CRIP COLONY

Mestizaje, US Imperialism, and the Queer Politics of Disability in the Philippines

Sony Coráñez Bolton

CRIP COLONY

CRIP COLONY

Mestizaje, US Imperialism, and the Queer Politics of Disability in the Philippines

Sony Coráñez Bolton

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS
Durham and London
2023

Printed in the United States of America on acid-free paper ∞
Designed by A. Mattson Gallagher
Typeset in Portrait Text by Westchester Publishing Services

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Names: Coráñez Bolton, Sony, [date] author.
Title: Crip colony : mestizaje, US imperialism, and the queer politics of disability in the Philippines / Sony Coráñez Bolton.
Description: Durham : Duke University Press, 2023. | Includes bibliographical references and index.
Identifiers: LCCN 2022039532 (print)
LCCN 2022039533 (ebook)
ISBN 9781478019565 (paperback)
ISBN 9781478016922 (hardcover)
ISBN 9781478024187 (ebook)
Subjects: LCSH: Racially mixed people—Philippines. | Sociology of disability—Political aspects. | People with disabilities in mass media. | Queer theory. | Imperialism. | Philippines—Colonization. | BISAC: SOCIAL SCIENCE / Ethnic Studies / Asian Studies | HISTORY / Asia / Southeast Asia
Classification: LCC DS665 . C67 2023 (print) | LCC DS665 (ebook) | DDC 305.8009599—dc23/eng/20221004
LC record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2022039532
LC ebook record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2022039533

Cover art: Julie Lluch, *Spoliarium* (detail), 2020. Cold cast marble. Courtesy of Julie Lluch and Galerie Stephanie.

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS GRATEFULLY ACKNOWLEDGES THE OFFICE OF THE PROVOST AND DEAN OF THE FACULTY AT AMHERST COLLEGE, WHICH PROVIDED FUNDS TOWARD THE PUBLICATION OF THIS BOOK.

For Dave

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A book is a community. So it gives me great pleasure to highlight the communities that have buoyed me, cared for me, and challenged me as I wrote this.

This book benefited immensely from the powerful, committed, and thorough engagement of Jodi Byrd, Iyko Day, Julie Avril Minich, and Joseph Pierce; thank you for your kindness and constructive feedback on earlier versions of this manuscript. I am also grateful to the two anonymous reviewers whose feedback was incredibly generative and generous.

During my time as an undergraduate and masters student I benefited from the very kind mentorship of so many faculty members at Marquette University in Milwaukee, Wisconsin; they truly embodied the *cura personalis* that is the cornerstone of any Jesuit education. Because I was at an institution that did not have institutionalized ethnic studies at the time, I sought it out in the study of US Latin American and Latinx literature. To my mentors in what was then the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures, I especially want to thank Eugenia Afinoguénova, Belén Castañeda, Dinorah Cortés-Vélez, Sarah Gendron, Armando González-Pérez, Todd Hernández, Jeannette Kramer, Jason Meyler, Anne Pasero, and Julia Paulk. I also wish to thank Bryan Massingale, Jodi Melamed, and Theresa Tobin, for crucial mentorship at a sensitive time of self-discovery. It was actually you, Jodi, whom I can blame for inspiring my move to American and ethnic studies. While I have never abandoned literatures in Spanish, I

had no idea of the depth and splendor of Filipinx American studies, which you encouraged me to explore. If not for you, I wouldn't have had the opportunity to meet some amazing people as I pursued my doctoral work in Ann Arbor, Michigan.

At the University of Michigan, I was an enthusiastic graduate student who tended to overcomplicate things. I remember fondly the kindness and patience that so many faculty members showed me as I developed intellectually. I am especially grateful to Evelyn Alsultany, Ruth Behar, Amy Sara Carroll, María Cotera, Deirdre de la Cruz, Vince Diaz, Julie Ellison, Colin Gunckel, Sandra Gunning, Jesse Hoffnung-Garskof, Brandi Hughes, Mary Kelley, Larry LaFountain-Stokes, Emily Lawsin, Victor Román Mendoza, Susan Najita, Lisa Nakamura, Sarita See, and Magdalena Zaborowska. All of you were exceedingly generous with your time and energy. There are a few whose interactions have really stayed with me through the years whom I would like to highlight.

Jesse, you were my first point of contact with Michigan; I was so delighted to receive your call offering me admission into the department. I am also so grateful that I had the opportunity to teach with you in "History of Latina/os in the United States," a class that was really an important touchstone for me. Susan, your incredible patience and goodwill are unmatched. It was such a luxury to spend time in your office speaking about literature and postcolonial theory at length. This kindness is one I try to emulate as a professor every day. Julie, you deeply read my prospectus with extraordinary attention to detail and gave me some of my first bits of advice as one writer to another, for which I am grateful. Colin, you supported my weird notion that I could be a Latinx studies graduate student; you and Amy supported my application into the graduate certificate program with a lot of passion and generosity. Amy, you were instrumental in getting my first journal article published; it is inconceivable to me now the amount of time and endurance you displayed reading my winding prose line by line. The ways that you phrased things, always with an eye to aesthetics and literary value (even in academic writing), continues to be inspirational to me even if I can't always execute it like you do. Ruth, you taught me what it is to be a vulnerable and exposed writer; any moments of daring in this manuscript I can trace back to your class "Ethnographic Writing and Film." Brandi, you taught me to go for what I want and to not be ashamed. I approached the job market with a lot more courage because of advice you gave me at a café in Ypsilanti. María, you continue to be an inspirational leader in Chicana feminist thought for me. I also have used you as a guiding star on how to approach comparative

work, refusing to be pigeonholed into either one field or another. We can have it all, as you so often reminded me. Victor, even though Michigan wasn't always an easy place to work and learn, I was astonished by the level of care, attention, and effort you put into reading my work. I never quite appreciated the pressure you were under, and now, as a professor myself, I can see how extraordinary and uncommon your mentorship was. Deirdre, you are basically a model for how rigorous multilingual scholarship should be. I was and am so privileged to learn from you. Sarita, what can I say? You have been a stalwart, durable, and crucial support system for me as I have navigated academia. Your candor and generosity have been moving. At virtually every step of this process, from first year graduate student to job negotiations, you have been there without fail. I have also benefited from the tremendous mentorship and intellectual camaraderie of Jody Blanco, who pioneered an important path in the study of the Hispanic Philippines and made it easier for the rest of us. On that note, I'm grateful for the intellectual community of Ernest Rafael Hartwell, Matthew Nicdao, and Paula Park. We got this! I'm also grateful to Rocío Ortuño Casanova and Emmanuelle Sinardet for continued collaboration and for being thought partners.

There are a few people in my graduate school cohort that have left an immense impression on me. I am thankful every day for the friendship and ability to have learned from Yamil Avivi, David Green, Liz Harmon, Frank Kelderman, Jennifer Peacock, Mejdulene Shomali, and Wendy Sung. Mej, we've been through everything academic together. You taught me what it was to be a good teacher, friend, cook, and intellectual. All around you are my model for what it means to be confident in one's powers as a scholar and decent human being. Wendy, you are amazing; you are stylish, smart, and hilarious, and you go after what you want. I am also so grateful for the continued friendship and brilliance of Cass Adair, Tiffany Ball, Ava Kim, and Michael Pascual. You all are amazing, funny, and a reminder that friendship is the single greatest treasure of this life. To Jina Kim: I'm over the moon that we can be intellectual neighbors academically and geographically. Here's to our little but thriving community in the valley.

I was fortunate to have benefited from the Creating Connections Consortium postdoctoral fellowship program, generously supported by the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation. This program put the liberal arts college research and teaching environment on my radar (I had very little notion what liberal arts colleges were and what it would be like to work at one of them until this program). I was in what was then the Department of Spanish and Portuguese (now Luso-Hispanic Studies) at Middlebury College. This special department

was affirmative and supportive in its mentorship of a young scholar that set out to study the Hispanic Philippines. This postdoctoral program changed my career and life; it gave me a foot in the door and helped me to establish the bona fides I needed to teach in a romance languages or Spanish department. I am especially grateful to Brandon Baird, Miguel Fernández, Enrique García, Nicolas Poppe, Fernando Rocha, Marcos Rohena-Madrazo, Patricia Saldarriaga, and Daniel Silva; my time in your department is unforgettable. I am also extremely grateful to Susan Burch for her amazing mentorship and guidance in the field of disability studies. Susan, you continue to be a champion for the field and your work has been pathbreaking for me.

I was fortunate to spend the beginning of my career in Tucson among amazingly generous and affirmative colleagues. The Department of Spanish and Portuguese at the University of Arizona took a rather courageous step in filling a position for a scholar in Latin American cultural studies with a Philippines specialist, and I admire that willingness to break with convention and geopolitical rubrics. I am so grateful to Bram Acosta, Katia Bezerra, Ana Maria Carvalho, Julieta Fernández, Lillian Gorman, Anita Huizar Hernández, Mary Kaitlin Murphy, and others in the department. I am also appreciative of the advice and goodwill that Malcolm Compitello shared with me when my path took me away from Tucson. I must give a special nod to Aditya Adiredja; you were my best friend and colleague during that blistering year in Tucson; yours is a friendship I continue to value and hold dear. You never knew this, but that year was a very low and depressing time for me. You were a light and a buoy.

The collegiality, support, and kindness shown to me by my colleagues at Amherst College is truly unmatched. I am so grateful to be in a community with passionate scholar-teachers. To my colleagues in the Spanish Department, it continues to be surreal that I can be an Asian Americanist professor of Spanish. This is not where I expected to be, but it is where I belong, and I feel that belonging more and more each day. An academic would be hard-pressed to find more dedicated and kinder colleagues than Sara Brenneis, Fiona Dixon, Carmen Granda, Catherine Infante, Jeannette Sánchez-Naranjo, Sarah Piazza, Paul Schroeder-Rodríguez, and Ilan Stavans. I am also indebted to the truly exciting work of colleagues in Latin American and Latinx and studies—thanks for letting me join the club. Again, being a Filipinx Americanist in a Latinx studies program is a learning experience, and I'm grateful to have found open-minded colleagues willing to learn with me; thank you, Solsi del Moral, Mary Hicks, Rick López, and Leah Schmalzbauer. And to the Michigan Mafia, it is wild that so many graduates of the

same program in American Culture at the University of Michigan have landed at Amherst; it's always great to be in community with you, Lloyd Barba, Jallicia Jolly, and Kiara Vigil. I also want to convey my gratitude for the support and friendship of Abner Aldarondo. This book benefited from his attentive work as a research assistant.

At Amherst College, I am so grateful for the kind words and mentorship of the provost, Catherine Epstein, and the president, Biddy Martin. I am also especially grateful for the critical mass of Asian Americanists at Amherst; thank you Pawan Dhingra, Robert Hayashi, Franklin Odo, and Christine Peralta for your friendship and collaboration. I have also benefited greatly from the thought partnership of Sarah Bunnell, Riley Caldwell-O'Keefe, and Sheila Jaswal; I have grown immensely through our sustained and sustaining dialogue. I think that none of my flourishing at Amherst would be possible without the professionalism and skill of good academic department coordinators. Thank you, Eva Díaz and Lauren Gladu, for answering my questions and for your logistical support.

Without support networks, camaraderie, friendship, and no small amount of laughter would it be possible to thrive in the breakneck pace of academic work. It has been a lifeline and godsend to have built a diasporic community of queer Asian American professors to survive the tenure track with: Matthew Chin, Yuri Doolan, Kareem Khubchandani, Tom Sarmiento, Ian Shin, and James Zarsadiaz. To the Boy Luck Club, as we affectionately call ourselves, you have really made life in academia worth it. The mantra "work hard, but play harder" has been our call to not take ourselves too seriously and to approach all that we do as a gesture of friendship, love, and support. Ian, I think that you are for me a model of what an Asian American studies professor ought to be. If I continually ask certain questions—What would Ian do? What would Ian say?—I know that the answers will usually set me on the right path. James, I am so happy that we have become friends. You remind me that being a professor need not be a life of monastic deprivation. Thank you for making sure we are well fed and for allowing me the benefit of your exacting palate. Kareem, "you're a winner, baby!" No, but, you really are! I'm convinced that any Asian American studies text should come with the keywords *verve*, *style*, *taste*, and *avant-garde* and that your picture ought to be right there. Tom, I feel like we've be through so much together: graduate school, learning Tagalog together, almost always reviewing the same articles, and almost always contributing to the same anthologies; I don't think that I could find a better doppelgänger! Yuri, thank you for being a rock star and a reminder of why transnational scholarship is a

priority. And Matthew, it has been such a pleasure that we have been able to have our paths cross so often, from being at Michigan together, on the job market together, and now in intentional community again. The Boy Luck Club summons a motif of luck that generally seems to be at play in my path toward this book. I am immensely lucky to count Elliott Powell as a constant source of levity, advice, and a sounding board for when I feel like the wheels are coming off. Thank you.

