

## **MARTÍ and RIZAL**

### **Notes Culled From All Over**

**por J. Charles Avila y Roberts<sup>1</sup>**  
An Essay for the International Union

### **The Tale of Two Jose's**

José Martí (1853-1895) and José Rizal (1861-1896) came from different backgrounds. Martí was from Cuba, a son of criollo family, whereas Rizal was from Las Islas Filipinas, a mestizo, mixture of Indio-Chinese-Spanish races. But they equally spent important years in the Spanish metropolis and even studied at the same university. Both were first-class writers in the Spanish language.

Although Martí advocated more explicitly the idea of independence than did Rizal at first, they similarly discovered in literature significant tools to construct a unified national identity vis-à-vis an imperial power. As a result of their efforts to achieve freedom for their peoples who were situated thousands of miles away from each other, the two revolutionaries fell into the hands of the Spaniards only within seventeen months of each other: Jose Martí was killed in the battlefield at the age of 42, while Rizal was accused of instigating a rebellion and executed by musketry without an official trial at the age of 35. Since their martyrdom, they have become iconic figures of anti-imperial resistance, nationalism and social transformation within their respective countries and way beyond their territorial boundaries. Today both Martí and Rizal remain at the epicenter of Cuban and Filipino national hagiography.

There is between the two lives “a series of ghostly parallels.” First, despite the overlaps in their lifespan, there is no evidence that they ever actually met face-to-face. Second, their relationship can be understood as “ghostly” because, even after their untimely deaths at the end of the nineteenth century, Martí and Rizal’s political thoughts had considerable influence on the formation of Cuban and Filipino identities throughout the twentieth century. While Fidel Castro famously referred to Martí as “the intellectual author” of the Moncada attack in 1953, the legacy of Rizal in the Philippines up to the present time is simply non-pareil.

Through different literary forms, Martí and Rizal not only criticized the Spanish colonial project but also foreshadowed the threatening emergence of modern U.S. imperialism. Rizal predicted that the U.S. would attempt to dominate the Philippines when the current phase [from his viewpoint in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century] of the Age of European Imperialism came to an end.

### **A Caribbean-Asian Communication Network?**

But was there really a Caribbean-Asian communication network in the time of Martí and Rizal? Even though Martí and Rizal never met, their immediate followers and those who were influenced by their national and anti-imperial visions would

---

<sup>1</sup> We owe Dr. Koichi Hagimoto an excellent study, “Between the Empires: Martí, Rizal and the Limits of Global Resistance.” Also cf. Sarreal D. Soquiño’s “Rizal on Agrarian Issues.” And, *passim*, Charles Avila’s “The Gardener’s Tales” ([www.thegardenerstales.com](http://www.thegardenerstales.com)).

increasingly interact with one another through correspondence and journal articles. For example, the letter exchanges between the Filipino Mariano Ponce and the Cuban José Alberto Izquierdo show that they not only shared similar anti-colonial ideologies but also manifested reciprocal support for each other's struggle for independence.

The Filipino Ponce's "*Cartas sobre la revolución*" (1897-1900) broaches the possibility of global resistance in terms of the historical interplay between political actors from diverse colonial contexts.

Still another form of the trans-Pacific link emerges through the journals in which Cuban and Filipino writers expressed mutual support for their respective independence movements. An analysis of the newspapers "*La República Cubana*" (1896-1897) and the Filipinos' "*La Solidaridad*" (1889-1895) shows that these people from different corners of the globe were deeply aware of each other's fight against a common enemy, Empire - the Spanish empire.

Again, for instance, an article in *La República Cubana* maintains that Cuba will energetically support the Philippines with the battle cry "¡Viva Filipinas Libre!" while articles in the Filipinos' *La Solidaridad* claimed that the Caribbean island has every right to achieve freedom.

As a matter of fact, too, the Cuban periodical was studied by Filipinos in Hong Kong and the Philippines, while the Filipino newspaper was sent to the Cubans residing in the United States. The editorial offered a particular space of print community in which writers from the two regions came to interact with one another, creating the essential condition for a Caribbean-Asia communication.

Consider the genre of the manifesto and study Martí's "*Manifiesto de Montecristi*" (1895) and Rizal's "*Filipinas dentro de cien años*" (1889-1890). In order to produce national solidarity as a viable response to the Spanish imperial agenda, the two writers similarly turned to the manifesto form and articulated their discourse of nationalism and anti-imperialism.

