And, as we shall see, it was Rizal’s liberalism that led him to his pro-independence position. If he was a subversive in nineteenth-century Philippines, it was because he was a staunch liberal in a reactionary colony.

Rizal's thinking was defined by liberalism. Still, I recognize that the Rizal I will represent in these pages is also specific to my own concerns and the concerns of the world today. I agree with the most celebrated Rizal scholar, Ambeth Ocampo (2013, 6), who argues that "Rizal was and is a different man to different people in different times." His biography, his ideas, and his legacy have served various political and ideological purposes, not only because interpretations vary, but also because Rizal was a complex thinker who addressed multiple concerns using multiple lenses. To focus on his liberalism may leave out or underemphasize other facets of his philosophy. Any historian must prioritize, and I have prioritized Rizal's liberalism, for both empirical and political reasons.

If I seek to write into historiography a liberal Rizal, it is partly because a liberal Rizal is necessary at a time of illiberalism. As I write this, multiple countries are sliding into illiberal democracy, where populist politicians are elected and celebrated not in spite of, but because they challenge norms such as human rights and rule of law. In these states, taboos about acceptable political behavior and speech are broken every day, so that ideas once considered immoral are now normal. In 2016, Rizal's own country elected a mass murderer, who sees human rights as "liberal" inventions of the West. "Catholic" Filipinos who once valued the sanctity of life then endorsed a war on drugs that resulted in thousands of state-sanctioned executions. The Philippines is proof of how quickly voters dispense with what were once sacrosanct values in favor of appeals to base instincts. From the liberal nationalism of Jose Rizal, the country degenerated into the authoritarian barbarism of President Rodrigo Duterte. In writing about Rizal, I seek to remind Rizal's compatriots that liberalism and human rights are not foreign impositions; they were integral facets of our national imagination.

The reader who hates being preached at, however, has little to fear, as this book is not a political pamphlet. Despite the political crisis that subtends its writing, it is primarily introduction to readers who are encountering Rizal for the first time. And despite my own desire to speak to Filipinos at a critical juncture, this book's main audience is the non-Filipino reader, who did not grow up learning about Rizal in school.

This book is not concerned with the many biographical debates that Filipino Rizalists have engaged in over the years (e.g. whether or not Rizal died a Catholic, or whether or not he lent his support to the Philippine Revolution of 1896 that overthrew Spain). Rather, my goal is to outline

Rizal's thoughts on principles such as liberty and freedom in colonial contexts, and to do so for the broadest audience possible. I also seek to introduce readers to Rizal's most important works. My sources will therefore be the most easily accessible translations of Rizal's writings, except in those cases where a closer reading of the original Spanish proves necessary. The core texts are three: the collection of Rizal's writings and correspondences published by the National Historical Commission of the Philippines and his two novels, *Noli Me Tangere* (Touch Me Not) and *El Filibusterismo* (Subversion) which, like most Filipinos, I refer to as "The *Noli*" and "The *Fili*" respectively. In discussions of the novels, I will quote from the widely available Penguin translations by Harold Augenbaum. Since I refer to these works multiple times, I have used a shorthand citation method for them, which I explain in the bibliography. For greater simplicity and to reflect linguistic practice in contemporary Philippines, I have also Filipinized Spanish-derived words by removing accents, except in cases of direct quotation.

Apart from contributing to global political theory, a secondary goal is to introduce non-Filipino readers to the best of Rizal scholarship written mostly, though not exclusively, by Filipinos published in the Philippines. I have consciously made an attempt to consult and cite liberally from these works, because they have been the most consistent with the spirit of Rizal's own writing—writing that carries global resonance, ironically, because they are anchored on local realities.

This short book cannot be anything but an introduction. Yet it hopes to do a bit more. Beyond getting to know Rizal, my hope is that the reader and future writers start to think about the horizons and limits of liberalism and its role in colonial/postcolonial contexts. The first chapter situates Rizal life and works in the context of late nineteenth-century Philippines, a period of economic growth and political awakening. Chapter 2 mines Rizal's political writings and correspondences to sketch his overarching vision of liberty in the colony. His central vision, I contend, is that liberty becomes purified through the pain and suffering of colonial peoples. Chapters 3 and 4 provide readers with introductions to Rizal's novels, using Rizal's liberalism as a philosophical backdrop.

The focus on the novels is deliberate. Although there is much to be said about Rizal's verse, his philological work, his historiographic work, and even his research in the natural sciences, Rizal will be remembered as a novelist. In any case, he was a first-class fictionist, and a second-rate historian, too prone to letting propagandistic goals distort historical fact.

Moreover, I am certain that most non-Filipino readers are more interested in literature than anthropological arcana.