This book was made possible by generous institutional support. I am grateful to the research staff librarians at the Bentley Historical Library at the University of Michigan for their assistance with the archival research that made chapter 4 possible. I am also exceedingly thankful for the support of the staff of Amherst College's Frost Library, particularly that of Blake Doherty. A version of chapter 3 was first published as "Cripping the Philippine Enlightenment: Ilustrado Travel Literature, Postcolonial Disability, and the 'Normate Imperial Eye/I.'" *Verge: Studies in Global Asias* 2, no. 2 (2016): 138–62. I thank the University of Minnesota Press for permission to republish it here.

This book is a love letter to my immediate family. The more I'm alive, the more, it seems, our love for one another has grown. It's a love that seems effortless, that seems natural, that seems to be the foundational architecture of the world. To my siblings, Jeffrey Bolton, Brandilyn Hadjuk, Ashley Mejías, and Danica Malo: it is unreal, the supremely amazing people that you have transformed into. To my father, James, words cannot travel to where I need them to go to express the simple idea that you are my hero. You are a template for wit and grit. I find that as I get older that I am surprised that I am not a wholly terrible person and that I even have positive qualities like humor, cleverness, and deep reserves of energy, dedication, and resiliency. I look at you, Dad, and I see why. You might be the best human being I have ever met or that any person will ever meet. To my mother, Charlita, I know that it has not always been easy living in a place where you perhaps never truly felt that you belonged. But you carved out an impassable and incorruptible space of love and belonging for me even while it took me so long to feel like myself or to be completely truthful. I thank you and I love you, *mahal kita*.

Dave, it's hard to find the words to go there. I've known you through so many different versions of myself, both nurturing and self-destructive. Seasons change and we do too. I look at your face, and it's nice to know that spring always comes.

Crip Colonial Critique

READING MESTIZAJE FROM THE BORDERLANDS TO THE PHILIPPINES

Then there were my fights at Chinese school. And the nuns who kept stopping us in the park, which was across the street from Chinese school, to tell us that if we didn't get baptized we'd go straight to hell like one of the nine Taoist hells forever. And the obscene caller that phoned us at home when the adults were at the laundry. And the Mexican and Filipino girls at school who went to "confession," and how I envied them their white dresses and their chance each Saturday to tell even thoughts that were sinful.

—MAXINE HONG KINGSTON, *The Woman Warrior*

Confession

When I was a child, no more than nine years old, I was a new transplant to the midwestern United States. My formative years until college were spent living in a racially diverse working-class rural exurb about an hour due north of Chicago.[1] My white father was initially stationed at a naval base in Alameda, California, before work forced him to relocate somewhere near the city of North Chicago—the then and still current site of the Great Lakes Naval Base on Lake Michigan. I suspect that he deeply wanted a change after serving multiple tours of duty during the Persian Gulf War, tired of fighting over oil. Sometimes I mourn the loss of a life I could have spent as a denizen of the East Bay area of San Francisco, mostly because this move signaled a rather prolonged detachment from a connected Asian American

or Filipino American identity normalized on the West Coast.[2] I was a mixed-race kid, growing up in the rural cornfields of northern Illinois, resentful of the itinerancy of my youth and yet craving global connections that would explain the brownness of the mestizo skin I saw reflected back in the mirror.

One of the clearest and first midwestern childhood memories I have is being recruited by my mother to move a piano across the living room shortly after our move to Illinois. This was a recent acquisition, as my parents thought it would be an enriching activity for my sisters to learn to play. My brother and I were forbidden from playing. I suppose because it was too artistic, was considered a feminine activity, or was "too queer." (It was awkward to have to disappoint my mother by coming out approximately ten years later.) With two of my sisters and me in tow to help push the impossibly heavy instrument, my mother coordinated our efforts by counting down in three languages: "Uno, dos, tres, *push*! Uno, dos, tres, *push*! Ulit."[3] Not being raised speaking Tagalog or Visayan at all, it was jarring for me to hear my mother utter what even I knew to be Spanish words. When we finally finished, physically spent, I reflected on the words my mother used to align her and her Asian American children's efforts. As I look back on this moment decades later, it is still curious to me that numbers in Spanish came to her more naturally. As an adult haggling at a *tiangge* (bazaar or market) in Quezon City, I relived that childhood curiosity when I discovered that Spanish numbers are almost always used in these negotiations. Might there be an unconscious association at play between Spanish and labor? Was it simply because reciting Spanish numbers was simpler than the multiple syllables of "Isa, dalawa, tatlo"?

The curiosity that this banal moment sparked has led me to become a professor of Spanish, which is somewhat surprising to me given that I consider my main field of inquiry to be Asian American studies. In some ways my intellectual trajectory is set into relief by Maxine Hong Kingston's observations in *The Woman Warrior* on the ways that the perpetual foreignness ascribed to Chineseness provokes the manifold indignities that she and her family had to endure. Notably, Kingston's memoir illustrates a truism in much multiethnic American literature, which, as literary critic David Palumbo-Liu has argued, presents narratives that are protagonized by racialized characters that harbor a defective, eccentric ethnicity that is rehabilitated by the hard work of American liberalism and assimilation. Authors like Palumbo-Liu and Allan Punzalan Isaac have demonstrated how the trope of the eccentric ethnic immigrant presents them as generally unhealthy, damaged, and ill-fitting aliens whose physical and intellectual labors do not

contribute advantage to the United States.[4] Therefore, we could reasonably position the work of the genre of assimilation as itself the representational instantiation of a rehabilitative logic that ramifies and reengineers alien laborers to be compliant with the mandates of ableist racial capitalism.

These are indignities that Kingston famously litanizes for us in a stream-of-consciousness style in *The Woman Warrior* epigraph that opens this introduction. Even so, couched within these painful recollections is the intimacy drawn between Mexican and Filipina girls, whose Catholic devotion, however glib, ties them together in the practice of confession. This cross-racial intimacy stands out to me for the ways that, as Michel Foucault has argued, the transhistorical "scope of the confession" whose iterations across dogmatic cultures increased its rhythms in an effort to prompt and "impose meticulous rules of self-examination," though "above all . . . it attributed more and more importance in penance."[5] It's ironic that what troubles me in Kingston's words is the ways in which the colonial power of the ritual of confession—which presumes to know and hollow out the native claiming to divine their mind better than they—would indeed prompt autodisciplinary self-examination. This moment of confession, in one of the most famous books in Asian American literature, sticks out in my mind delineating a difference that Filipino American subjectivity brings to Asianness by way of their likeness and propinquity to Mexicans—an intimacy to which the Chinese American Kingston is only ever an observer but which hails *me* as a Filipinx American. *The Woman Warrior* foundationally introduces the ways in which the violence of American assimilation unfurls between China and a borderlands space in the US West. The echoes of Spanish colonial subjectification through Catholicism serve as a partial though unmistakable backdrop. These echoes ripple through the multivalent threads of the tapestry of Asian racialization within a US multiethnic imaginary.

Given this analytical vantage, the ironies of being a Filipinx professor of Latinx studies and Spanish in the United States do not escape me. I feel as if I restage daily the girlish literary confessions described by Kingston, seduced by the discursive power to name that which must remain unnameable. I teach in a liberal arts context in which close colloquy with students is quite routine. After I'd had an unusually successful semester teaching a Spanish language course on bilingual Latinx experience, a bright Cuban American student from Miami dubbed me an "honorary Latino"—definitely in jest, but also in recognition of the intellectual camaraderie that we had cultivated throughout the semester. I did include material about the Hispanic history and heritage of the Philippines as a way to bring my own identity and

perspective into the conversations in order to demonstrate that I was not coming at the topic of the course as a total outsider. Yet any claims of mine to an "insider" bilingual Spanish identity are, *a fin de cuentas*, circumspect, even though I and some of my students heard our mothers chanting in a language that was introduced by the same historical and colonial processes.

When I was hailed an "honorary Latino," my anxiety peaked. "I want you to know that that's not my objective!" I explained; I did not want to assume a sameness between Filipinx and Latinx Americans that overwrote important distinctions in our experiences, relationships to the state, and migratory histories. I wanted to convey that racial drag was not the outcome that I desired and yet I *did* feel an affinity with my students and was indeed honored that they would entrust their experiences and vulnerability to me as was organic to the topic of a class on bilingual identity and autobiography—to be seen as a part of the same batch of peoples descended from colonial processes that were global in scope. I want my reader to understand that this affinity goes beyond a simple common experience of all of us being "people of color" in the United States. I told my students that I felt like we were *primxs*, cousins—*mga pinsan*. Much like Latinx peoples, Filipinx Americans live, work, and study at the intersection of contradictory origins of the same two imperial powers—a Venn diagram of which might feel more like a complete circle at times. While I don't want to assume Filipinx experience is exceptional in terms of the ambivalent racial meanings negotiated as a result of colonialism, I am also often confronted with how unassimilable Asianness is into what normatively constitutes "Hispanic" or mestizo identity. The Philippines simultaneously challenges and corroborates Asian exclusions from *mestizaje* (racial admixture, miscegenation) as an American racial landscape.

Every time I step in front of a class that I will be teaching in Spanish, I convey to my students that while I am not nor ever will truly identify as Latinx, Latin American, or even as the much broader Hispano or Hispanic, I do not come to stand before them simply because of an impersonal avid interest in the language, its literature, and culture. In any event, what are the stakes in claiming, cultivating, and protecting a hybrid bilingual identity elaborated at the intersection of the colonial languages of English and Spanish whose introduction to the Americas was fundamentally rooted in Indigenous displacement, slavery, and racial capitalism? Even so, I really do view the better part of the past two decades meticulously studying the Spanish language as an extension and exploration of my own *Asian American* heritage and history; I don't actually feel a keen attachment to a journey to claim

Hispanic identity even if, ironically, the mechanism of that exploration has been learning Spanish. While identity markers like *Asian American* and *Latinx* index very real and different political experiences, they can't always account for how some experiences and identities vex the stable identitarian delineations to which they sometimes aspire. A Filipinx American person and scholar who serves as a professor of Latinx studies and Spanish, who even *teaches* Latinx heritage students the Spanish language, is not there by accident. There are deep, colonial histories that have set the conditions of possibility such that this pedagogical encounter between Asian America and Latinx America is indeed somehow inevitable, even *necessary*. It is encounters like this one—and, more pointedly, the deep geographies that subtend them—that animate the study of race, colonialism, disability, and mestizaje in this book.

