SINCE 1922

VOL. 85 • NO. 1 • MAY 2012

UNITAS

SEMI-ANNUAL PEER-REVIEWED INTERNATIONAL ONLINE JOURNAL
OF ADVANCED RESEARCH IN LITERATURE, CULTURE, AND SOCIETY

THE INAPPROPRIATE OTHER(S) in Selected GUMIL-Hawaii Short Fiction (1977–1993)

BEATRIZ P. LORENTE

UNITAS

The Inappropriate Other(s) in Selected GUMIL-Hawaii Short Fiction (1977–1993)

VOL. 85 • NO. 1 • MAY 2012

UNITAS

SEMI-ANNUAL PEER-REVIEWED INTERNATIONAL ONLINE JOURNAL
OF ADVANCED RESEARCH IN LITERATURE, CULTURE, AND SOCIETY

The Inappropriate Other(s) in Selected GUMIL-Hawaii Short Fiction (1977–1993)

BEATRIZ P. LORENTE

Indexed in the International Bibliography of the Modern Language Association of America

The Inappropriate Other(s) in Selected GUMIL-Hawaii Short Fiction (1977–1993)

Copyright © 2012 Beatriz P. Lorente
and the University of Santo Tomas

About the Book Cover:
"Cutting Seed Cane" by Robert A. Duckworth-Ford

Layout by Paolo Miguel G. Tiausas
UNITAS Logo by Francisco T. Reyes

ISSN: 2619-7987
ISSN: 0041-7149

UNITAS is an international online peer-reviewed open-access journal of advanced research in literature, culture, and society published bi-annually (May and November).

UNITAS is published by the University of Santo Tomas, Manila, Philippines, the oldest university in Asia. It is hosted by the Department of Literature, with its editorial address at the Office of the Scholar-in-Residence under the auspices of the Faculty of Arts and Letters. Hard copies are printed on demand or in a limited edition.

Copyright @ University of Santo Tomas

Copyright

The authors keep the copyright of their work in the interest of advancing knowledge but if it is reprinted, they are expected to acknowledge its initial publication in UNITAS. Although downloading and printing of the articles are allowed, users are urged to contact UNITAS if reproduction is intended for non-individual and non-commercial purposes. Reproduction of copies for fair use, i.e., for instruction in schools, colleges and universities, is allowed as long as only the exact number of copies needed for class use is reproduced.

History and Coverage

Established in July 1922, UNITAS is one of the oldest extant academic journals published by a university in the Philippines as well as in Asia. Still, UNITAS is perhaps the oldest extant academic journal of its kind in the Philippines and Asia in terms of expansive disciplinary coverage and diverse linguistic representation through the decades. While always cognizant of disciplinary specialization, it has been "multidisciplinary" in publishing scholarship that is intra-disciplinary within the humanities and the arts, and interdisciplinary across the other disciplines. As it was in the beginning, it has aimed for "unitas" by conjoining disciplinary difference through its pages.

Moreover, it has been multi-linguistic on the whole, allowing itself to evolve from a journal published purely in Spanish, and then in English, becoming bilingual eventually in the various issues in which articles are written in Spanish and English, or

as has been the case in the last several decades, in English and Filipino. And, of late, UNITAS has also published articles in other languages.

Apart from its disciplinary inclusiveness and crossovers, in almost 100 years of its existence, UNITAS has expanded the conceptual terrain of academic and topical coverage. It has published on cutting-edge and time-honored themes in which both established and emerging voices in research and scholarship are heard in articles that range across traditions, modernities, movements, philosophies, themes, politics, geographies, histories, musical types, architectural styles, gender relations, sexualities, government and non-government institutions, educational philosophies, media, forms, genres, canons, pedagogies, literary and cultural relations, and comparative studies, among others, in book review essays, critical commentaries, scholarly papers, and monographs. Such an expansiveness has allowed for establishing new lines of inquiry or exploring new lines of thinking about old ones.

Editorial Policy

UNITAS invites work of outstanding quality by scholars and researchers from a variety of disciplinary, intra-disciplinary, interdisciplinary and cross-disciplinary principles, protocols and perspectives for its readership consisting primarily of academics, researchers, and graduate students, as well as of a diverse public consisting of scholars and leaders who are at the forefront of their fields and advocacies, undertaking research on multidisciplinary aspects of national and global issues within and beyond academia broadly from the perspective of but not limited to the human sciences.

In general, UNITAS aims to publish leading-edge and challenging articles and monographs in regular and special issues in relation to the critical currents and themes of the nation, the Asian region and the world which try to meet the various problems and opportunities of today's globalization.

Although single-authorship of articles remains typical, UNITAS encourages the submission of papers that are co-written by authors working across multi-cultural and multi-linguistic settings, which have resulted from an inter-cultural, inter-regional or inter-national collaboration of researchers in an effort to internationalize knowledge production, circulation and reception.

In particular, under the rubric of literary and cultural studies in Asia, UNITAS aims to be a platform for ethically engaged studies that represent intersections of national and international literatures, arts and cultures, crisscrossing critical and creative categories, authors and readers, "East" and "West," "North" and" South," text and

context, close readings and fieldwork, original works and translations, and theoretical and practical methodologies.

UNITAS welcomes submissions from all locations of the globe which are published in English, Philippine national and regional languages, and other foreign languages. Non-English language articles are required to submit an extended abstract in English containing the full argument rather than just a digest of the main idea.

Submissions to UNITAS are to follow the 8th edition of the MLA Style Manual. During the evaluation process, unless otherwise recommended by the double-blind peer reviewers to use a different documentation format, articles must be published following the MLA guidelines.