I have, unsurprisingly, incurred a number of debts prior to and while working on this book. I extend my deepest appreciation to Kyoto University's Caroline S. Hau, who convinced me to tackle what I had previously thought of as a trite topic. This is not the first time Carol has pushed me outside my comfort zone, and probably won't be the last. Apart from Carol, much of my thinking on Rizal has been shaped by the immense work of two great Filipino historians, Resil Mojares and Ambeth Ocampo. Ambeth, Carol, and Jojo Abinales also read this manuscript and provided valuable feedback.

Felix Rösch and Hartmut Behr, the editors of Palgrave Pivot's Global Political Thinkers series, believed Rizal to be important to global political thought, and entrusted me with making the case for him. Megan Thomas trusted me enough to endorse me to Felix and Hartmut.

I worked on this manuscript during my first year at De La Salle University, and benefited greatly from the support of La Salle's College of Liberal Arts and University Research Coordination Office. My thanks to Dean Jaz Llana, Research Coordinator Feorillo Demeterio, former Dean July Teehankee, Rene Escalante, Ronnie Holmes, Fernie Santiago, Xiao Chua, Jeremy de Chavez, Ricky San Jose, Beth Gabiosa, Babyln Batlanggao, Chris Collantes, JJ Joaquin, Kat Gutierrez, Ron Vilog, Bubbles Asor, Mikee Inton, Cleo Calimbahin, Che Soriano, Phil Binondo, Nelson Tantoco, and Bro. Armin Luistro, FSC.

I remain indebted to my alma mater, Ateneo de Manila, and to my friends and colleagues there, in particular Filomeno Aguilar, Jayeel Cornelio, Jewel Canuday, Melay Abao, Melissa Lao, and Niño Leviste.

Outside the Philippines, I thank Nicole Curato, Kate McGregor, Jafar Suryomenggolo, Nicole CuUnjieng-Aboitiz, Mario Lopez, Sheila Coronel, Julius Bautista, Mike Montesano, Sharmila Parmanand, Jon Ong, Jason Cabañes, and Tomas Larsson. I thank Tomas and Jayeel in particular for making me part of a grant that aided with research. This research was aided by the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation program under grant agreement N°770562.

Marriage has given me a new family: Alex, Nancy, Jack, Mark, and Kate Herrin. Then there is my old family: my parents, Rafael and Sylvia, and my brothers Bas and Redd. My final thanks is for my wife, Christine Herrin, to whom this work is dedicated.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aguilar, Filomeno V. 2005. Tracing Origins: Ilustrado Nationalism and the Racial Science of Migration Waves. *The Journal of Asian Studies* 64 (03): 605–637.
- Chibber, Vivek. 2014. Making Sense of Postcolonial Theory: A Response to Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 27 (3): 617–624.
- Claudio, Lisandro E. 2013. Postcolonial Fissures and the Contingent Nation An Antinationalist Critique of Philippine Historiography. *Philippine Studies: Historical and Ethnographic Viewpoints* 61 (1): 45–75.
- . 2017. *Liberalism and the Postcolony: Thinking the State in 20th-Century Philippines*. Singapore: NUS Press.
- Guillermo, Ramon. 2017. Andres Bonifacio: Proletarian Hero of the Philippines and Indonesia. *Inter-Asia Cultural Studies* 18 (3): 338–346.
- Mead, Walter Russell. 2013. A Historical Look at American Liberalism. Interview by Charles R. Kesler. Youtube Video, September 12. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pRCTg5OWIZs>
- Mehta, Uday Singh. 1999. *Liberalism and Empire*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.
- Mojares, Resil B. 2013. *Isabelo's Archive*. Manila: Anvil Publishing Inc.
- Ocampo, Ambeth R. 2013. *Meaning and History: The Rizal Lectures*. Revised ed. Pasig City: Anvil Publishing Inc.
- Polasky, Janet. 2015. *Revolutions Without Borders: The Call to Liberty in the Atlantic World*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Ryan, Alan. 2012. *The Making of Modern Liberalism*. Princeton/Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- Sison, Jose Maria. 1966. Rizal the Social Critic, December 29. <https://josemaria-sison.org/rizal-the-social-critic/>
- Thomas, Megan C. 2012. *Orientalists, Propagandists, and Ilustrados: Filipino Scholarship and the End of Spanish Colonialism*. Minneapolis/London: University of Minnesota Press
- Zinoman, Peter. 2013. *Vietnamese Colonial Republican: The Political Vision of Vũ Trọng Phụng*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

CONTENTS

1	Creolism and the Liberal Nineteenth Century	1
2	Pain and the Purification of Liberty	21
3	<i>Noli me Tangere</i> and the Failure of Transplanted Liberalism	37
4	The Solution of the Enigma in <i>El Filibusterismo</i>	55
5	Conclusion: Resurrecting Plants	71
	Shorthand Citations for Rizal's Works	79
	Bibliography	81
	Index	85