I neither propose recuperation of Hispanic identity for Filipinas, Filipinos, or Filipinxs, nor really advocate for the mere inclusion of the Philippines in "Spanish studies" or Hispanic studies such as they are. While I am struck, for instance, by sociologist Anthony Christian Ocampo's claim that Filipinos are the "Latinos of Asia," I cannot claim a shared objective of unearthing the ways that Filipinos sociologically confess to or come to claim *latinidad*.[6] The ways that queer studies is positioned as a critique of normativity rather than the archival excavation of factual LGBTQ people is rather analogous to the ways in which I think about Filipinx *hispanidad*. That is, rather than an empirical possession of or propertied relation to the Hispanic, what are the regulatory and disciplinary rubrics through which we come to know of ourselves in racial, ethnonational terms in the first place? How do we resolve the conflicting meanings forged in the crucible of contradictory colonial origins? Or, do we defiantly reject resolution wholesale? And, more pointedly to the frameworks that are animate in this book, for which bodyminds does Spanish colonial humanism and US liberalism serve as a refuge and space of enminded political power? Spanish—the language, the history, the people, and the culture—has perennially signified a bastion of intellectual power and racial aesthetic beauty through mixture, the intersection of which is readily encapsulated by the disability concept of the bodymind.[7]

Fetishizing a recovery of the Hispanic as an empirical fact about myself or people like me is rather beside the point, particularly given the multilingual archives that I prioritize in this book. Spanish *is* a Filipino language. The Philippines was a part of the Spanish Empire. These facts aren't really debatable from my vantage. Moreover, Filipinx Americans and Latinx Americans have lived together, worked together, and shared community

with one another for more than a century—even longer if we consider the exchanges of the Manila Galleon Route. There are deep, overlapping histories that have brought these communities—across continents and oceans—into contact. I thus view Spanish colonialism, and its collusions with US empire, the Spanish language, and the abstract Hispanic mestizo identity it inspired, as part of a field of meaning making that secured ability, capacity, and privileges for some while relegating others to the underside of political modernity. The Spanish language nourished an intellectual discourse that attained robust cognitive capacity in the face of colonial debilitation by eviscerating native self-determination and autonomy.

The archive through which the contradictory origins of these multifarious political landscapes intersect continues to be the discourse and archive of mestizaje, which binds such diverse geographies together while simultaneously being the source of the radical differentiation among them. I confront the historical and cultural representations of mestizaje and its constitutive imbrications with disability as a colonial logic that proposed the rehabilitation of the native Filipino into a fully fledged democratic subject with the colonizer existing in a propertied relationship to ability itself. In what follows, I elaborate how the rehabilitation of allegedly diminutive native capacity was seen to be an effect of colonialism whose rationalizing and anchoring cultural logic was secured through mestizaje.

On the Queer Colonial and Racial Life of Disability

Crip Colony: Mestizaje, US Imperialism, and the Queer Politics of Disability in the Philippines is an interdisciplinary study engaging an ample archive in literature, visual culture, and historical analysis of Anglophone and Hispanophone texts, which proposes the analysis of disability and colonialism as a unified ideological structure. Temporally, I privilege the transition of the Philippines from a Spanish colony in the late nineteenth century to US imperial territory during the early twentieth century. I suggest that the ideology of colonial disability "hails" subjects to be rehabilitated through a colonial reform ethos while endowing others that are at the interstices of the modern civilized subject and "savage" Indian with the ability to rehabilitate. I mark and archivally locate such interstitial spaces within racial fusions that foment, as part of mestizaje's project, intermediary subjects at the crux of ostensibly monolithic racial identifications. For this reason, the transitionary period from late Spanish colonialism to early US imperialism is striking, as we can view a snapshot into how racial meanings shifted from

one epoch to the next through an already ambivalent and multivalent discourse like mestizaje.

At base, I argue that Filipino mestizaje simultaneously becomes a marker of difference from the colonized *indio* and a vehicle evoking and evidencing their reform—the mestizo body then is the evidence, product, and agent of colonial rehabilitation. I thus claim that mestizaje is itself a *racial ideology of ability* marking a preference for able-bodied and able-mindedness aligned with the colonial project. More specifically, I contend that mestizaje is a liberal form of colonial ableism that adapts a preference for able-bodiedness through the projection and representation of a queerly deviant Indian in dire need of reform and rehabilitation.[8] Characterizing mestizaje as a racial ideology of ability similarly picks up on Chicana literary studies scholar Julie Avril Minich's contention that mestizaje functions like a "national prosthesis." That is, it serves as a unifying discourse that "bolsters the formation of national identity [through] a body politic predicated on able-bodiedness."[9] Blending disability analysis with Chicanx studies, Minich adapts David Mitchell and Sharon Snyder's critique of narrative structure in literature, in which a protagonist's autonomy is secured through the secondary disabled characters who serve as metaphorical scaffolds.[10] For my purposes, I will similarly argue that the mestizo architects of the political community of the nation are assumed to possess and are afforded the capacities of able-bodiedness and able-mindedness, thus authorizing their arguments for national cohesion. The so-called Indian is the crip presence that augments or prostheticizes the rational powers of the mestizo.[11]

Broadly speaking, Filipino mestizaje is a racial, political, and aesthetic discourse that blends Spanish humanist and US progressivist thought in order to identify adequate beneficiaries of colonial rehabilitation and capacitation.[12] The Filipino "mestizo mind" also becomes the actualizer of colonial rehabilitative mandates for an Indian from which it has evolved.[13] I suggest that Philippine mestizaje colludes with US benevolent reform by interiorizing settler colonial logics surrounding and producing the Indian. Through an attention to the Philippines, I seek to confirm what Chickasaw theorist Jodi Byrd suggests: that the "Indian" need not be limited to understandings of settler colonial violence only in North America. Byrd argues that "Indianness has served as the field through which structures have always already been produced . . . [it] moves not through absence but through reiteration, through meme."[14] US imperialism in the Philippines reiterates settler colonialism and, where the Filipino *indio* is concerned, Indianness is also a "transit . . . site through which US empire orients and replicates itself by

transforming those to be colonized into 'Indians' through continual reiterations of pioneer logics, whether in the Pacific, the Caribbean, or the Middle East."[15] Mestizaje is a troubling racial discourse through which its subjects aspire to the vaunted capacities of the colonizers while navigating being weighed down by an Indigenous past. Rather than slough this past off, they rehabilitate and re-semanticize it. In order to understand these dynamics, this book positions and aligns with Jina Kim's calls for a "crip of color critique" in order to actualize a trenchant reckoning with genealogies of Spanish humanism, US liberal progressivism in the form of "benevolent assimilation" (which I analyze in more detail in chapter 1), and their various entanglements within mestizaje.[16] I break, however, with the orientation of crip theory, which is often geographically limited to the United States. I hold in tandem the various intersections of disability and colonialism that conspire in the racialized management of the native. In doing so, this project develops a framework I denote as *crip colonial critique*.

Crip colonial critique is a queercrip heuristic through which we grasp the racial-sexual and racialized gendered relations of disability within the developmentalist telos of colonialism more broadly.[17] Crip colonial critique unearths and scrutinizes the ways in which disability discourses fundamentally inhere within, animate, and propagate colonialism generally. Relations and ideologies of ability are always imbedded in colonial relations of power. This analytical frame imagines a union of colonial critique and crip theory that draws on concepts of race germane to Latin American coloniality. The term *coloniality* was originally coined by Peruvian sociologist Aníbal Quijano in his canonical essay "Colonialidad del poder, eurocentrismo y América latina" (Coloniality of power, Eurocentrism and Latin America), which foundationally argued that the notion of race emerged at and developed from the founding moment of modernity: the conquest of the Americas. Race's purpose was to give a framework to hierarchize bodies racially; to categorize and justify the valuation of their labors; and to facilitate the hyperextraction of surplus value from said racialized labor in order to introduce and sustain the order of colonial capitalism as the prominent global economic system.[18] Building on this foundational concept in Latin American studies, I read the ways that disability inherently structures the mechanisms through which the political rights of sovereignty and autonomy were annulled in order to effect the colonial hierarchization of race in the first place. Relevant to *Crip Colony*'s racial framing, a powerful aspect of Quijano's original formulation is the ways that race underwent shifts with the introduction of a new labor class of racially mixed mestizos who had

access to the wider freedoms and political advantages associated with wage labor rather than the abject dispossession that Indigenous and Black slaves experienced under the colonial system. This new fabrication of humanity would, as a group, later wield great political power in the nation-states that would form in the "postcolonial" era significantly, for the purposes of this study, as creole mestizo intellectuals.[19] This demonstrates the ways that sexuality, race, and labor blended as much as humanity did in the advent of modernity with conquest.

I contend that crip colonial critique is a queercrip frame because of the ways that mestizaje often emphasizes a heteronormative mestizo subject as the center of revolutionary history and as the intellectual architect of robust political futures for the nation-state that suffered the violence of colonial rule—futures that are often expressly imagined through a heteroproductive lens and which thus rely on the labor of reproduction. All of the case studies in this book focus on the queerness of disability that colonialism attempts to rehabilitate and normalize through either heteronormative marriage, liberal education, or racial capitalist political economy. Thus, my work with mestizaje seeks to confirm, in another global context, what Robert McRuer foundationally theorizes as the "construction of able-bodiedness and heterosexuality, as well as the connections between them" in which the production of "disability [is] thoroughly interwoven with a system of compulsory heterosexuality that produces queerness."[20] The developmentalist telos of the nation as sovereign, autonomous, and invariably "good" enmeshed the cultural discourse of race with the biological drive to ensure heteroproductive "better breeding" along idealized racial lines.[21] Mestizaje, as a liberal and colonial form of ableism, fabricates ideal norms for national embodiment through the projection and representation of a queerly deviant Indian in dire need of reform essentially replicating the hierarchies endemic to the coloniality of power as not only a question of race but also of sexuality.[22] Queer critique of this racial discourse becomes instructive because it connotes an explicit form of racial-sexual power, to again invoke the apt formulation coined by queer-of-color critic Victor Román Mendoza, in which mestizos are created through the reproductive mixing, often coerced and violent, of white Europeans and the Indigenous peoples autochthonous to the Americas.[23]

For the various iterations of rehabilitated Indigeneity evinced in Filipino mestizaje, the *indio* is an epistemic container, evolutionary departures from which demonstrate modernization from precolonial atavism. Significantly, the meanings of this atavism also rebound through an Orientalist logic that

affirms not only the "savagery" of the *indio* but also the barbarity of Asia, usually in the form of an antimodern China. And yet the role that Chineseness fundamentally plays in articulating Philippine iterations of mestizaje demonstrates that a Filipino mestizo archive is decidedly different from American varieties. In short, "the Oriental" was too foreign and thus unassimilable into mestizo embodiment, unlike the *indio* who necessarily had to be. Nevertheless, in the mestizaje that I examine, Asian and Indigenous embodiment and identification intersect indexing complimentary forms of retrogression that the Filipino mestizo (who is defined, under colonial processes, as *both* Asian and *indio*) civilizes, thus differentiating Filipino Asianness as itself a form of Indigenous rehabilitation and philosophical distance from depraved Chineseness. Perhaps one compelling and laconic rendition of my argument is the following: mestizaje in the Philippines was circumscribed by a colonial ableism that recursively gained meaning between the native, tidally locked in a usable past, and the Orient, recalcitrantly impervious to much-needed Westernization.

I don't cast *Crip Colony* as a study of Indigeneity per se, as I limit my scope to the study of mestizaje. Nevertheless, because of the ways that mestizaje has fundamentally and problematically exploited Indigenous identity, it strikes me as necessary to define the ways I am engaging with the concept. In what follows, I want to identify briefly the ways in which I am theorizing Indigeneity and the *indio* as a recursive issue for the politics of colonial ableism. In this project's critique of the manifold ableist logics racially enmeshed in mestizaje, the *indio* is a historical and epistemological juncture that connects multiple sites marked by Spanish and US racial colonial violence such as the borderlands, Latin America, and the Philippines.[24] I take inspiration from Cherokee queer theorist Joseph Pierce's moving theorization of Indian identification as a "process that is imminently queer. . . . Not queer as an identity position, not a fixed claim of self, but as a relational possibility."[25] Because I aim to frame this study in a geographically expansive colonial state of affairs, the ways that Indigeneity emerges across various arenas structured by asymmetrical power can be frustratingly elusive. That is, I use terms such as *native*, *Indigenous*, *autochthonous*, *Indian*, or *indio* in ways that are specific to their etiology of emergence whenever it is known and possible. Oftentimes, however, there are slippages that are difficult to resolve due to historical context and differing ways that state or colonial powers narrowly, or even *expansively*, define the parameters through which Indigeneity emerges or what it constellates—parameters that we might want to militate against in order to perform a relational analysis but whose

specifics we may also want to maintain and which can be diluted by the act of comparison. This slippage is part of the very epistemological problem that is at the heart of a colonial politics of ableism.