Ethical Policy

Every submission is assumed to have not been previously published and is not under consideration elsewhere for possible publication, unless it is a major submission meant as a reprint, and later approved for publication as such.

Plagiarism is the copying of large blocks of texts of someone's work and representing them as one's own. If plagiarism is ascertained after publication, the article may be withdrawn or retracted. Self-plagiarism or or duplication of passages without proper citation will be evaluated on a case-to-case basis.

After the protocols of peer review and editing, UNITAS may or may not ask the authors to review the article prior to publication due to constraints.

Securing the publishing rights of all photos, images, or charts accompanying the article is the responsibility of the author.

Articles have to be submitted via e-mail to unitasust@gmail.com

Address all communications to:
University of Santo Tomas Office of the Scholar-in-Residence/UNITAS Office, Faculty of Arts and Letters
G/F, St. Raymund de Peñafort Building, España St., 1008, Manila, Philippines
Telephone No: 406-1611 loc. 8830

International Editorial Board

Patricio Abinales
University of Hawaii at Manoa, US

Syed Farid Alatas
National University of Singapore

Jonathan Beller
Pratt Institute, US

John D. Blanco
University of California, San Diego

Melani Budianta
University of Indonesia

Richard Chu
University of Massachusetts, US

Joel David
Inha University, South Korea

Fabian Antonio M. Dayrit
Ateneo de Manila University

Eduardo Deves-Valdes
Universidad Santiago de Chile

Leonard Harris
Purdue University, US

Caroline Sy Hau
Kyoto University, Japan

Loren Kruger
University of Chicago, US

Bienvenido Lumbera
University of the Philippines

Pawit Mahasarinand
Director, Bangkok Art and Culture (BACC)

Victor Merriman
Edge Hill University, UK

Patrick A. Messerlin
Sciences Po, France

Resil Mojares
University of San Carlos
Cebu City, Philippines

International Editorial Board

Mitsuya Mori
Seijo University, Japan

Tran Van Phuoc
Hue University, Vietnam

E. San Juan, Jr.
Emeritus Professor of Ethnic Studies and Comparative Literature, University of Connecticut

Stephen Shapiro
University of Warwick, UK

Inseop Shin
Konkuk University, South Korea

Brian Singleton
Trinity College Dublin, Ireland

Megan Thomas
University of California, US

Nicanor G. Tiongson
University of the Philippines

Lily Rose Tope
University of the Philippines

Ruanni Tupas
National Institute of Education, Singapore

Christa Wirth
Universität Zürich, Switzerland

Paul Young
University of Exeter, UK

Nie Zhenzhao
Zhejiang University, China

Editorial Staff

Maria Luisa Torres Reyes
maria.luisa.reyes@ust.edu.ph
EDITOR IN CHIEF

Joyce L. Arriola
ASSOCIATE EDITOR

Lawdenmarc Y. Decamora
ASSISTANT EDITOR

Nicole R. Tablizo
Niccolo Rocamora Vitug
MANAGING EDITOR

Ralph Edward P. Sekito
EDITORIAL ASSISTANT

Contents

xii Acknowledgments

xiii Abstract

1 The Inappropriate Other(s) in Selected GUMIL-Hawaii Short Fiction (1977-1993)

65 Notes

71 References

76 About the Author

Acknowledgements

The author is indebted to Lulu Torres-Reyes who saw the value of this work and who patiently and tenaciously pushed the publication process from the beginning to the end. Your energy and your vision is incredible, Lulu. I am very grateful to Nicole Tablizo who coordinated the editing process and who graciously took care of all the details that complete a monograph - the cover, the abstract, the bionote - before she left UNITAS. Thank you to the anonymous editor who read and very competently edited and proofread this almost 25 year old text, to the person/s who located the hard copy of my MA thesis in the Ateneo de Manila University Library and retyped the whole manuscript in MS Word, to Cori Perez and my mother, Amelia P. Lorente, for help with translating some of the Ilocano passages and to Niccolo Angelo Vitug who took care of the final steps before publication.

Abstract

This monograph describes the images of the Inappropriate Other(s) in selected GUMIL-Hawaii short fiction from 1977 - 1993 and delineates the implications of such in colonial discourse. Specifically, it attempts to answer how the Inappropriate Other(s) is manifested in terms of the characters and settings of the short stories. The Inappropriate Otherness of the characters can be seen in the following motifs: (1) the desire to belong to the center of the colonial discourse'; (2) dispossession, marginalization, and rootlessness; (3) the fragmentation of one's self-image; (4) alienation from the Center, the margins and from one's own self and (5) sublimation of the power of the colonial center. In terms of setting, the colonial geography and a sense of displacement in the imagination and consciousness of the Ilocano characters signal their positions as Inappropriate Others. The monograph emphasizes the need to chronicle texts such as the short stories of GUMIL-Hawaii as part of the post-colonial project.

Keywords
GUMIL-Hawaii, Inappropriate Other, post colonialism, short fiction, migration

Introduction

The literature produced by the Gunglo dagiti Mannurat iti Iloko-Hawaii (GUMIL-Hawaii) is a postcolonial peculiarity. The "peculiarity" is both for the association and its literary products. It is a fact that GUMIL-Hawaii is a recognized branch of GUMIL-Filipinas, the nationwide association of Ilocano writers in the Philippines. It is a fact that GUMIL-Hawaii is based in Hawaii, USA and has existed there since 1971.[1] It is a fact that GUMIL-Hawaii is exclusively for writers in the Ilocano language who are in Hawaii. These GUMIL-Hawaii writers have produced poems, dramas, essays, biographies, novelettes, short stories and plays—written and sometimes performed—in the Ilocano language.[2] This literature has been compiled in anthologies produced by GUMIL-Hawaii in Hawaii to be read by Ilocanos in Hawaii and in the Philippines. How are these facts relevant to the statement that the literature of GUMIL-Hawaii is a postcolonial peculiarity?