\*\*\*\*\*

Spain "discovered" the Philippines in 1521 and took possession of Manila in 1571, naming the colony as "the Philippines" after King Philip II. Because of great distance, Spain governed the Philippines through the viceroyalty of colonial Mexico until the beginning of the nineteenth century.

In Cuba, Creole plantation owners represented the principal agent of economic exploitation while in the Philippines it was the Spanish friars. The Spanish colonial system was characterized by the so-called unity of church and state: the state offered the military protection and political organization while the church was responsible for promising people's "spiritual consolidation" and for ensuring their absolute submission to authorities.

Since the friars outnumbered government officials in many parts of the country, the clergy was a central figure in colonial Philippines. As Ambassador and scholar León

Ma. Guerrero correctly pointed out, "The Spanish history of the Philippines begins and ends with the friar" (xiii).

In nineteenth-century Philippines, clerical power controlled the colonial government more than ever before; the religious orders dominated over every aspect of societal life. According to Peter W. Stanley, "The power of the friars derived not only from a logical extension of Spanish colonial theory and from the reality of Catholicism as a cultural force in the archipelago...The friar orders were able to control the government of the archipelago by using their great wealth and their influence at court to win offices for those who would cooperate with them and remove those who would not."

Who, naturally and logically, would want to square off with the Friars? The Freemasons, that's who. During the first three quarters of the century, the Masonic lodges in Madrid served as the center for liberal conspiracies against clerical and colonial authorities (Schumacher, 1966 ). Less known is the fact that Freemasonry also played a significant role in the development of revolutionary thought not only in the Philippines but also in many Spanish-American republics.

Indeed it is quite true that the history of Freemasons is intricately related to the origins of both Filipino and Latin American nationalism during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Many of the revolutionary leaders were associated with Freemasons: to name a few, the list includes Simón Bolívar, José de San Martín, Vicente Guerrero, Benito Juárez, the Filipino Marcelo H. del Pilar, and of course José Martí and José Rizal. In one way or another, pro-independent intellectuals from Cuba and the Philippines found initial inspiration in Spanish Freemasonry, which allowed those discontented with the colonial power to organize clandestine activities and provoke anti-clerical movements. The secret yet egalitarian atmosphere of Masonic lodges provided a valuable space in which racial, religious, and even political discourse could be discussed without restraint (Minges).

Thus Cuban and Filipino nationalists began to interact with each other within the nineteenth-century Masonic circuit in such a way that Masonry in Spain and Filipino ilustrado activism would be closely linked, with ilustrados joining lodges with Cubans and Puerto Ricans. In April of 1886, for example, the Masonic lodge known as "Solidaridad" was established in Madrid not only by people from the Philippines but also from various other countries. Among the eight founders of the lodge, there were only two Filipinos; the rest were three Cubans, one Puerto Rican, and two Spaniards (Schumacher). Soon after its founding, more Cubans and Filipinos joined the lodge, creating a trans-national association of educated individuals concerned with the abuse of imperial power.

Influenced by the Masonic experience is a personal relationship between followers of Rizal and Martí, exemplified, as already mentioned, by the friendship between the Filipino Mariano Ponce and the Cuban José Alberto Izquierdo.

Ponce was a secretary of the Asociación Hispano-Filipina in Madrid as well as a member of the Masonic lodge "*Revolución*," which was also frequented by Cuban activists. Later he was representative of the *Comité Revolucionario Filipino* in Hong Kong and attempted to raise money and collect arms for Manila's revolutionary

regime from abroad. Izquierdo, on the other hand, was a lawyer and a liberal thinker who belonged to the Cuban community in Paris at the turn of the century. The two figures first met in the Ateneo club in Madrid which at that time represented one of the most prestigious social clubs for men of letters and sciences in the Spanish metropolis.

*"Cartas sobre la revolución,"* 1897-1900 (1932) shows that Ponce and Izquierdo corresponded a lot between 1897 and 1898.

While residing in Hong Kong, Ponce wrote to his Cuban friend in order to inform him about the ongoing insurrections in the Philippines and to inquire about the situation in Cuba. Izquierdo, on his part, supported Filipino independence by actively trying to communicate with Cuban leaders in the United States, hoping that they would send some material goods to the Philippines. The personal connection between Ponce and Izquierdo was made possible in great part due to the development of transoceanic communication, even if only at an incipient stage. The communication between the two individuals reveals how people from geographically remote countries shared the same concern about Spanish imperialism and the urgent need for national independence.