Philippine Recursive Indigeneity

Indigeneity, it seems to me, is—as a political and identitarian fabric quilting across wildly divergent yet intimately connected contexts—a recursive phenomenon. That is, what might appear to inhere as an error of identification or a misattribution of unearned Indigeneity is central to the obfuscating logic of imperialism. This is not to circumvent the ways that durable, meaningful, and politically valid modes of national tribal identification persist despite such obfuscating logics. Indeed, Mohawk anthropologist and Indigenous theorist Audra Simpson has written that her own fraught discipline of anthropology colludes with settler state power and "has very much been the domain of defining the political for Indigenous peoples historically, and in fact was the mode for constructing and defining Indigeneity itself."[26] I partly mean to pinpoint the ways that colonial processes of producing Indians, *indios*, and natives through territorial expansion across broad transpacific geographies puts sovereign processes of nationhood for Indigenous peoples in jeopardy.

My focus on the politics of mestizaje is intimately connected to the elaboration of Indigeneity as a colonial knowledge object that can be rehabilitated, but such a focus on mixedness actually evokes the ways in which the racial calculus of settler regimes produces benchmarks for piecemeal claims to Indian identity that collude with colonial governmentality's strangulation of sovereign practices. Again, to cite Simpson's book on the contrapositions and ethnographic refusals of the Mohawk, she affirms that "present-day Kahnawá:ke was a seigniorial land grant that became a reserve held in trust for the use and benefit of these 'footloose' mixed-blood Mohawks—Mohawks, who, I will demonstrate through the course of this book, are not 'mixed blood.'"[27] That is, "mixed blood" is a settler and eugenic category that amplifies settler power by downgrading the power of an Indigenous sovereign polity to determine the political life of its citizens and identify them as *nationals*. What should be a *political* question answered in the realm of sovereign denomination is transformed by colonialism into a *racial* question that delimits sovereignty. In the frame of crip colonial critique, it's important to come to terms with the reality that for many, Indigeneity is *not* racial but rather national; not cosmic but instead kinship; not

statistical calculation of genetic inheritance but—in its place—the sovereign articulation of material citizenship. Nevertheless, mestizaje is a valuable framing in that it demonstrates the discursive colonial processes that import Indigeneity into a Western national form, delineating for us, with more analytical certitude, the ways in which the categories of Indigenous and postcolonial citizen-subject are viewed as incommensurate, thus necessitating the latter to rehabilitate the former. In Simpson's more clarifying terms, you can't claim to be "48 percent Indian"—that is, 48 percent of a whole national sovereign identity (in racial terms); you either are recognized as a national citizen or you are not.[28] This is decidedly counterintuitive to the ways that ethnic minority entitlements to citizenship are enmeshed with hyphenated claims to personhood that presuppose arithmetic identities coformed through stable "halves": Filipinx American, Mexican American, and the like.

In my study, Indigeneity and its material and philosophical confluences within mestizaje across various domains of encounter function as a form of recursion. In the context of mathematics, logic, and computing, a recursion is a "technique involving the use of a procedure, subroutine, function, or algorithm that calls itself one or more times until a specific condition is met."[29] In simpler terms, a recursive code is a problem in code that is solved by a piece of the very same code that introduced the problem in the first place—as though one used material from a machine to build a hammer to repair that very same machine. The problem and its solution are part of the same self-contained ecology, though permutations of this system are not always selfsame by definition. This metaphor helps to explain the ways that race, disability, and Indigeneity layer on one another; fold in on themselves and into each other; introduce polemics of racial identification and misidentification; and introduce slippages whose inconsistencies are resolved by antecedent codes that originated the problems to begin with. In this way we can approach an understanding of how it is possible that Filipinos, the Kanaka Maoli, and the Quiché Maya are all Indian in relation to each other in recursive ways made possible by the broad swath of racial classification interdigitated by colonialism. Yet—and I want to be very clear here—in examining the queer relationality of Indianness I neither mean to make a case for the Indigeneity of Filipinos as equivalent to American Indigeneities nor for evaluating others' claims to such identity. I neither hold the subject position to ethically argue such a point, nor is that the focus of my project's genealogical exploration of mestizaje, though terms such as *tribal* and *Indigenous* are indeed political categories that are assigned to Indigenous

Filipinos by the Philippine state, not unlike in North America.[30] This is all to say that there are relational possibilities to mine particularly for populations that were classified as *indio* under Spanish colonial rule and later assimilated into the US settler empire. Moreover, it is this notion of recursive Indigeneity that allows me to think ambitiously across geography and racial difference to elaborate a comparative ethnic studies analysis.

Despite the mining of such connections, there also exists major differences in these wildly diverse locations in which race and the political category of the Indian circulate. These differences provide a portrait that might be more interesting for its incommensurability rather than comparative overlap. Nevertheless, it is precisely the incommensurate nature of the "American" Indian, the Spanish American *indio*, and the Philippine iterations of both that adumbrates a transnational genealogy of the colonial and racial life of disability. Spanish colonial law itself was drawing these connections in order to make racial sense of the disparate, far-flung, and diverse peoples that populated its colonies.[31] This space of incommensurability, rather than being one of friction and separation, I consider to be a place of mutual recognition, affinity, and possibility across a recursive field of global Indigeneity managed by and resistant to imperialism and settler colonialism. There is queer resonance in the racial ambiguities that inhere within referents like *Asia* and *America* or fabrications like *the mestizo*. As far as hemispheric, transnational, and transpacific conceptions of American studies are concerned, my hope is that a crip colonial critique will allow us to crip the colony and, in so doing, may provide a language to think through the ways that the Spanish colonial embeds within the US racial imaginary a biopolitical construction and management of the *indio* across philosophical and geopolitical borders.

In order to understand the ways that colonialism and disability intersect in the landscape of mestizaje, it is important to understand the different racial outcomes for the peoples historically subjugated by British versus Spanish colonialism. Both Anglo-American and Spanish colonialism treated the subjects of racial mixture and native peoples distinctly. In a basic sense, the Spanish Empire incorporated the *indio*, while Anglo imperialism treated the Indian as separate and distinct. In discussion of the ways that mestizo Chicanx people may have historical claims to Indigeneity but who do not exist under the political sign of "Indian" as US ethnic minorities, Maria Cotera and Josefina Saldaña-Portillo explore the ways that Spanish imperialism considered *indios* political subjects of the Spanish crown, while this was not the case for Anglo imperialism, which considered Indians distinct political subjects though still beholden to the British crown. They suggest that this

is one compelling reason why the nations of the United States and those of Latin America incorporated Indigenous peoples differently.[32] Because the Philippines sits at the intersection of these at times not complementary ideologies that span the Americas, it becomes necessary to contextualize how hemispheric American race relations would result in various nation-building projects in Latin America predicated on precisely that which would be considered anathema in what eventually became the United States: the mestizo or racially mixed person. This is not to say there are insignificant traces of racial mixture or mixed-race people in the United States. Nevertheless, the histories of the violent extremes to which efforts went to preserve white purity in the United States stand in contradistinction to Latin American nation-states such as Brazil, Cuba, Mexico, and Uruguay, whose national mythologies and cosmologies rely on Indian incorporation rather than explicit elimination.

For our purposes, the condition through which Indigenous peoples were variously, and oftentimes inaccurately, integrated or eliminated index profound concerns germane to disability. Mestizaje was a discourse that famously blended *indigenismo*, cosmology, and eugenics to project a future state whose ideal figure was the mestizo. But it is also important to recognize that the United States also integrated the Indian into American Western imaginaries of the frontier as an equally if differentially mythic figure that rationalized white American claims on the land and its resources.[33] While there are certainly vast visible differences in the ways that American Indigeneities were treated, imagined, and exploited, I also find much discursive similarity in the ways that the Indian is a figure that was mythologized. While the Philippines is in Asia, its histories of conquest tell similar stories that seem more germane to the borderlands and Latin America.[34]

I seek to clarify the mestizo archive of the Philippines and its relevance to transnational studies of disability; however, I want to make it clear that I approach the question of mestizaje as an Asian American critic invested in hemispheric race relations. Mestizaje has a pronounced and prominent archive across the Americas. The Philippines poses a productive epistemological challenge to the geographies and embodiments we typically might imagine with mestizaje. Facetiously, Spanish historian Antonio García-Abásolo characterized the racially mixed populations from the Philippines as "mestizos de un país sin mestizaje" (mestizos from a country without mestizaje).[35] Despite its relative paucity, mestizaje's cultural import in the Philippines is rather undeniable despite its divergence from American examples. Rather than a simple "Filipino twist" on a more established Latin

American or Latinx mestizo norm, I center the Philippines as a productive opportunity in "queering mestizaje" by embracing contexts, histories, and cultures that would fall more within the purview of Asian American studies.[36] Even so, because mestizaje has been treated with incredible levels of critical profundity in both Latin American and Latinx studies *and* being inspired by the Philippines' shared history of Spanish colonial rule, I find it ethically and critically necessary to engage with the archive of mestizaje as an Asian Americanist invested in analyses of comparative imperialism. Through a crip colonial critique, I turn to the mestizo Philippines to think through the ableism of colonial enlightenment, which fashions able-mindedness through the rehabilitation of a crip Indian that the mestizo does *not* wish to be but from whom he derives an authorizing kinship—an Indian shaped through ideologies of US American and Spanish humanisms. Troubling and expanding on canonical renditions of mestizo thought embroiled in ableist eugenic architectures provides greater clarity to the ways that Filipinx engagements with mestizaje deviate from and align with it in ways that I believe can productively remap Asian American studies, Latinx studies, and disability studies.

In calling attention to mestizaje's ableist preference, I crip the colony in order to explore the ways that sexuality, coloniality, and race interlock in shaping our often commonsense and underexplored notions of the body and its attendant, often wildly differential, capacities. Throughout this book I will maintain that the discrepancy between colonizer and colonized is one reasonably understood as a difference of imagined capacity—ability requisite for the material conditions of robust political existence, subjectivity, and independence. In making this argument, I suggest that the colonial relation is also a relation of disability embedded in a logic of relational racialization; indeed, rather than an inert term that describes a set state of affairs, I agree with scholars like Sami Schalk and Jina Kim that disability is a socially and politically constructed system of norms that actively produces a set of relations that predispose racialized bodies to vulnerability, injury, and debilitation.[37] By the same token, I suggest that colonialism constitutes and materializes a spectacular array of disablements that I seek to understand. Mestizaje is enmeshed within this array as both a critical apparatus that reads against its colonial grain while also being endemic to the power asymmetries that give it life.

The Philippines has an uneasy and discomfiting position in the Americas as a former Spanish and US colony. I position its mestizo archive within an expansive and transpacific vision of the Americas given the ways that

both Spanish and US colonialism similarly mark Philippine historical experiences of race. Such experiences resonate with Latin America and the US borderlands. Thus, Latin American and Latinx studies provide helpful models of understanding the entanglements of Anglo-American and Hispanic empires while Filipinx American and Philippine studies stand to enrich a hemispheric American studies approach. What ties these seemingly disparate groups and fields of inquiry together is a cultural and philosophical reckoning with mestizaje. The Philippines represents a unique milieu to which these "American" liberal ideologies have been exported.[38]

Yet before Philippine mestizaje can be understood for the ways that it reifies colonial ableism, it is necessary to gain an understanding of the ways that mestizaje has been taken up by disability studies. Necessarily this requires an engagement with Gloria Anzaldúa, who has been recuperated by disability analysts as a foundational woman of color disability theorist. Her work is an indispensable crossroads where disability and mestizaje intersect that is imminently relevant for the field orientation of this book. While *Crip Colony* is not centrally a book on Chicanx border studies (as it is principally a critique of Filipinx mestizaje), because transnational disability studies is a main field of inquiry it is crucial to gain a clear picture of the ways in which mestizaje has been theorized in disability studies in order to establish the difference that Filipinx mestizo studies brings to crip critique. As I'll explain in the following section, Anzaldúa's own work unfortunately reentrenches some of the eugenic ideologies inherent to the pseudoscience of American mestizaje in ways that are not thoroughly engaged by feminist disability studies. This should be of concern to a robust theory attending to the intersection of colonialism and disablement.