The statement assumes several things. First, that GUMIL-Hawaii literature belongs to the postcolonial category and second, that GUMIL-Hawaii literature is peculiar because its characteristics make it very different from that of the norm.[3] These two threads of GUMIL-Hawaii literature constitute an important subject of study.

What does it mean to be "postcolonial"? To speak of the postcolonial is to refer to the larger concept of postcolonialism. Postcolonialism assumes the existence of colonialism in the world, colonialism being both a historical fact as well as a power relationship. As a historical fact, one can look at certain periods in history when one nation attempted to subjugate another by extending its political, economic, and cultural power over it. For example, one can refer to the Spanish and American periods of occupation in the

Philippines as the country's periods of colonization.[4] The present period of independence would then be the postcolonial period, "post" referring almost to a chronological period "after" the colonial. In this sense, GUMIL-Hawaii literature would be postcolonial, both from the point of view of the Philippines and the United States.[5] But colonization is also now recognized as a continuing historical phenomenon in the whole world. It is increasingly being seen as a power relationship, a dynamic one that alternately creates and re-creates itself, consequently defining and redefining historical contexts. In this light, postcolonialism can no longer be just a marker in history textbooks. The "post" in postcolonialism is a subject position critical of colonialism as a historical phenomenon and as a power relationship. It is critical insofar as it seeks to "[dismantle] the Centre/Margin of imperial discourse" (Ashcroft et al., *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader* 11).[6] No longer can colonialism be seen only as the matter of the Center (the colonizer) extending its control over the Margin (the colonized). Rather, postcolonialism recognizes the dynamism of such a discourse. It refuses to assign positive and/or negative values to the Center and the Margin, recognizing as it does, the diversity and plurality created by a discourse between the two. GUMIL-Hawaii and its literature are postcolonial in the sense that they can be studied from a subject position that is critical of colonialism and that recognizes their diversity and plurality as a product of such.

GUMIL-Hawaii literature is "peculiar" when seen in relation to a growing body of literature known as "immigrant literature," "literature in exile" and/or "expatriate literature."[7] GUMIL-Hawaii literature belongs to the broad category of "Asian American literature" and to the more specific category of "Filipino American literature."[8] But GUMIL-Hawaii literature has not been included in anthologies of Asian American and Filipino American literature; neither has it been included in anthologies of Filipino literature, despite the inclusion of so-called Filipino-American writers such as Carlos Bulosan, NVM Gonzales, Bienvenido Santos, and Jose Garcia Villa in those anthologies.[9] Nor has GUMIL-Hawaii literature been made the subject of critical study by postcolonial critics such as Epifanio San Juan. If such anthologies and studies are the norms in Asian American and Filipino

American literature, then the exclusion of GUMIL-Hawaii literature from them, points to its peculiarity. While a study of GUMIL-Hawaii literature is not divorced from the concerns of writers and critics of Filipino American, Asian American and postcolonial literature, this peculiarity all the more affirms the diversity such writers and critics are dealing with. In light of postcolonialism, one must recognize and chronicle such diversity in order to reclaim and redefine the histories of various "imagined communities" that were and are created and re-created by colonialism.[10] The imagined community, in this case, can be said to be that of the Ilocanos in Hawaii.

In dealing with this phenomenon of Filipinos writing in their native language from the United States, one must deal with the context of the phenomenon. Implicit in the existence of GUMIL-Hawaii literature is a complex power relationship between places (e.g., mainland USA—Hawaii—Philippines—Ilocos) and people (e.g., Americans—Hawaiian Americans—Ilocanos in Hawaii) and the colonial discourse. These are the very relationships which postcolonialism can problematize and be critical of. This is what this monograph seeks to do.

In order to accomplish its purpose, this study proposes to describe the images of the Inappropriate Other(s) in selected short fiction of GUMIL-Hawaii from 1977–1993 and the implications of such in colonial discourse. It examines how the Inappropriate Other is manifested first, in terms of the texts and second, of the contexts of the stories.

Specifically, this study aims to answer the following questions:

1. How is the Inappropriate Other manifested in terms of the elements of character and setting in selected short fiction of GUMIL-Hawaii from 1977–1993?
2. In relation to the first problem, do the terms of the specific context of the selected short fiction of GUMIL-Hawaii from 1977-1993 shed light on the Inappropriate Otherness of the texts? These terms are (a) Hawaii; (b) Hawaiian Ilocanos, and (c) GUMIL-Hawaii.

To begin responding to the preceding questions, there are several assumptions underlying the problems posed by this study.

First, it is assumed that the texts are postcolonial texts. In using the term “postcolonial”, one underlines the impossibility of decolonization insofar as a return to a pure and essential native is concerned. The term “postcolonial” does not imply the existence of a single colonial moment (for in the broad sense of the term, there is no such moment) but it does point to an ongoing relationship between colonizer and colonized that is at first glance reactive and then revolutionary.