However, some have noted that throughout his copious correspondence with Izquierdo, Ponce never comments on the fact of slavery within the context of revolutionary struggles. His use of the term "esclavitud" does not seem to be a representation of slavery as a historical event but rather an all-embracing metaphor that embodies colonial violence...perhaps like Jose Rizal's own last line hours before he was murdered by the Spanish government: "Querida Filipinas, oye el postrer adios./Ahi te dejo todo, mis padres, mis amores,/ **Voy donde no hay esclavos, verdugos ni opresores**;/ Donde la fe no mata, donde el que reina es Dios."

Like many other leaders of the Philippine nationalist movement, Ponce was "ilustrado" or bourgeois, not totally integrated with the majority populace of peasants and farm workers.

Nonetheless, Ponce's view which saw the Philippines alongside Martí's Cuba seems to have been quite concrete and tangible. His letters tell us of efforts to get representatives of the revolutionary government in Manila to draw up the plan of sending Filipino soldiers to Havana in order to support the Cuban struggle for independence. On May 11th, 1897, Ponce informed Izquierdo that "en Manila están resultando gente para que se presenten voluntarios por fuerza para Cuba; parece que hay el pensamiento de mandar allá voluntarios filipinos para sustituir á la parte de las tropas que piensan extraer de aquel punto y remitir á Filipinas".

The possibility of sending volunteers to Cuba was a concrete idea in Ponce's mind. He mentioned this potential expedition across the Pacific again on September 8th of the same year. Martí's maxim has become "inolvidable" for Ponce's political project that considers the act of remembering an effective practice to amalgamate the colonized force.

The project, however, never became a reality due to insufficiency of communications between the Cuban revolutionary leaders (Havana and New York)

and the Filipino delegates (Manila and Hong Kong). By January of 1898, the idea of further aid from Manila became practically impossible with the Philippine-Spanish war at its height, which resulted in the inauguration of the first Philippine Republic, only to be followed immediately by a new war, more fierce than one could ever have imagined – the Philippine -American War, where millions died. Ponce lamented this stoppage of aid to Cuba in one of his letters to Izquierdo, stating that “Lo único que siento es que hemos dejado de prestar nuestra significante ayuda á Cuba”.

As earlier mentioned, neither Martí nor Rizal lived to witness the collapse of the Spanish empire. But their writings and the indomitable spirit pulsating in their literature and poems indubitably and in different ways became the main influence on individuals who would construct post-1898 republics.

Both Martí and Rizal spent important time in the U.S.A. before the untimely end of their lives, although the former ends up staying there for a much longer period than the latter- understandably, with Cuba being just a stone’s throw away from the USA. Martí and Rizal reflect upon the United States in both positive and negative terms. Positively, they admire the country’s principle of freedom and realization of modern urbanism. Negatively, they present critical perceptions of domestic racism and economic inequality.

And they denounce the creeping project of expansionism directed toward Latin America and Asia. Even though coming from seemingly disparate political and socio-economic circumstances, the two figures articulate parallel views on these positive and negative elements of U.S. society. Perhaps most importantly, their premonitions concerning the imminent threat of American expansionism would later manifest itself in the Spanish-American War of 1898, the event that neither Martí nor Rizal was able to witness during their lives – but which both had foreseen. That war soon became the Philippine-American War.

Going back to their followers Ponce and Izquierdo, it may seem to some that their struggle against the Spanish imperial program is really more about the interest of the bourgeois class in the respective colonies. It can be said that to contemplate an inter-colonial alliance came naturally to them as they were in great part “European” in education and breeding.

Martí’s construction of a Cuban “people” means leaving out the fainthearted, and the “false” individuals from the national sphere, and rejecting the model of Latin American “peoples.” On the other hand, Rizal’s conceptualization of a Filipino “race” could be interpreted as eliminating the singularities of what he calls “independent races” such as Negritos and Moros. Rizal’s underscoring the solidarity of a single, anti-imperial race has been understood by some as a sociological practice of homogenization which often tended to obscure the reality of the country’s multi-ethnic and multi-cultural characteristics. However there’s no denying Rizal’s rootedness in the common folk despite his thoroughly universal education, as will now be demonstrated when we consider the Land Question.