Mestizaje and Feminist Disability Studies

In her pioneering text *Borderlands / La Frontera*, Gloria Anzaldúa argues that a new mestiza consciousness problematizes the extent to which both the Mexican and US nation-states could presume to accurately frame the cultural and political thinking of Chicana feminist experience. As I have stated, my deployment of crip colonial critique is certainly deeply indebted to the ways that Quijano offered a powerful lens to map the emergence of race through conquest and dispossession of Black and Indigenous peoples.[39] Nevertheless, Anzaldúa is an equally powerful interlocutor in linking and expanding my adaptation of coloniality to the material realities of not only racialized bodies whose labors were historically hyperextracted

by settler colonialism and chattel slavery but also the profound imbrication of race and ability. In a passage often cited by disability theorists claiming Anzaldúa as a disability figure, she famously writes, in a way that explicates an ethos of mixture and mestizaje, that "the U.S.-Mexican border *es una herida abierta* where the Third World grates against the first and bleeds. And before a scab forms it hemorrhages again, the lifeblood of two worlds merging to form a third country—a border culture."[40] Moreover, she reflects on the "Tortilla Curtain" that euphemistically marks the imposition of the border as a

> 1950-mile-long open wound
> Dividing a *pueblo*, a culture,
> Running down the length of my body,
> Staking fence rods in my flesh,
> Splits me splits me
> *Me raja me raja*.[41]

The almost itinerant subjectivity of the mestiza produces a consciousness that deals with ambiguities and contradictions not as realities to be resolved into tidy categories but instead as part of innovative hybrid thinking. Anzaldúa relies on the figure of the mestiza as the product of and agent to materialize a hybridity evocative of a "border culture" that is the "lifeblood" of "worlds merging"—blood spilt by the violent division and cleaving of the "pueblo" (people) or nation. The injury of the "herida abierta" (open wound) evidences her subjectivity as "rajada" (split or torn); these are tears that are implicitly stitched by the merging of blood evocative of the racial fusions and merging worlds of mestizaje.

Because of the philosophical unfixedness of the Chicana mestiza body and its imbrication with (and physical harm caused by) a political environment emblematized by the border, it is unsurprising that many feminist disability theorists have tried to argue that Anzaldúa is a foundational feminist disability theorist. Such moves are demonstrative of disability literature that attempts to resituate some foundational feminist thinkers, prominent in other fields, as scholars or activists not only in movements for racial justice but also for disability justice (and also to question frameworks that would consider said movements as irrevocably separate). Suzanne Bost; Qwo-Li Driskill, Aurora Levins Morales, and Leah Lakshmi Piepzna-Samarasinha; Alison Kafer and Eunjung Kim; AnaLouise Keating; and Carrie McMaster have all encouraged engagement with Gloria Anzaldúa and Audre Lorde, for instance, as women of color feminists foundational to what Schalk

and Kim have called a "feminist of color disability studies."[42] Keating, for instance, conducted interviews with Anzaldúa later in her life that have crucially established the explicit linkages the Chicana feminist made between her physical impairments and her borderlands feminism.[43] Dissonant with the more mainstream ways that Anzaldúa is taken up in Latinx, queer, and feminist studies, McMaster notes, "although I viewed Anzaldúa as a feminist, a Chicana theorist, and one of the founders of queer theory, I had not learned to also think of her as a woman with a chronic illness, a person with a disability."[44] She and Bost have established that Anzaldúa's life and understanding of her body were substantially shaped by her adult onset diabetes and a rare genetic hormonal imbalance that caused her to begin menstruation at three months of age.[45] This condition required her to undergo a hysterectomy in order to remove a mass in her uterus.[46] Bost goes as far as to state that Anzaldúa's ample figurative use of animals to describe her mental states, such as "la serpiente," evokes a posthumanist break with the human/animal divide tantamount to "embracing . . . madness," thus placing "Anzaldúa's worldview outside of contemporary critical or political discourse—yet also within contemporary disability discourse" that is allied, indeed, with mad studies.[47] In a similar vein, McMaster has argued that Anzaldúa's very-well-known "concepts of la facultad, nepantla and nepantleras, conocimiento/desconocimiento, El Mundo Zurdo, new tribalism, the Coatlicue state, the Coyolxauhqui experience, and spiritual activism contribute both ideological and pragmatic tools to our work" of disability studies and activism.[48]

Foreshadowing the recent intervention of feminist of color disability studies as a productive and deeply necessary revision of Rosemary Garland-Thomson's feminist disability studies, Kafer and Kim have argued that claiming figures like Anzaldúa as "crip kin" substantiates that

> there is no monolithic "disabled person" or universal experience of disability, but rather experiences, conceptualizations, and manifestations of disability that vary widely by cultural, historical, and global context. Just as scholarship that fails to attend to disability is complicit in maintaining ableism, scholarship that attends *only* to disability, casting it as separate from processes of racialization or histories of colonialism, reproduces oppressive norms. . . .
>
> Moreover, an additive approach fails to consider that *disability* will likely need to be reconceptualized when colonial relations or histories of sexuality are addressed.[49]

My stake in these debates is to address such "colonial relations," as well as Schalk and Kim's invitation for engagement with iterations of race and disability outside the United States, which they themselves point to as a limitation of their own framing of feminist of color disability analysis.[50] To wit, Suzanne Bost's US-centric engagement with disability may dangerously limit an understanding of the pitfalls of Anzaldúa in adequately addressing both the coloniality of mestizaje, which Anzaldúa romanticizes, and the settler coloniality of the United States in which her claims to mestiza consciousness structurally obtain meaning. This limitation is evident in a provocative question posed by Bost speculating on Anzaldúa's disabled subjectivity: "What does it mean to live like an Aztec goddess in the late twentieth-century United States?"[51] Perhaps inspired by the framing given by technofeminist Donna Haraway that characterizes women of color as political "cyborgs," this pivotal question posed by Bost in her influential essay suggests that the irrationality and spirituality of Anzaldúa's "shape-shifting" mestiza consciousness generate critical opportunities for questioning liberal humanism as the locus of ableist ideologies.[52] Bost contextualizes Anzaldúa's ostensible Indigenous deity status, elaborating that "by bringing the ontologies of Aztec thought into her writings about her own embodiment, Anzaldúa creates friction between temporalities and epistemologies; she undermines assumptions about human life and human history that are rarely questioned. What does it mean to live like an Aztec goddess in the late twentieth-century United States? We must use our imagination to answer this question because there is no historical or empirical model to draw on."[53]

Claiming that there are no "models" to draw on perhaps contributes to and speaks to the prevalence of the eliminatory logics that erase Indigenous peoples from the present. This has the effect of locking them in a past that Anzaldúa and contemporary feminist disability scholars can then rehabilitate for different political ends, advancing disability justice while ignoring settler violence.[54] Bost's exuberant desire to claim Anzaldúa as an Indigenous disability "goddess" speaks to the need for renewed calls for a rigorous transnational, comparative, and multilingual approach to what Josefina Saldaña-Portillo calls a truly "American 'American Studies,'" one differentiated from a superficial approach to the transnational that "steers clear of the difficulties and complexities of archival research, ethnography, multilinguality, and multiculturality required by this approach" and instead produces knowledge that is more tantamount to a kind of "intellectual tourism."[55] Relevant to the feminist disability claiming of Anzaldúa that I have elaborated on, Saldaña-Portillo has produced perhaps one of the more

widely known critiques of Chicanx feminist recuperations of mestizaje. This is significant because mestizaje is one of the central devices through which Anzaldúa's disability story unfolds. Ultimately I agree with Saldaña-Portillo that Chicanx appropriations of an ancestral Indian as the point of origin for political and territorial claims are materialized "by claiming [that] Aztlán as an Indigenous nation [is] historically anterior to the founding of the United States." Moreover, when such ancestral claims are read within, for instance, the Zapatistas' critique of mestizaje as a harmful racial ideology that has oppressed Indigenous sovereignty, it is clear that "mestizaje is incapable of suturing together the heterogeneous positionalities of 'Mexican,' 'Indian,' and 'Chicana/o' that co-exist in the United States" instead relegating "the Indian [to] an ancestral past rather than recognizing contemporary Indians as coinhabitants not only of this continent abstractly conceived but of the neighborhoods and streets of hundreds of U.S. cities and towns."[56] The inability of Anzaldúa to connect modern Chicana mestiza identity to contemporary concerns that affect Indians relegates them to an ornamented past that is treated as "a kind of pastiche grab bag of Indian spiritual paraphernalia."[57] Saldaña-Portillo concludes that "[Anzaldúa] goes through her backpack and decides what to keep and what to throw out, choosing to keep signs of Indigenous identity as ornamentation and spiritual revival. But what of the living Indian who refuses mestizaje as an avenue to political and literary representation? What of the *indígena* who demands new representational models that include her among the living?"[58] That is to say, Chicanx invocations of mestizaje collude with the settler colonial project positioning Indians on what Denise Ferreira da Silva calls the "horizon of death," even if such claims point to a process of "mourning" vis-à-vis an Indigeneity—the connectivity to which has been erased due to colonial violence.[59] For this reason, it is important to keep in mind the ableist eugenic framework in which mestizaje was initially articulated.

Bost's claim that Anzaldúa's feminist disability bona fides are anchored in her status as an "Aztec goddess" advances disability justice as a form of settler violence. I contend that it is absolutely vital that disability studies not replicate these settler patterns of colonial violence that rely on an Indian that mestizaje has rehabilitated in order to advance the goal of "diversifying" disability. Without considering Indigenous peoples among the living and the very real "historical and empirical model" that they indeed do bring to the present, disability studies will run the risk of succumbing to a multiculturalist logic that only very shallowly includes racial critique as a central aspect of its analytical operations.[60] Placing Anzaldúa at the

center of a rapprochement between disability studies and racial hybridity shows an uncomfortable yet productive paradox. What happens to the celebrated status of Anzaldúa as "crip kin" when brought into the context of critiques of her appropriative and reductive "postnationalist" uses of mestizaje? Foregrounding the ways that settler colonial ideology manifests itself through discourses of debilitation demonstrates how they are reliant on the image of a crip Indian to be rehabilitated by and as a technology of colonial ableism. Disability theory that is not attentive to these realities actually then *propounds* disability as an effect of settler colonialism. In a sense, Anzaldúa's postnationalist feminist frame, which she announces through the visibility of the epistemic and physical "open wound" of the border, similarly recuperates an ancestral Indian to then be evolved *into a Chicana* with hybrid cognition. This furthers the violence of colonial ableism as a form of settler colonial appropriation in its rehabilitative attachment to an Indigenized *frontera*.

Rather than a radical disability justice framework, what we are left with in this context is a settler colonial disability studies. One way in which borderlands feminism in Anzaldúa's articulation capitulates to what Jessica Cowing calls "settler ableism" is by decontextualizing the deep eugenic quagmire in which mestizaje is embedded.[61] Anzaldúa recuperates the cosmic race by ultimately misunderstanding José Vasconcelos's arguments around a "fifth race" as a "theory . . . of inclusivity," similarly endorsing pseudoscientific arguments romanticizing a "hybrid progeny [as] a mutable, more malleable species with a rich gene pool." In a celebratory tenor she extols the exciting hybrid character and epistemological possibility of the cosmic race: "José Vasconcelos, Mexican philosopher, envisaged *una raza mestiza*, *una mezcla de razas afines*, *una raza de color—la primera raza síntesis del globo*. He called it a cosmic race, *la raza cósmica*, a fifth race embracing the four major races of the world. . . . From this racial, ideological, cultural and biological cross-pollinization, an 'alien' consciousness is presently in the making—a new *mestiza* consciousness, *una conciencia de mujer*. It is a consciousness of the Borderlands."[62] Anzaldúa actually seems to trumpet the ideal of Vasconcelos's cosmic race, which one would be very hard-pressed to do after a careful reading of his essay. I want to leave open the possibility, however, that it may certainly be conceivable to retool a problematic ideology and infuse it with new political meanings. Nevertheless, given the ways that Anzaldúa liberally reaches back into time to resuscitate a lost Indigenous heritage grounded predominantly in Aztec spirituality, it is fair to pose the question of what it means to recuperate a past decoupled from its granular

specific historical conditions and contexts—in this case, the historical development of the race sciences and eugenics through which mestizaje (by Anzaldúa's own citational protocol) obtains its meanings. The conversation that Anzaldúa initiates with Vasconcelos in her canonical and significant contribution to women of color feminist thought (and, by proxy, feminist disability studies) forces us to come to terms with a contradiction at the heart of mestiza consciousness as a concept that is born from the traumas of historical exclusion while also propounding foundational exclusions of Black and Indigenous peoples central to the cultural discourse of mestizaje. Questioning the ableism of mestizaje as a political discourse is in tension with the recuperation of it as a mode of productive though arguably heavily romanticized "hybrid" thinking that, similar to Vasconcelos's theory, attempts to recast the Chicanx and the Mexican uncomplicatedly within a field of Indigenous identification: "I am visible—see this Indian face—yet I am invisible. I both blind them with my beak nose and am their blind spot. But I exist, we exist. They'd like to think I have melted in the pot. But I haven't, we haven't." Read alongside her acknowledgment that "this land was Mexican once / Was Indian always / and is. / And will be again" there is a desire to articulate the mestiza consciousness as emergent from the status of an individual that we are encouraged to consider, for many intents and purposes, a detribalized Indian.[63] While this is a generalization, casting the Chicana mestiza as an unmoored Indian appears to be at least one of the implications of Anzaldúa's mestiza consciousness.