Second, underlying the use of “postcolonial” as a term and a category is a subject position or frame of reference being taken by this study. By saying that a postcolonial society exists, this study aligns itself with those who believe that postcolonial societies are ideologically determined, that they do not exist “naturally” or “per se.” The texts of GUMIL-Hawaii are not “naturally” postcolonial. There is a recognition and assertion of a subject position here. Such recognition and assertion is essentially a political position, poised towards political criticism.[11] In this manner of reading, it is important to point out that both the texts and their specific contexts are important in developing a fuller and more authentic reading.

Third, it is assumed that postcolonial criticism, contextualized in the framework of the Inappropriate Other, will be relevant to the texts, that is that postcolonial criticism will shed light on the nuances of this specific body of literature that is GUMIL-Hawaii’s and that this exercise will be relevant to the projects of determining what are Filipino American and postcolonial literatures.

Fourth, it is assumed that the texts will also be relevant to the emerging field of postcolonial studies, particularly in relation to the experience of Ilocanos in Hawaii. Taken fully in this sense, the texts become sites of struggle where both the writer and the reader and a separate body which they create which is of and yet beyond the two, can re-write the history of Ilocanos in Hawaii and consequently of Filipinos in the United States and other postcolonial people as well.

Postcolonial Ambivalence

The definition of postcolonialism as a process of "dismantling the Centre/ Margin binarism of imperial discourse" (Ashcroft et al., *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader* 117), seemingly delineates only two terms—the Center and the Margin. It also seems to deal with colonialism as something that is already finished. As has been pointed out, colonialism is an ongoing discourse. It involves the dynamic interface of the Center and the Margin. The Ilocanos in Hawaii belong to an imagined community that is all their own. This can be viewed as a metaphor of the Center and the Margin which produces an Other that does not and cannot belong to neither the Center nor the Margin. This is an Other by itself. Trinh Minh-ha has renamed and in the process, redefined this Other as an Inappropriate Other ("No Master Territories" 215- 218).

In the presence of an Inappropriate Other, what would be the dynamics of a Center-Margin relationship? In terms of colonial discourse, one may simply say that the colonizer is the Center and the colonized is the Margin. However, the relationship between the colonizer and colonized can no longer be viewed in terms of reciprocity: "[t]he participants are frozen into a hierarchal relationship into which the oppressed is locked into position by assumed moral superiority of the dominant group" (Ashcroft et al., *The Empire Writes Back* 172). It must be noted here that this relationship is not as "frozen" as it may first seem to be. There is a growing awareness of the struggle between the participants, between the Center and Margin. This struggle is the "fundamental constitutive mode of such relations" (Ashcroft et al., *The Empire Writes Back* 172)

The struggle begins with the recognition of difference. Implicit in the term "struggle" is the participation of two or more parties who are definitely not similar to each other. By difference what is being referred to is:

> . . . a slippery and therefore, contested concept. There is the 'difference' which makes a radical and unbridgeable separation: and there is a 'difference' which is positional, conditional, and conjectural, closer to Derrida's notion of difference. (Hall 226)[12]

It is a definition closer to Derrida's *differance* that is being referred to. By being positional and conditional, difference becomes a "pressure, and a presence, that acts constantly, if unevenly along the entire boundary of authorization; [it] occupies a position in space lying on the borderline between outside and inside" (Bhabha, "Signs Taken for Wonders" 32). At this point, it is important to recognize that the texts, even before being subjected to textual analysis, already assert their being different by their very contexts. How do they recognize and assert their occupying a position "on the borderline between the outside and the inside"? First, in terms of the language used—the texts are in Ilocano, a Filipino language. As a vernacular language, Ilocano is 'different' from the so-called national language, Filipino. It is also 'different' from English which has been consistently identified as the international language. In the hierarchy where a Center-Margin relationship exists, Ilocano would be a marginalized language.[13] In the Philippines where Filipino is the national language, Ilocano is at the periphery. In relation to English, Ilocano would still be at the periphery even with the recognition of a "Philippine English."[14] Second, in terms of the place of origin, the texts were literally written on 'different' ground that is in Hawaii instead of the Philippines. The Ilocanos in Hawaii are the only known group who actively writes and publishes Ilocano literature in the United States.

These enunciations of 'difference' are important. It is at this point that the texts can be used to "problematize the division of past and present, tradition and modernity, at the level of cultural representation and its authoritative address" (Bhabha, "Cultural Diversity" 62-65). The traditional concept of universality and homogeneity which were ideologically conceived by the Center are thus questioned and undermined.[15] Under the subject position of postcolonialism, the texts become quite ambivalent. The ambivalence is the product of their occupying a space on the borderline of the Center and Margin. However, the borderline was never fixed, and therefore the texts' existence is always filled with simultaneous contradictions. Under the subject position of postcolonialism, it is when the texts are called postcolonial that they are differed. Thus, the moment of identity is also the moment of alienation. In postcolonialism, the moment one claims his 'different' iden-

tity is also the moment one loses it. In terms of the "I-Others" relationship, the moment one claims his being an "Other" is also the moment when one is "othered." By refusing, one actually consents. Thus the center is only the center because of the existence of the margins. And vice versa. "They accept the margins, so do we" (Minh-Ha, "No Master Territories" 215).

The ambivalence of this simultaneous and contradictory movement of identity and alienation is a theme repeated in postcolonial criticism. The relationship between the "I" and the "Other" or in the postcolonial perspective, between the colonizer and the colonized, is a complex relationship of power and domination. To account for colonization by saying that the colonized was merely a construct of the colonizer is an oversimplification. The movement between the colonizer and the colonized could not have been one-sided. A good example of this is the relationship between the Orient and the West. "The Orient was Orientalized not only because it was discovered to be 'Oriental' . . . but also because it could be – that is, submitted to being – made Oriental (Said, "Orientalism" 133).