## **THE LAND QUESTION**

Like Marti's, Rizal's Struggle was rooted in agrarian disputes that resonate up to our present times. It is now well known that Marti had more than a few occasions to directly imbibe the philosophy of land ownership propounded by Henry George as the latter lived in New York in those years. Rizal did not have that chance. Nonetheless we can have more than a peep into the mind of Rizal on the Land Question.

In his second novel, "El Filibusterismo" he wrote of a character named "Cabesang Tales." "Tales" was nickname for "Telesforo." The story underlines an inevitable reality of the brewing agrarian conflict during the 19th century that, in fact, led to a major peasant revolt, which was an integral ingredient of the 1896 separatist revolution.

The story is of a man who brought his whole family to a thickly forested land, cleared the area and cultivated the fertile land which caused the death of his wife and elder daughter due to extreme hard work and disease. The land was planted with crops and eventually yielded bountiful harvests. The tragedy began when a Spanish religious order that "owned" vast agricultural lands in the neighboring town now also claimed ownership of the rich fields cleared by Tales and his family. The administrator of the Friar estate demanded an annual rental from Tales on grounds that Tales occupied, and earned from the friars' property. On his father's advice, the poor tiller gives in to the administrator's demand, unwilling to invite any trouble or conflict with the powerful Spanish friars. But he finally lost his patience when rental continued to increase every year, accompanied by threats of "dispossession" from the alleged owners should he refuse to comply. He finally refuses to pay the rent, and insists that, after all, it is he who really owns the land legally, which the Spanish friars were simply grabbing from him.

*"He saw himself, poor Tales, plowing in the noonday sun, tearing his feet on rocks and roots while this friar rode on his coach...The images of his wife and daughter rose before him, pale, gaunt, the death rattle of the fever in their throat...he would never consent to leaving this land: rather let the earth swallow his fields and all of them! Who was this foreigner that he should have any right to the land of Tales? Had he brought from his own country the merest handful of that land? Had he bent a single finger to pull out a single root in it? Exasperated by the threats of the friar, Cabesang Tales rebelled, refused to pay a single penny, and still seeing red declared that he would only yield his fields to the first man that watered them with his own blood. His father, old man, tried to calm him down, reminding his son that in lawsuits, even the winner ended up by losing his shirt. 'We shall all end up in the earth, father,' Tales replied, 'and we were born without a shirt.'*

So, he brings up the matter before the court of justice. But how could he win against Spaniards in a Spanish court? The story ends with Tales becoming an outlaw, a "bandit", a "robber" while the land grabber became the "honorable landowner." So, Tales disappeared. He joined the growing number of "subversives."

*"One day they would burn down a sugar mill and its fields in Batangas, on the next murder a municipal judge in Tiani, on another take a town in Cavite by surprise and seize the arms in the town hall. 'Matanglawin' [his nom de guerre] plundered the*

*provinces of the Central Valley from Tayabas to Pangasinan, and his sanguinary name echoed as far as Albay and as far north as Kagayan.*" (from Rizal's novel)

The acts of brigandage in Rizal's novel remind his audience of the native armed groups during this period between the 1820s and 1830s in the province of Cavite and other towns in Southern Tagalog at the height of peasant unrest in rice and sugar-producing provinces like Batangas, Laguna, Tondo, Bulacan, Pampanga, Tarlac and Bataan where vast friar haciendas were located.

This tale of Cablesang Tales, though fiction, was derived from real experiences of people whom Rizal knew quite well like his very own family and relatives who were unjustly dispossessed of their lands in a lawsuit with the Dominican Order during the height of agrarian conflict in Calamba.

Like Tales, who joined the "bandits", many natives now refused colonial subjugation, and preferred to spend their lives in the mountains, fearlessly challenging the colonial order even as government authorities and religious friars called them names like bandits, robbers, and outlaws.

Actually when Rizal went home to Calamba in August 1887 he realized that reality was imitating his novels. The government was checking on taxes by asking the Calamba tenants about rental paid to the Dominican hacienda, the lands "owned" by the Dominican friars. In January 1888 they replied with a petition drafted by Rizal and signed by the *principales* of the town challenging the legitimacy of the land titles supposedly held by the Dominicans. By February 1888, the Calamba tenants had refused to pay rent. A year later, after trying in vain to collect rentals due, the Dominicans brought the case to the Justice of the Peace in Calamba and lost, allegedly because the local JP was very close to Rizal's brother Paciano.