While reifying the lens of "mestizos" to read social reality better than the rest of us is not something that I wish to do in the space of this book, I do think that analyzing the politics and representations of Filipino mestizos can communicate something important about the colonial politics of ableism. At base, what is true about all the historically divergent contexts of Latin America, the Philippines, and the borderlands is the broad articulation of mestizaje as a discourse shaping identity, nationalism, and cultural politics. Mestizaje emerges from the contact between Spanish colonizers and the Indigenous colonized. As such, it is indelibly and inescapably a colonial reality that is shared across various diverse geographies and temporalities. However, mestizaje is also a philosophical and cultural theory pertaining to the complexities of hybridity. The Philippines is not an exception to this. This book indeed foregrounds some works by Filipino *hispanistas* for their challenges to coloniality, on the one hand, while also taking a critical posture to the ways in which they calcify mestizaje's racial and colonial ableist assumptions, on the other. In this way, the pitfalls of Anzaldúa's work offer

a helpful historical resonance of similar entrenchments of asymmetrical power in the mestizo Philippines.

Filipinx Mestizaje: The Reorientation of an American Concept

The Philippines' colonial history is a marginal "peculiar" case for Spanish historical studies while being a central case study for American studies' understanding of US foreign policy shifts at the turn of the twentieth century.[64] I am buoyed to see that this is shifting.[65] Nevertheless, Spanish historian Josep Fradera originally remarked on the "peculiaridad" (peculiarity) of the Philippines as Spain's only Asian colony solidifying an Orientalist register in the articulation of Spanish colonial history vis-à-vis its mysterious and exceptional Asian experiment. And although he was highlighting a fundamental inassimilable quality of the Philippines into normative chronicles of Spanish historiography that more regularly include its American colonies, he might not be too far off the mark on the ways in which the archipelago presents differences that must be accounted for as strange, peculiar, and even queer.

The Philippines was first "discovered" by Portuguese explorer Ferdinand Magellan in 1521 during his famed and apocryphal circumnavigation of the globe.[66] Coincidently (though perhaps fated), this was the same year in which conquistador Hernán Cortés defeated Montezuma in the Aztec city of Tenochtitlán, completing the *conquista* of what today is Mexico. The Philippines officially and administratively became a Spanish colony when its first colonial outpost was established on the island of Cebu in the central Philippines in 1565. The Philippine islands became a far more ecclesiastical colony rather than a well-established military outpost, as was observed in the colonies of New Spain and in other parts of Latin America. Its positioning as an *ultramar* (overseas) territory of the Spanish Empire was significant, however, on the Manila Galleon Route, which connected the port cities of Acapulco, Mexico; Granada, Spain (notably the last Muslim stronghold to be conquered by the Catholic monarchs Ferdinand and Isabel in 1492); and Manila in the Philippines, as well as many other economic hubs controlled by the Spanish crown. In fact, the Philippines was administered on behalf of Spain by the viceroyalty of Mexico City from 1565 until 1815, when the Galleon Route was ultimately ended by the Mexican War of Independence. In this administrative sense, the Philippines was actually a part of Mexico; this historical relationship has inspired the necessary conversation with aspects

of Chicanx studies in this introduction. There were many cultural, intellectual, linguistic, and political exchanges, as well as the trade in commodities, foods, and bodies, between the Americas and the Philippines through this route, attesting to the inherent global nature of Philippine culture and politics.[67] Despite such exchanges, the Catholic priests evangelized by transcribing Indigenous Philippine languages with the Latin alphabet, and the Spanish language never saw widespread use nor was it systematically imposed—this is perhaps one of the most convincing historical explanations for why the Philippines is not a Hispanophone country today.

Nevertheless, many Filipinos (nonpeninsular Spaniards born in the Philippines) and peninsular Spaniards liaised with Natives, producing a creole class of Filipinos who later reclaimed the term for the native-born, autochthonous peoples of the islands. These *ilustrado* (intellectual) Spanish-speaking mestizos were instrumental in the Philippines' own revolutionary, nationalist period of consciousness raising in the late nineteenth century, fitting a pattern of independence movements that transpired in Latin America during that century. Philippine historiography dates this period from the execution (on the charge of sedition) of three native-born Filipino Catholic priests, Mariano Gómez, José Burgos, and Jacinto Zamora, in 1872 until the beginning of the Philippine Revolution in 1896.[68] Known by the portmanteau of their last names the GomBurZa execution fomented widespread resentment and suspicion of Spanish authority—and particularly of the Catholic Church. Such anticlericalism became a central political sticking point for mestizo intellectual José Rizal, seen by many as one of the central figures of the so-called Philippine Enlightenment and the revolution though he was mainly a reformist who believed in a continued relationship with Spain.[69] A central figure of study of this book project, Rizal, a *sangley* or Filipino-Chinese Hispanic mestizo, represents an anticolonial striving for political and intellectual self-determination in the face of Spanish malfeasance and debilitation, on the one hand, and a contentious avatar for a Philippine mestizaje that integrated and replicated colonial rehabilitation, on the other.

The Philippine Revolution (1896–98), following Rizal's execution by a firing squad of the Guardia Civil (again, on the charge of sedition), gained an ally in the United States, which ensured its triumph, though the victory was short-lived. The United States entered into war against Spain following the sinking of the USS *Maine* in the Bay of Havana and defeated the weakening colonial power in a matter of months in a conflict remembered in history as the Spanish-American War (1898). Custodianship of the Philippines passed to the United States after a negotiation with Spain following

its defeat at the Treaty of Paris, despite the Philippines' protestations and hard-fought grassroots independence movement. Thus began the colonial period under the United States following the Filipinos' defeat in the Philippine-American War (1899–1902)—a period that endured until 1946. United States control was characterized as "benevolent assimilation" and tutelage in the modern franchise of democratic self-government. As I will explore in chapter 1, benevolent assimilation assumed the inability of Filipinos to self-govern, and thus the Philippines became a custodial population of the United States—indeed, *sold* to the United States by Spain.[70] While such political rationalizations of the annulment of sovereignty were certainly metaphorically staged, they were also deeply entwined with evaluations of the literal cognitive capacity of the colonized. While I suggest that the asymmetrical power dynamics between the colonized and the colonizers are partially shaped as a function of perceived ability, these are also ideologies that are internalized and replicated within colonial society. Accompanying disablement is the desire to rehabilitate; and such rehabilitation not only involves mestizo and colonial uplift of the *indio* but also the ways that the Orient is cast in disabled terms.

Rizal is evocative and emblematic of a crucial difference indexing a profound departure of American mestizaje from Filipinx iterations of it: Chineseness, China, and the corresponding ways that Orientalism manifests within the development of hybridity. While I have described Rizal as a *sangley* mestizo, this, according to Philippine historian Richard Chu, would cause confusion given prevailing historical Spanish legal categorizations whose "colonial regime used a three-way classification system to segregate the people under its rule. The '*sangleyes*' or the 'Chinese' comprised one group, and the *mestizos* (the creole offspring of 'Chinese' men and local women) and the '*indios*' (the natives) comprised the other two."[71] Later the United States would simply classify mestizos and *indios* as "Filipinos" while the Chinese were regarded as "alien," demonstrating the ways that Chinese exclusion influenced US colonialism in the Philippines. When compared to Latin America, it's important to note that the variety of mestizaje that is central to Philippine national mythography integrates (however contentious and illusory that integration may be) Chinese racial identity into the Filipino national body despite these exclusions. Yet this exists alongside anti-Chinese animus, which also animates Philippine mestizaje not as a unifying racial nationalism but as a racial-colonial hierarchy scaffolded by an abiding Orientalism. Cultural and literary studies scholar Caroline Hau has asserted that contemporary Filipino racial politics evokes this Orientalist

historical dialectic of "inclusion and exclusion [that] highlights the unsettled and shifting meanings not only of 'Chinese' and 'Chineseness,' but of mestizoness, 'Filipino,' and 'Filipinoness' as well."[72] One need not look further than the *pambansang bayani* (Philippine national hero) José Rizal who, as a Hispanic Chinese mestizo, was demonstrative of a kind of mestizaje that was crucially oriented in an Asian context bridging East Asian and Southeast Asian hybridities. Yet Rizal, like other *sangley* mestizos, would likely not have identified strongly with Chinese identity, particularly during a nationalist period in which a general Filipino identity was solidifying. Indeed, during the US period, evidence suggests that Filipino intellectuals utilized Spanish culture (partly, though not exclusively, in the form of the Spanish language) and US anti-Chinese rhetoric to distinguish the Philippines as a modern, "Americanized" nation vis-à-vis China, which was scripted as a container for depravity, ruin, queerness, and disability (see chapter 3). The hybridity evocative of mestizaje is especially complex in the Philippines in that it can be difficult to determine where Asia is, who's Asia, and whose Asia? Asia in the Philippine articulation of it is at once American, Asian, and Spanish, amalgamating multifarious cultural formations that vex stable identification and categorization.

The mestizo Philippines is an important case study rounding out Asian Americanist engagements with mestizaje in the Americas, which has not paid too much attention to the archipelago as it does not fit neatly within critical race study historiographies that prioritize histories of migration *from* Asia. In American instantiations of mestizaje, critics like Jason Oliver Chang, Ana Paulina Lee, and Lisa Lowe have shown that unlike the ways that Indigenous peoples, and to a much lesser extent Black peoples, were folded into mestizaje and ostensibly integrated into the mestizo national body, Chinese laborers during and after the period of the liberal abolition of slavery were articulated as foreign presences.[73] "Chinos" were largely considered unassimilable into the national identities that were forged in the independence movements of the nineteenth century from Spain. Independence from European powers galvanized American republics (including the United States) to cast the Orient as irrevocably foreign even though today many of these nations pride themselves on being inclusive multicultural havens. Performance and food studies scholar Tao Leigh Goffe, for instance, has offered important readings against the grain of the liberal multiculturalism of the Americas using the amalgamated tastes of the dish chop suey as an analytic to track the ways that Afro-Asian intimacies are configured as "surplus" and therefore obfuscated by a Black-white dyad.[74]

Afro-Asian, Chinese, and Indian (as in from India) subjectivities are often left out of critical conversation in the multiethnic landscapes of American experience, particularly as these Asian laborers "replaced" Black plantation labor. Significantly, the substitutive function orchestrated by colonial racial capitalism of Chinese and South Asian laborers seems to have also solidified a persistent forgetting of hemispheric Asian Americas, which concerns the mestizo archive centered in this book. For instance, Chang has demonstrated that Chinese laborers were subjected to an *antichinista* discourse that was fundamental to the consolidation of a Mexican national identity, particularly in the early twentieth century after the Mexican Revolution.[75] While this could be said to be beyond the scope of the ways that a cultural "disability" theorist like Gloria Anzaldúa engaged with multiraciality by consistently commenting on the Black, Hispanic, and Indian identities that compose her mestiza consciousness, the backdrop of *antichinismo* in Mexican identity is completely absent from the mestiza consciousness in ways that prompt questions about what precisely composes the renditions of Mexican national history that are then innovated by Chicana feminist thought. Similar to the ways that Asian Americans in North America are configured as perpetual foreigners differentiated even from the most liberal and pluralistically multiracial instantiations of national identity, the Asian racial form was jettisoned out of the "inclusive" clutches of mestizaje. Paulina Lee has tracked similar ways that Orientalist sentiments have shaped the supposedly racially democratic and plural Brazilian national identity.[76] In all of these cases, the mestizo racialized body consolidated its meaning around its fundamental difference from the Asian body. Unfortunately, these historical, economic, and discursive articulations of the manifold Asian exclusions that quilt across American experience are corroborated in the foundational literature of mestizaje philosophy.