This ambivalence of the colonial discourse underlines the dynamism of the moment of claiming "difference." This moment is no longer static. There is a dynamic dialectic in this moment of loss and identity, of being an Other and being othered. For while the center (I) marginalizes (others), the margin (Other) also centers the "I". For those who are marginalized, like the Ilocanos in Hawaii, "the margin become (our) sites of survival; become our fighting grounds and their sites of pilgrimage" (Minh-Ha215-216). This movement, by its very nature of being a dialectic, cannot be defined. It can only be described in terms of a problematic.

The product of the interface of the I and the Other, of the margin and the center belongs neither to the I nor the Other, neither the margin nor the center. It can be looked at as an Other in itself which "introduces . . . an ambivalence in the act of interpretation" (Bhabha, "Cultural Diversity" 208).[16] It is because of this ambivalence that one can claim to be 'different'. This Other is a point in consciousness parallel to the concept of nationalism—nations being a concept that is invented and nationalism being a mental construct, a point in one's consciousness.[17] What this Other is, is

defined by its boundaries, by its fences or enclosures rather than by what it encloses. This is parallel to the idea of ethnic boundaries where the identit of an ethnic group lies in its boundaries, in the points of which the group can say, “it is because of this that we are different” (Sollors 220). The process of creating this kind of Other, of naming and renaming, is what Vincent Rafael calls localization, or “ . . . the particular ways by which the boundaries that differentiate the inside from the outside of native societies are historically drawn, expanded, contracted, or obscured” ([15-16]. This localization and creation can also be described as a process of “demarcation and appropriation” where the natives find ways to domesticate the dislocating effects of colonization.[18]

This Other does not only say “I am different. I am neither this (Other) nor that (I). I am neither here (margin) nor there (center).” More explicitly, this Other can be described as:

> Not quite the Same, not quite the Other, she stands in that undetermined threshold place where she constantly drifts in and out. Undercutting the inside/outside opposition, her intervention is necessarily that of both a deceptive insider and a deceptive outsider. She . . . moves about with always at least two/four gestures, that of affirming ‘I am like you’ while persisting in her difference; and that of reminding ‘I am different’ while unsettling every definition of otherness arrived at . . . .” (Minh-Ha 218)

This is the Other which Trinh Minh-Ha names as the “Inappropriate Other.” True to the spirit of the dialectic, the Inappropriate Other is neither here nor there. The movement of the Inappropriate Other can be said to be in or even to create the Third Space. In this sense, the Inappropriate Other cannot be marginalized by the center because its boundaries are perpetually in motion. In the same sense, the Inappropriate Other underlines an identity always in transit, an identity that conceals and reveals at the same time and as such, that cannot be pinned down. The Inappropriate Other negates and therefore evades the strategies of the center, the position of the colonizer, with its “guerrilla tactics.” It continually demarcates and appropriates, establishing itself again and again but never in the same place and never at the same time. The Inappropriate Other cannot marginalize because of

its perpetually-in-motion boundaries. It cannot dispossess because it is in a state of constant flux. It cannot displace because it has no fixed points. The Inappropriate Other thrives on diversity and is therefore, necessarily ambivalent.

The notion of the Inappropriate Other may best describe the movements of the Center/Margin binary of colonial discourse. As such, it can manifest itself dynamically in both texts and contexts.

In particular, this study will look into selected short works of fiction from GUMIL-Hawaii's publications from 1977-1993. Of the eleven books published by GUMIL-Hawaii, only nine were available. Thus, the two other publications were excluded from the selection under study—*Dandaniw*, a book of poems, and *Bullalayaw* (Rainbow).[19] Of the nine available books, only five contained short stories: *Utek ni Kayumanggi* [The Mind of the Brown Man]; *Bin-i* [Seedling]; *Dawa* [Sprout]; *GUMIL-Hawaii Iti Dua A Dekada* [GUMIL-Hawaii in Two Decades] and *Beggang* [Ember].[20] In selecting the stories to be used for this study, the criterion used by Campomanes to describe most of the writing produced by Filipinos in the United State was used. Therefore, only short stories with "motifs of departure, nostalgia, incompletion, rootlessness, leave taking and dispossession . . . with the Philippines as either the original or terminal reference point" were selected ("Filipinos in the United States" 21). Although my father, Felino L. Lorente and I translated important passages, translation is not the subject of this study. The translations are at best working translations, provided for the non-Ilocano reader. The subject foregrounds the elements of character and setting for its textual analysis. The other formal elements of fiction (e.g., point of view, theme, symbol and irony) have been subsumed in the discussions of character and setting.

It is worth pointing out that the framework may be able to describe the dialectic of the Inappropriate Other as described in the texts, but it cannot fully account for the context of the texts. The phenomenon of an immigrant population writing in its mother tongue in its adopted country seems to be peculiar to the Ilocano community, at least insofar as Filipino American literature is concerned. One must point out here that the history and the situation of Ilocanos in Hawaii are very different from those of Ilocanos on

the Mainland. Accounting for this phenomenon would necessitate taking into consideration social, economic, and even political factors, which are beyond the scope of this study. This study concerns itself primarily with a literary interpretation and textual analysis of GUMIL-Hawaii short stories. The context of the texts will be discussed in a limited manner as the background to the textual discussion.