On appeal, however, to the Provincial Court of Santa Cruz, the Dominican friars won. The higher court then ordered the tenants to vacate the lands owned by the hacienda. When they refused, agents of the court, with 50 soldiers standing by to keep the peace, effected the order of eviction, which resulted in the burning of some houses and injury to some tenants.

After a while, however, the evicted tenants began to return to the land - they had to, out of necessity - prompting Governor-General Valeriano Weyler in 1891 to order the deportation, for example, of 25 individuals, to undeveloped islands far from home. The 25 included Paciano Rizal and his brothers-in-law who were exiled to Mindoro. Another brother-in-law was later exiled to Bohol. The Dominicans with their Pharisaical "vow of poverty" won their land-grabbing case in both the appellate court in Manila and at the Supreme Court in Madrid.

There in Spain, at the newspaper "La Solidaridad", which was patronized by followers of Filipino Jose Rizal and Cubano Jose Marti, Rizal published the findings of his investigations into the Calamba farmers' problems with the Dominican Friars:

1. The hacienda of the Dominican Order comprised not only the lands around Calamba, but also the town of Calamba.

2. The profits of the Dominican Order continually increased because of the arbitrary increase of the rentals imposed on and paid by the tenants.
3. The hacienda owner (the Friars) never contributed a single centavo - not for common town activities, not for the education of the children, nor, especially, for the improvement of agriculture.
4. Tenants, who had spent much labor in clearing the lands, were dispossessed of these lands for flimsy reasons.
5. High rates of interests were charged the tenants for delayed payment of rentals, and when the rentals could not be paid, the hacienda management confiscated the developed farms, including their carabaos (work animals), other tools, and even their residential houses, their homes.

Aside from the landownership question, namely, the land grabbing by the powerful religious corporations treated in his article on the Filipino farmers, Rizal saw natural calamities like floods and locust pests causing poor harvest, if not a total destruction of their crops, emphasizing that institutions and practices imposed by the colonial regime like Forced Labor and the Constabulary (civil guards) were greatly contributory to farmers' problems.

The policy of Forced Labor or *polo y servicio* that required native males, from 16 to 60 years old, to render labor services to any government projects like construction of bridges, roads, ship-building, etc., was an example of an abusive economic colonial institution that affected the Filipino farmers, taking away so much time from their own work. It was a form of "esclavitud."

Then, too, the abuses of civil guards against the farmers, Rizal exposed, exacerbated the already difficult situation. How? Farmers could no longer tend their fields once they were accused by civil guards of violating "regulations" because, as accused, they were forced to clean the barracks. More often than not, no one was available to take care of the farm because workers spent most of their time cleaning the barracks. In order to free himself from the abuses of those who are in power, the farmer resorted to bribery.

Then there was the big problem of robber-bandits: "For those who have their farms far from the towns, it is the robber - bandit that is a terrible enemy. There can be no favors gained, like in the others, by giving him gifts and bribes, which they do secretly, because he would then be plunged into abyss: whosoever deals with the bandit is accused of connivance and being an accomplice...would mean certain torture, and later, exile."

However, Rizal recommended a solution. Amidst rising acts of banditry coupled with the failure of the authorities to deal with the situation, the farmer must own a firearm to protect himself, his family and properties against lawless elements who unashamedly flourished from the vulnerabilities of the unarmed members of society. And he urged self-organization. To this end he founded the Liga Filipina in July 3, 1892 in Tondo, Manila. It was a society that was exclusive to Filipinos that aimed for national unity, reforms and defense against violence and injustice. One of its objectives was to encourage instruction, agriculture, and commerce. Clearly, he believed that a developed agricultural sector was a requirement to genuine social and economic progress.

Rizal's story on Cablesang Tales and his findings on the agrarian conflict in Calamba in 1887 brought to the fore the exploitative agrarian set-up created by the vast friar estates. The friar haciendas were the source of oppression, poverty, and peasant discontentment that led to armed revolts, which challenged the Spanish colonial structures. Rizal fully understood that the agrarian problems that surfaced during his time was a socio-economic problem because it affected not only the farmers or peasants including their families, but its impact also generated serious circumstances like economic dislocation, poverty, and revolt. Thus, Rizal knew very well that agrarian conflict could ignite a national revolution.