There is evidence of an enduring, constitutive, yet undertheorized Orientalism in perhaps the most infamous text on mestizaje—that of Mexican statesman and politician José Vasconcelos. I want to cover Vasconcelos briefly because his eugenic outlook is relevant to the disability analysis of this book and, moreover, the ways in which he excludes Asia mark the fundamental difference that Filipinx racial politics brings to the scholarly conversation on mestizaje that must fundamentally include Asianness. In his book of essays *La raza cósmica* (The cosmic race, 1925), Vasconcelos is well known for arguing that mestizos are a "cosmic" master race that should inevitably be the future outcome for humanity. The foundational character of mestizaje utilized the Orient as a discursive space in which disability and pathology

are situated. This is important because it economically, culturally, and racially indexes the extent to which Chinese people were inassimilable into the mestizo frame. To this point Vasconcelos writes,

> Ocurrirá algunas veces, y ha ocurrido ya, en efecto, que la competencia económica nos obligue a cerrar nuestras puertas, tal como hace el sajón, a una desmedida irrupción de orientales. Pero al proceder de esta suerte, nosotros no obedecemos más que a razones de orden económico; reconocemos que no es justo que pueblos como el chino, que bajo el santo consejo de la moral confuciana se multiplican como ratones, vengan a *degradar la condición humana*, justamente en los instantes en que comenzamos a comprender que la inteligencia sirve para refrenar y regular bajos instintos zoológicos . . . si los rechazamos es porque el hombre, a medida que progresa, se multiplica menos y siente el horror del número, por lo mismo que ha llegado a estimar la calidad.
>
> It shall occur at times, and in effect it has already, that economic competition will obligate us to close our ports, as the Anglo-Saxon has, to an immeasurable eruption of Orientals. But in doing so we are only following economic rationalizations; we realize that it is not just that nations like that of the Chinese, under the holy counsel of Confucian morality would multiply like rats, would come to *degrade* the human condition, when we have just begun to understand that our intelligence would influence us to refrain from base animal instincts . . . if we reject them it is because man, as he progresses, will procreate less feeling the horror of overpopulation and because he has begun to understand quality (over quantity).[77]

This passage illuminates for the reader that the national mestizo body possesses an able-bodiedness through the uplift of the autochthonous native. Indeed, the purpose of "inteligencia" is to refrain from base sexual depravity, thus linking cognitive ability and sexual respectability on the screen of Yellow Peril. Mel Chen has established the profound linkage of disability and the Asian racial form in ways that demonstrate that Orientalism, as one of the engines of mestizaje's ableism, was part of a global eugenic norm rather than an exception to the rule. While "mongoloidism" (the racist initial term for Down syndrome) is not mentioned by Vasconcelos explicitly, it is difficult to extricate the conceptual and deep ontological relation of the term from Vasconcelos's reference to the racialized "mongol." This demonstrates the extent to which Asian racialization has been deeply imbricated in the

understanding of disability as a product of global processes of colonial encounter.[78] Insofar as disability discourses are concerned, the body indexes likewise the extent to which qualification of ability transpires within the frame of sexuality ("se multiplican como ratones"). The founding identity of the mestizo shores up its meanings through its fundamental dissimilarity from the Asian body.

Mapping the Book

The Philippines' experience as a Spanish colony and its particular history as a "mestizo" nation are definitely outliers to the more tried-and-true paths worn in the Americas. American genealogies of mestizaje have been analyzed by many scholars in Latin American studies and Latinx studies, as I've demonstrated in this introduction. While there are certainly exceptions, mestizaje as a political and social engine of the Latin American republic is understood in contradistinction to US American varieties of multiculturalism that expressly foreground racial fragmentation and segregation over that which is imagined and understood in the Caribbean and Latin America. What I aim to do is establish canonical mestizaje alongside more peripheral idealizations of it in the Philippines as it transitioned into the rehabilitative framework of US benevolent assimilation. Indeed, José Vasconcelos conceived of his own framework of mestizaje as a direct response to US imperialism's own global expansionist efforts, wherein the Louisiana Purchase and the subsequent acquisition of the previously Mexican territories of the Southwest ensured an accumulation of wealth without which "no hubieran logrado adueñarse del Pacífico" (they wouldn't have taken over the Pacific).[79] Because Mexican philosopher and state builder Vasconcelos was so global in his account of mestizaje, I in turn seek a similarly expansive account that would contextualize epistemic flashpoints of mestizaje and its various meanings in concert with wildly divergent geographic arenas—specifically, the mestizo nation of the Philippines that was acquired by the United States when "se adueñó del Pacífico" (it overtook the Pacific), as Vasconcelos has observed.[80]

The first two chapters of *Crip Colony* seek to understand Philippine mestizaje within such global framings as Hispano-Philippine culture collides with US imperial statecraft. In chapter 1, "Benevolent Rehabilitation and the Colonial Bodymind: Filipinx American Studies as Disability Studies," I resituate the US colonial discourse of benevolent assimilation within disability analysis. By cripping this particular genealogy, I argue that

Filipinx American studies has, in all but name, propounded its own deep understanding of the mutual constitution of race and disability in its deconstruction of the supposedly "benevolent" empire of the United States. Filipinx Americanists have already critiqued the ways that benevolent assimilation assumed and imposed colonial subjects' incapacity for self-rule. I suggest that this was rooted in a belief in the native's cognitive incapacity for robust and full-fledged sovereignty. Therefore, benevolent assimilation was implicitly designed to rehabilitate the native in order that they acquire the capacities that they sorely lacked. To home in on the colonial disability discourse of US imperialism, I dub this form of assimilation arguably more accurately as *benevolent rehabilitation*. The intervention of this chapter is a historiographical and genealogical expansion of Filipinx American studies to contemplate its already prodigious consideration of disability while also insisting on a fuller embrace of some of disability studies' foundational theories. Additionally, I suggest that disability studies more intentionally consider the Philippines and Filipinx America, which have been foundational case studies precipitating American studies' moves to think about US history and culture as the historical formation of an empire.

As we'll see in chapter 2, "Mad María Clara: The Bastard Aesthetics of Mestizaje and Compulsory Able-Mindedness," similar difficult entrenchments are likewise advanced in canonical Philippine renditions of mestizo thought in the writing of José Rizal. Departing from Mexico's centrality in terms of the meanings and prominent conditions through which mestizaje as a philosophical discourse materializes, I seek to analyze Filipino recursions of it in Rizal's canonical novel *Noli me tángere* (Touch me not, 1886). I suggest that colonial society in the Philippines was ineradicably structured through a "compulsory able-mindedness," drawing on the theory of "compulsory able-bodiedness" suggested by crip theorist Robert McRuer. I argue that the literary aesthetics of mestizaje bring together the institutions of heterosexual marriage, nationalist patriotism, and disability in order to establish that full national status as a citizen-subject turned on a heteronormative identity that spurned or rehabilitated cognitive debility. I suggest that Rizal's famed and hapless heroine, María Clara, the paramour of the patriot protagonist Crisóstomo Ibarra, runs afoul of dutiful patriotic Filipina femininity. While Ibarra is the architect of revolution, the mestiza María Clara ends the novel having gone insane, wailing skyward for a nation that must forsake her. While this chapter's arguments might seem counterintuitive to this book's claim that mestizaje marks out subjects that are rehabilitated and thus able-minded agents of colonial violence, this process

was not invariable. Variations of it exist when we are attentive to gender and think feminism and queer critique alongside mestizaje's domestication of the colonial bodymind.

In chapter 3, "Filipino Itineraries, Orientalizing Impairments: Chinese Foot-Binding and the Crip Coloniality of Travel Literature," I return to the question of mestizaje's relationship with China. Perhaps surprisingly, similar notions of Vasconcelos's "Oriental" degeneracy exist in Filipino interpretations of mestizaje despite the Philippines' location in Asia. The chapter argues for a reading method that critiques colonial travel narration as a genre that discursively proliferates itself through what I call a "normate imperial eye/I." I align crip theory and postcolonial criticism to mount a critique of the often-studied colonial genre of travel literature. Teodoro Kalaw's Spanish-language travel narrative *Hacia la tierra del zar* (Toward the land of the czar, 1908) advances Philippine national interests at the intersection of competing imperial projects—the Japanese in Taiwan, Czarist Russia in Manchuria, and the United States in the Philippines. Kalaw morally reforms Philippine modernity through the deformation of the Chinese female body and its bound feet, demonstrating how the Filipino mestizo intellectual, or *ilustrado*, participates in the complex systematic normalization of the able-bodied subject as invisible/benevolent translator of space, place, and other bodies. In so doing, I establish that the mestizo writer actually demonstrates that he is the benevolently assimilated Americanized Filipino—the Hispanic mestizo product of US benevolent rehabilitation advancing its imperial aims throughout a disabled Asia from which he is ontologically and corporeally distinct.

In chapter 4, "A Colonial Model of Disability: Running Amok in the Mad Colonial Archive of the Philippines," I examine the ways that US settler colonialism and its transpacific migration indelibly shaped the administrative colonialism of the Philippine archipelago. I examine archival evidence of the curious case of Indigenous Muslim, or "Moro," Filipinos who, in dozens of cases in the late 1920s and early 1930s, would "run amok" on a vengeful killing spree, typically with a machete, that lasted until they were killed by Philippine Constabulary officers trained by the United States. Philippine and US colonial officials characterized these cases as acute states of madness in which uncivilized Filipinos went insane, even though these same officials connected such incidents to a premeditated religious rite targeting sworn enemies. It was theorized that this racialized form of madness particular to the "Malay race" was the result of an illiberal religious worldview, the pagan practice of slavery, and, significantly, the custom of plural marriage

or polygamy. These cases of "mad" Filipino Indians running amok became a litmus test for potential Philippine independence provisionally granted in the 1934 Tydings-McDuffie Act. If civilized Filipinos couldn't handle their own Indians like the United States did, it was reasoned, then they were not ready to join the civilized nations of the world as a truly independent nation. The chapter demonstrates that the introduction of benevolent rehabilitation earlier in the twentieth century would recur in civilized Filipino police management of "uncivilized" Indigenous Filipinos decades later.

All of these case studies demonstrate the ways in which ideologies of ability ramify through and as racial discourses that anchor the liberal promise of sovereign ability to the liberal product of the uplifted racially mixed body. Because different racialized bodies have been shown to have differential abilities ascribed to them, there is sound reason to think through mestizaje as itself an ideology of ability navigating the pressures of colonial reality. What I observe in all is an unerring faith in the rehabilitative powers of racial mixture and the intellectual prowess of the mestizo class in championing the liberal cause of self-determination. Through engagement of prominent and emblematic examples of Filipino cultural and intellectual thought, I show that mestizo politics in the Philippines propagated mestizaje itself as a colonial discourse of the rehabilitation of the colonial body and mind of the native and thus participated in an (anti)colonial politics of disability. In short, what would it mean to examine mestizaje as a racialized colonial "ideology of ability"?[81]

NOTES

CRIP COLONIAL CRITIQUE

1 I'm very grateful to the Asian American (sub)urban historian James Zarsadiaz for his help in the surprisingly mercurial task of classifying the area I grew up in.