The phenomenon has linguistic implication in terms of the development of a hybrid Hawaiian Ilocano language. Again, this is beyond the scope of this study. The study will not delve into the linguistic possibility of a hybrid Ilocano.

Background of GUMIL-Hawaii Short Fiction

This section foregrounds the context of the short fiction of GUMIL-Hawaii in terms of the continuing history of Hawaii, Hawaiian Filipinos and GUMIL-Hawaii, and the implications on the production and, consequently, consumption of the texts. This is done in relation to one of the specific objectives of this study, which is to situate the texts in their context, a knowledge of which is invaluable in seeing the analysis of the texts in an authentic light. The specific terms of the context are examined in light of the concept of the Inappropriate Other, the terms being Inappropriate Others in their own right. The terms specified here must be seen as interacting and not independent of one another. This is to further explicate and affirm the idea that GUMIL-Hawaii literature has a peculiarity all its own in the world and a subject position of the postcolonial. The following discussion serves to highlight the Inappropriate Otherness of the texts of the GUMIL-Hawaii short fiction which will be analyzed in the next section.

Hawaii as an Inappropriate Other

It is a fact that the GUMIL-Hawaii short stories were written and published in Hawaii. It is also a fact that such short stories are bought and read and therefore, consumed by Ilocanos in Hawaii. These facts can be said to be 'peculiar' or 'different' in a sense. First, one must point out the peculiarity of Hawaii. Hawaii is the 50th state of the United States of America.

This island state, which is geographically separated from the continent of North America (also referred to as the“Mainland” by Ilocanos in Hawaii) is also the youngest state, having been admitted into the union only in 1959. Second, one must also point out the peculiarity of the Ilocanos being in Hawaii, a group of Pacific Islands many thousands of kilometers away from the Philippines. Third, there is the peculiarity of Ilocanos reading and writing, individually and more importantly, as an association, in their native language, Ilocano, while they live in Hawaii, USA. These peculiarities point to a Hawaii that is ‘different’ and that can potentially be an Inappropriate Other.

That Hawaii is ‘different’ can be gleaned from the very popular distinction between “Mainland” to refer to the states on the continent of North America and “Hawaii” as geographically separated from the “Mainland.” First, Hawaii is geographically separated from the Mainland, it being a group of islands situated in the Pacific Ocean.[21] It is the last and the youngest state of the US, its statehood having been granted only on August 21, 1959, after almost 60 years of being a US territory. It has a tropical climate and a topography entirely different from that of the Mainland. Instead of being a continuous land mass, the state of Hawaii is composed of the main islands of Hawaii. Kauai, Lanai, Maui, Molokai, and Naiihau.

Second, it can be said that Hawaii has also been excluded from the history of the Mainland. It has a history that is ‘peculiar’, especially when seen vis-s-vis the accepted history of the Mainland, to wit:

> Hawaii is an island community of immigrants; even the Hawaiians migrated to these islands from western Polynesia . . . These settlers were able to develop their own culture and way of life isolated from the rest of the world until James Cook ‘discovered’ Hawaii in 1778. (Teodoro 6)

Before the Europeans came, Hawaiians had already established a theocratic class-caste system headed by the local chiefs. But English explorer Captain James Cook’s arrival in 1778 precipitated the collapse of the fragile island civilization. The influx of trading ships rapidly undermined tradi-

tional Hawaiian agriculture and replaced it with an economy built around meeting international agricultural demands (Teodoro 6).

Early in the documented history of Hawaii, one can already see the workings of the colonial discourse. Colonialism for the early Hawaiians meant European colonizers' entry and control of the island economy and subsequently, of the islands' politics and way of life as well. The *haole* ("foreigners of European descent") influence on Hawaiian economic and political life can be said to be indicative of the kind of intervention the colonizing power would take in later years. Through the *haole*'s influence, a new form of government was organized where "American and European missionary-business interests effectively seized control of the various government institutions (Teodoro 7). A further reading of Hawaiian history also shows how the colonizing power used the constitutional monarchy (in which the king was a mere figurehead) to dispossess and alienate the Hawaiian people from their very own land.[22] This is quite glaring in the period of time when Hawaii was claimed as a "territory" of the United States. The colonial (and racist) agenda of the US was quite clear in this excerpt quoted by Teodoro from the Hearings before Congress of the Emergency Labor Commission (U.S. Congress, Washington, D.C., 1921): "The territory of Hawaii is now and is going to remain American under any condition and we are going to control the situation out there . . . the white race, the white people, the Americans in Hawaii are going to dominate and will dominate." (Teodoro 10)

In this deceiving state of being a "territory" of the US, Hawaii was practically not given any access to power in the colonial discourse, even as the dominating party was using Hawaii to produce sugar and agricultural products to be consumed exclusively by its markets. This growing dependence on the American market marginalized Hawaii all the more. It is, for example, particularly ironic that Prince Kuhio (also called Prince Cupid) had to fight for the Rehabilitation Act which would give Hawaiians homesteads when they had communally owned the land in the first place.[23] The figure of Prince Kuhio is an apt metaphor for the history of Hawaii. Sent to the United States Congress as the Republican delegate of the territory of Hawaii, he had very limited political powers and was a figurehead in the US controlled Hawaiian

economy and politics. Such contradictions and resulting dispossession and fragmentation can be said to be indicative of the Inappropriate Otherness of Hawaii. In terms of having power in the colonial discourse, Hawaii had none, even as it was called a “territory.”