\*\*\*\*\*

The question now remains: had Rizal lived beyond 35 years of age, had he survived to witness the formation of subsequent Philippine Republics, what philosophy of land ownership would he have embraced? In the case of Jose Marti, it is good to note that a Georgist orientation was already explicit. In the case of Jose Rizal, his writings always go back to pre-colonial notions, to a common ownership of the commons, to a land-to-the-tiller philosophy, and, therefore, he could have been quite open to our current idea of Land Value Taxation for the raising of common funds and the maintenance of social equity. Would either Jose Marti or Jose Rizal have welcomed a totalitarian philosophy of owning wealth and property, including the means of production? The answer to any such would-have-should-have query is always a present tense ideological bias. Ask Companero Fidel.

In any case, it is interesting to note that the Land Question for Cuba and the Philippines dragged on effectively unanswered to the time of the dictator Batista and post-WWII Philippines, and , in particular as it applied to sugar lands, where the USA now had an upper hand in the creation of wealth and poverty in those lands through its arbitrary quota system in sourcing the fast rising volumes of sugar demanded by its millions of consumers. Accepting the inevitable, Castro said all would be fine and better because, "Sin quota, sin amo." But some of the landlords whose sugar lands were confiscated by Castro more than made up for it in new profits in their sugar lands in the Philippines as they were given more share from the Cuba losses and they became richer and more powerful in their oppression of the Filipino farmer - leading to another chapter in the struggle of farm workers and another challenge at international solidarity, this time between Avila of the Free Farmers in the Philippines and Cesar Chavez of the United Farm Workers in California and the USA. Now that the old USA and the new Cuba are on diplomatic terms at last, how long it take to deal with the issue of confiscated foreign-owned lands. And what philosophy of land ownership will guide their legalese?

### **Rizal's International Stature**

Back to Rizal: Rizal's life was all too brief in the space-time limits on the earth plane - so that going through the volumes written by him and about him one is struck by that quality so characteristic of him - indefatigability for the cause of his country. The debate between reform and revolution was, to him, a debate on means. More important to him was the goal, namely, the emergence of the Filipino nation with a

glorious past that he had taken pains to point out in his annotations of Morga's "Sucesos..." In this Jose Rizal and Jose Marti were very much alike.

The great Spanish philosopher Miguel de Unamuno remarked that Rizal's last words, 'consummatum est', Jesus' own, prefigured in ways that he knew but could not exactly foresee, that his death would be the end of Spain in the Philippines, for the shot that the crowd heard that moment in Manila ending the temporal life of Rizal was the shot that brought Spanish Rule in the Philippines to an end.

It marked as well the beginning of the end of all colonialism in Asia. Such was recognized by Mohandas K. Gandhi who regarded him as a forerunner and as a martyr in the cause of freedom. Nehru, in his prison letters to his daughter Indira, acknowledged his significant contributions in the Asian freedom movement.

Coinciding fortuitously with the age of Tagore and Sun Yat Sen, Rizal from an early age was enunciating in poems, tracts and plays, ideas all his own of modern nationhood as a practical possibility in Asia. In the body of written works for the period nothing compares to the outright statement in the 'Noli' that if European civilization had nothing better to offer, colonialism in Asia was doomed.

He stands among a few who belong to no particular epoch, who belong to the world, and whose life has a universal message. Although his field of action lay in politics, which he bore in the cause of duty--rendering him a rarity in human affairs, a leader without ambition and a revolutionary without hatred--his real interests lay in the arts and sciences, in literature and in his profession of medicine.

More than a hundred years after Rizal's martyrdom, Malaysia's Deputy Prime Minister, Anwar Ibrahim, often quoted this line from the dedication in the Noli: "In the history of human suffering is a cancer so malignant that the least touch awakens such agonizing pains." The dedication of the first Southeast Asian novel (according to Ibrahim) "stirred a critical awareness of the fundamental problems of colonial society. Its setting was the Spanish-ruled Philippines, but the book could have been about any nation in Asia."

When the Philippine Organic Act was being debated in the U.S. Congress, hypocritical doubts about the capacity of Filipinos for self-government were swept away by a passionate speech of Congressman Henry Cooper of Wisconsin in which he recited an English translation of Rizal's valedictory poem "Mi Ultimo Adios," capped by a stirring peroration that underscored how a race that could produce a member of such talent and spirit had to be one most ready, indeed, for self-determination and self-governance. FINIS