2 I'd like to call attention to the ways in which I'll be using identity terms throughout my book. While I personally am in favor of the use of terms such as "Latinx," "Filipinx," "Filipinx American," and "Chicanx," it is also important to maintain the use of conventionally gendered terms such as "Latina/o," "Filipina/o," and Chicana/o" when the self-named identity of the speaker or subject to which these terms pertain correlates to a particular gendered identity that would be overwritten in problematic ways by gender-neutral or gender-radical terms ending in "x." This avoids anachronistic uses of nonbinary terms. Nineteenth-century *ilustrado* Filipinos are not "Filipinx" unless compelling archival evidence would suggest otherwise. Additionally, maintenance of feminine endings can be particularly crucial for feminist analysts or figures for which the feminine-signaling "a" is important. I want to highlight that maintaining the use of the gender binary in some of these terms is not so much arguing for its merits. Instead, it demonstrates an attention to historical, social, and political contexts that would be diluted by a transhistorical use of "Latinx" (just as one example). However, I more often use terms like "Filipinx" or "Latinx" when I am referencing or prefer to endorse fields of critique such as "Filipinx American studies" or "Latinx studies" and the analytical maneuvers found therein. Readers will note a variety of uses of various gendered identity terms, which may require an attention to the details and contexts of passages' analyses which would be overly burdensome to explain

in every single instance. "Filipinx" and "Filipina/o" exist in parallel and with one another in my view. For instance, in this particular passage to which this endnote pertains, because it is my past childhood self that I am referencing for whom "Filipino American" would be a meaningful identity, I indeed use "Filipino American" because Filipinx did not yet exist for me empirically or personally. Nevertheless, in the majority of cases where a decision for the sake of consistency ought to be prioritized, I will use terms ending in "x" *unless* there is a compelling reason to opt for a different term ending in "o" or "a."

3 *Ulit* is a Filipino/Tagalog word meaning "to repeat."

4 Palumbo-Liu, *Asian/American*; Isaac, *American Tropics*.

5 Foucault, *The History of Sexuality*, 19.

6 Ocampo, *The Latinos of Asia*.

7 Price, "The Bodymind Problem."

8 I adapt Tobin Siebers's definition of an "ideology of ability," which many would call "ableism," to this colonial context. See Siebers, *Disability Theory*, 7–9.

9 Minich, "Mestizaje as National Prosthesis," 212–13.

10 Mitchell and Snyder, *Narrative Prosthesis*.

11 While those in disability studies will be very familiar with the term "crip" as an analytical framework, those coming across it for the first time may find it jarring. Crip, much like "queer," is a scholarly lens that analyzes the ways that power shapes our assumptions around normative embodiment and its ideal capacities. "Crip" (recuperated from the derogatory "crippled" much like queer is a recuperation) disrupts those ableist processes in ways that deemphasize the myth of pure independence seeking to build social relations that are constituted through care and our mutual interdependence. I align my use of "crip" with these moves thinking critically about how global processes of race and colonialism are fundamentally about disability.

12 For a foundational reading of modernity, the Renaissance, and the baroque from a Latin American subalternist perspective, see Mignolo, *The Darker Side of Western Modernity*. See also Blanco, "Baroque Modernity and the Colonial World."

13 Art historian Serge Gruzinski has denoted this unique mélange of "mongrel worlds" (a problematic flourish to be sure) as evocative of a "mestizo mind." Thus, it is not simply the objective existence of syncretic cultures and races but the subjective array of "hybrid conceptual frameworks from which new ways of knowing emerge"; see Gruzinski, *The Mestizo Mind*; see also Russo, *El realismo circular*, 76. Scholars of the so-called *novohispano*, like Gruzinski and Alessandra Russo, have remarked on the problematic separation of Renaissance developments in art and philosophy being confined to Europe while innovations transpiring coevally in the Americas suffer the attribution of "Columbian," thus engulfing diverse geographies, peoples, and knowledges wholly within a conquest narrative. That is, aesthetic, political, and philosophical developments in Europe during conquest are coherent on their own. Meanwhile, the colonial experience is made to seem disjointed—absent from its European referent. Their answer is to recuperate mestizo hybridity

as being a central part of the Renaissance rather than on its periphery. Other scholars with different political commitments have similarly spoken on the ways that colonialism forms the dark underside of Renaissance and Baroque modernities. Despite these developments, there is a curious way that recuperating hybridity within European frameworks might center them.

14 Byrd, *The Transit of Empire*, xviii.

15 Byrd, *The Transit of Empire*, xiii.

16 Kim, "Toward a Crip-of-Color Critique," coined the term.

17 I borrow the powerful formulation of "queercrip" from crip theorist Alison Kafer. See Kafer, *Feminist, Queer, Crip*. For the use of "racial-sexual" as an analytic, see Mendoza, *Metroimperial Intimacies*, 12–18. I find the term to be a productive frame to understand discourses of mestizaje. For an elaboration of the Marxian-informed and Asian Americanist cultural concept of "racialized gendered relations" under capitalism, see Lowe, *Immigrant Acts*, 22.

18 Quijano, "Colonialidad del poder."

19 Mojares, *Brains of the Nation*; Go, *American Empire and the Politics of Meaning*; Hau, *Elites and Ilustrados*.

20 McRuer, *Crip Theory*, 2.

21 See Stern, *Eugenic Nation*. Stern defines eugenics pithily as the desire for "better breeding" (19).

22 Siebers, *Disability Theory*.

23 Mendoza, *Metroimperial Intimacies*.

24 This particular thought was shaped by a compelling conversation with Joseph Pierce. See Pierce, "Adopted," 57–76.

25 Pierce, "Adopted," 58.

26 Simpson, *Mohawk Interruptus*, 33.

27 Simpson, *Mohawk Interruptus*, 3.

28 Simpson, *Mohawk Interruptus*, 8.

29 *Merriam-Webster.com Dictionary*, s.v. "recursion," accessed June 10, 2022, https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/recursion.

30 In thinking about my own subject position as a Filipinx American, I think about the differences of Filipinos in the Philippines that have been categorized by the Philippine state as "tribal" or "Indigenous." For a stunning account of the Lumad (a conglomeration of various Philippine Indigenous groups in Mindanao) fighting against the settler violence of the Philippines and multinational extractivist corporations, see Alamon, *Wars of Extinction*.

31 Seijas, *Asian Slaves in Colonial Mexico*.

32 For a truly stunning exploration of the divergences between racial claims to Indigeneity and the political categorization under Indian, see Cotera and Saldaña-Portillo, "Indigenous But Not Indian?"

33 For a primary source that treats the topic of how white Anglo-American settler culture integrates in the Indian, see Turner, *The Significance of the Frontier*. See also Deloria, *Indians in Unexpected Places*.

34 This probably shouldn't surprise us given that administratively, as I've stated, the Philippines was technically a part of Mexico for more than two hundred years (1565–1815) and was US territory for almost fifty (1898–1946).

35 García-Abásolo, "Mestizos de un país sin mestizaje," 223–45. While García-Abásolo makes the case that the raw number of mestizos produced during the Spanish colonial period is far less when compared to New Spain, the mythic status that the mestizo has in the Philippines is quite potent in cultural production.

36 Arrizón, *Queering Mestizaje*, 119–54.

37 Schalk and Kim, "Integrating Race," 31.

38 Lowe, *The Intimacies of Four Continents*.

39 Quijano, "Coloniality of Power."

40 Anzaldúa, *Borderlands / La Frontera*, 25.

41 Anzaldúa, *Borderlands / La Frontera,* 24.

42 Schalk and Kim, "Integrating Race," 32–33. See also Bost, "Disability, Decoloniality, and Other-than-Humanist Ethics," 1562–80; Driskill, Morales, and Piepzna-Samarasinha, "Sweet Dark Places," 77–97; Kafer and Kim, "Disability and the Edges of Intersectionality," 123–38; Kim, "Toward a Crip-of-Color Critique"; Anzaldúa and Keating, *The Gloria Anzaldúa Reader*, 298–302; and McMaster, "Negotiating Paradoxical Spaces," 102.

43 Anzaldúa, "Disability and Identity."

44 McMaster, "Negotiating Paradoxical Spaces," 102.

45 Bost, "Disability, Decoloniality, and Other-than-Humanist Ethics," 1568.

46 Bost, "Disability, Decoloniality, and Other-than-Humanist Ethics," 1569.

47 Bost, "Disability, Decoloniality, and Other-than-Humanist Ethics," 1577.

48 McMaster, "Negotiating Paradoxical Spaces," 103.

49 Kafer and Kim, "Disability and the Edges of Intersectionality," 124, 126, emphasis in the original; see also Kafer, "Crip Kin, Manifesting." For the original invocation of a feminist disability studies analysis, see Garland-Thomson, "Integrating Disability."

50 In their pathbreaking article, Schalk and Kim admit that "Given our bases in US feminist-of-color scholarship, we want to emphasize that, in addition to the areas we have identified, future feminist-of-color disability studies work needs to engage transnational and postcolonial perspectives"; Schalk and Kim. "Integrating Race," 50–51.

51 Bost, "Disability, Decoloniality, and Other-than-Humanist Ethics," 1567.

52 Haraway, "A Cyborg Manifesto."

53 Bost, "Disability, Decoloniality, and Other-than-Humanist Ethics," 1567.

54 Here I am thinking through Patrick Wolfe's logic of elimination. See Wolfe, "Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native."

55 Saldaña-Portillo, *The Revolutionary Imagination*, 262.

56 Saldaña-Portillo, *The Revolutionary Imagination*, 279.

57 Saldaña-Portillo, *The Revolutionary Imagination*, 286.

58 Saldaña-Portillo, *The Revolutionary Imagination*, 286.

59 Silva, *Toward a Global Idea of Race*, 25. Cotera and Saldaña-Portillo, "Indigenous But Not Indian?," 554–63, refers to this as a process of "mestizo mourning."

60 Bost, "Disability, Decoloniality, and Other-than-Humanist Ethics," 1567.

61 Cowing, "Occupied Land Is an Access Issue," 11.

62 Anzaldúa, *Borderlands / La Frontera*, 99, emphasis in the original.

63 Anzaldúa, *Borderlands / La Frontera*, 108, 25, 113.

64 Fradera, *Filipinas, la colonia más peculiar*.

65 See the very impressive online repository of Philippine literature in Spanish compiled at the web database "Humanidades digitales y literatura filipina en español," https://digiphilit.uantwerpen.be/.

66 Magellan died in the Philippines after a conflict with Indigenous peoples lead by Lapu-Lapu. He did not complete the journey that is credited to him.

67 Lifshey, *The Magellan Fallacy*.

68 For a notable critique of the "segmented" historiography of the Philippines, see Ileto, "Outlines of a Non-linear Emplotment."

69 Mojares, *Brains of the Nation*.

70 For more on this contradiction, see Velasco Shaw and Francia, *Vestiges of War*. For a more canonical treatment of "benevolent assimilation," see Miller, *"Benevolent Assimilation."*

71 Chu, "The 'Chinese' and the 'Mestizos' of the Philippines," 216. Chu's self-conscious framing with Chinese diasporic histories obliges him to define mestizos more narrowly as Chinese men and local women. Filipino mestizos, of course, included other mixtures that were not limited to Chinese as the only "foreign" element added to the autochthonous.

72 Hau, *The Chinese Question*, 5.

73 Chang, *Chino*; Paulina Lee, *Mandarin Brazil*; Lowe, *Intimacies of Four Continents*.

74 Goffe, "Chop Suey Surplus."

75 Chang, *Chino.*

76 Paulina Lee, *Mandarin Brazil*.

77 Vasconcelos, *La raza cósmica: Notas de viajes*, 17, emphasis added, my translation.

78 Chen, "The Stuff of Slow Constitution."

79 Vasconcelos, *La raza cósmica: Notas de viajes*, 9.

80 Vasconcelos, *La raza cósmica: Notas de viajes*, 9.

81 Siebers, *Disability Theory*, 7.

CHAPTER ONE

1 As I noted in the introduction, when I refer to the field of "Filipinx American studies" I elect to use the term "Filipinx" as a way of signaling my own queer political commitments and my desire for the field of which I am an embedded interlocutor. It is not meant to be prescriptive. I also mean to highlight the