This irony is all the more emphasized in Hawaii’s becoming the 50th state of the United States. The campaign for statehood came with promises of a better life and vague and general statements about ‘democracy’, ‘citizenship”, and ‘freedom’. Consider, for example, the following statement made by Senator Howard W. Cannon at the Senate hearings for the statehood of Hawaii where the “othering” of Hawaii (and consequently, of the people living in it) and its separation from the Mainland or from “America” is quite evident:

> I believe that Hawaiian statehood would bolster American democracy in the Pacific, an area where American influence has suffered serious setbacks . . . Not only would Hawaiian statehood bolster our military defenses and serve notice of our intention to remain in the Pacific; it would provide a State where the peoples of the Pacific and Asia could study American traditions, where they could have visual proof that the East and West can meet . . . under the flag of freedom. Today, Hawaii, with its rich tradition in the service of democracy holds perhaps an even more strategic role in the defense of America . . . The Hawaiian peoples have demonstrated their citizenship and Americanism . . . . (*The Shaping of Modern Hawaiian History* 164-165)

That the granting of statehood to Hawaii was actually the cause of great celebration among peoples in Hawaii points all the more to the dominant power’s ability to interpellate the subordinate power into the dominant mode of relations in colonial discourse, making Inappropriate Others of those it controls and hegemonizes.

Today, Hawaii is known by the popular names of “Aloha State” and “Paradise of the Pacific.” Such names point all the more to the “exotization” and consequently, the Othering and marginalization of Hawaii from the mainland center. To say the Hawaiians have been accorded the same rights and powers as other American citizens is to underline the Hawaiians being “both (a) deceptive insider(s) and (a) deceptive outsider(s) . . .” (Minh-Ha

218). Do Hawaiians really have the same rights and privileges as other Americans? Hawaii's main agricultural products are still sugarcane and pineapple and its principal market is still the Mainland. Its economic as well as its industrial development, can be said to lag behind that of other American states.[24] Tourism is Hawaii's outstanding activity and highest source of income, affirming all the more its exoticization and "Otherness" in the consciousness of other Americans and its being at the periphery of the colonial discourse (this time as a "vacation place"). Its being first and foremost a tourist destination, can be said to be a continuation of the pattern and the irony of Hawaiian history, which is that of 'agreeing' to the dominant, marginalizing, and certainly, exploitative power that is the USA.

The concept of the Inappropriate Other also allows for the foregrounding of the ways by which the dominant power is sublimated and continues to be sublimated by the subordinate party or the Margin. The Margin which had been othered by colonial discourse re-appropriates and renames its own self, in the process creating an Inappropriate Other which can evade the colonial discourse's hegemonizing movement. In relation to Hawaii, it would be interesting to look at its population. Hawaii is a state of immigrants, a large number of them are Asians. The isolation of Hawaii from the Mainland, its history and the plantation economy it had, make the situation of Asians very different from that of Asians in the Mainland:

> The opportunities to make a place for themselves in the islands were greater for them than for their brethren on the mainland. They lived in a society where the elite included Hawaiians. . . and where racial divisions could not be drawn as sharply on the continent . . . they were able to establish families sooner than their continental counterparts. They lived in stationary communities . . . enabling them to transplant large part of their traditional culture . . . unlike Asians on the mainland, they constituted a majority of the population. They did not compete with a large majority of the population. They did not compete with a large white working class or arouse "ethnic antagonism" between Asian and white labor. They did not become victims of white working-class racism and violence . . . . (Takaki 176)[25]

Such a statement would point to the capacity and potential of those living in Hawaii to subvert and sublimate the dominating power. Of specific concern of this study are the Filipinos who formed a large part of the first wave of immigrant-workers on the plantations of Hawaii.

Filipinos in Hawaii as Inappropriate Other

The Filipinos in Hawaii can be said to share a very close and intimate history with this island state. The first wave of Filipino immigrants arrived in Hawaii in late 1906 in response to the recruitment campaigns of the Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association (HSPA). Just as Philippine recruitment agencies recruit and place overseas Filipino workers (OFWs) today, so did Filipino agents of the HSPA recruit large numbers of plantation workers then.[26] It was not long before Filipinos began arriving in Hawaii in large numbers despite the discouragement of those who were already there. Approximately 45,000 Filipinos arrived in Hawaii between 1925 and 1929 and for the period between 1906 and 1930, the HSPA was able to bring approximately 150,000 Filipinos to Hawaii. The prevalence of Filipinos in Hawaii was such that as early as 1926, Filipinos already comprised 50 percent of sugar plantation workers. Most of the Filipinos who went to Hawaii were unmarried young men in search of a better life.[27] A great majority of the first wave decided to stay in Hawaii although many Filipinos also chose either to return to the Philippines or to move out of Hawaii and work in Mainland US, e.g. in farms in California, salmon canneries in Alaska, etc.

The history of Filipinos in the plantation world of Hawaii is one that is marked by oppression and marginalization.[28] The situation of Hawaii at the time of their arrival and the very conditions of their recruitment already contributed much to their oppression. Of the groups of Asian plantation workers, Filipinos received the least for the same work. The economic returns were negligible and glaringly exploitative if one considers the physical exertion and long working hours they had to undergo:

> From 80 to 90 percent of field labor was done on the basis of the 'piece-work' system . . . about five percent (of the Filipino workers) earned the minimum one dollar a day . . . The able bodies received at least sixty dollars

> monthly as cane loaders, fifty as portable track men or cane haulers, seventy-five as seed or cane cutters, or sixty as watchmen. (Teodoro 19)

This kind of work effectively marginalized the Filipino, confining him to the label of "plantation worker", a term that existed only insofar as he was productive in the fields. The effort of the Filipinos at labor organizing during the 1920s and 1940s can be seen as their effort at sublimating the dominant power, at re-appropriating their own selves which had been othered (under the label of "plantation worker") by the center.[29] A crucial name in this effort is that of Pablo Manlapit who headed the Filipino union and who, on January 19, 1920, issued an order for the Filipinos to go on strike while urging the Japanese to join them. Although such labor organizing has been considered as the Filipinos' greatest contribution to the history of Hawaii, the objectives of such labor unions was simply to get better wages and working conditions for the Filipino workers in Hawaii. This was limited:

> All in all, the Filipino experience in the labor movement has so far not been expressed in organizing for the specific purpose of securing a larger share in decision making. This limited participation in the power structure, while not the only one, is certainly one of the more important reasons why Filipinos have not advanced as rapidly in Hawaii as other ethnic groups. (Teodoro 25)

Thus, although the strikes staged by Filipinos workers were already revolutionary, there was no real change in the system. This was because the ways in which the work of plantation workers was organized prevented the formation of durable and strong community-wide organizations:

> Scattered over large distances in relatively isolated areas, and largely a transient population, the early Filipinos did not develop any strong community-wide organizations. For the most part, their organization was shortsighted, temporary, localized, and unable to act within the community as a whole or effectively outside. (Teodoro 21)

Visible here are two simultaneous and contradictory movements in the person of the Filipino plantation worker. Such is a mark of the Inappropriate

Other. The Filipino plantation workers are seen opposing the system they have been marginalized in, even as they continue to be within its terms.

Such a pattern can be said to be true until the present day. As of 1990, Filipinos represented 15.2 percent of the Hawaiian population: "[t]hey are thus the third largest ethnic group after Whites (33.4%) and Japanese (22.3%) . . ." (*Social Process in Hawaii*, Preface). Despite this preponderance of Filipinos in Hawaii, their participation in the decision-making process and their economic power is still somewhat limited.[30] There is a large concentration of Filipinos in the more readily available, less prestigious, and lower-paying occupations. This fact is also indicative of the relatively low educational status and achievement of the Filipino in Hawaii.[31] Even if a number of Filipinos have already managed to carve niches of their own in Hawaiian society, the fact remains that the Filipinos in Hawaii, as a group, still face problems ranging from what may seem to be elementary (like learning English and taking care of the oldtimers) to the more complicated (e.g., housing, parenthood, education, employment).

The problems of Hawaiian Ilocanos are compounded by the existence of the gap between two groups: the locals (first generation immigrants and their descendants), and the postwar Filipinos (those who arrived in the post-World War II period). Both groups have stereotypes of each other. The locals regard the postwar Filipinos as being "uppity", "pushy", "know-it-all", non-insider Filipinos, "tight pants", and "clothes conscious" and the postwar Filipino group, on the other hand, consider the locals as being "passive", "lacking in class", "sloppy dressers", "uncultured", "lacking in depth" and "*bakya*" (Teodoro 58).

Such stereotypes and the resulting gap between the two groups only serve to marginalize Filipinos in Hawaii all the more. In the first place, the existence of stereotypes can be seen as part of the hegemonizing agenda of the dominant power in colonial discourse. The assignment of stereotypes with corresponding values creates images which identify and alienate the Filipinos from non-Filipinos, from each other, and more importantly, from their own selves, making it easier for them to be made subjects of the colonial

discourse. Such alienation, as a result of constructed images which do not correspond with reality, can be seen as a mark of the Inappropriate Other.

It is interesting to see, at this point, how Filipino immigrants respond to being in Hawaii. It appears that he "copes" with Hawaii by calling and counting on structures, values, and practices he had counted on back in the Philippines. Thus, one witnesses the reconstruction of kinship networks, sometimes based on hometown origins, into voluntary associations in Hawaii. One also witnesses the use of the native language (predominantly Filipino and Ilocano) in conversations, as well as the performance of traditional rituals and practices in an attempt, it seems, to assert the Filipino's uniqueness in Hawaii. Such an assertion of "difference" in a foreign space can be seen as indicative of the Inappropriate Otherness of Filipinos in Hawaii. One can see such use of Philippine culture as the Hawaiian Filipinos' symbolic reclaiming of the "I" which had been othered by the center of colonial discourse. This can be seen as the Filipinos' way of centering the Self which had been marginalized by the dominant colonial power. Yet, the Filipino cannot entirely return to the "I" who had existed in his mind nor can he return to the "center" which he perceives he had occupied back in the Philippines. Thus, the Hawaiian Filipino is ". . . not quite the Same [and] not quite the Other . . ." (Minh-Ha 218).

The limitations of and the problematic involved in such a position and the reactions of Hawaiian Filipinos have already been acknowledged and explicated:

> The use of Philippine culture merely as a means of defining Filipino uniqueness, on the other hand, tends to contribute only to the reinforcement of and even to the development of negative stereotypes. This attitude tends to express itself in terms of the outward manifestations of Philippine culture . . . [which] often tend to be regarded as curiosities, and as "proof" of prevailing prejudices. (Teodoro 54)

If anything, the expression and maintenance of immigrant Filipino ethnic identity could be said to be maladaptive rather that adaptive for immigrants insofar as they reinforce derogatory stereotypes of Filipinos prevalent

in Hawaii that originated with the largely uneducated plantation laborers. The emergence of a residential enclave, the formation of voluntary associations, the performance of traditional religious rituals, and the observance of other cultural norms and activities could be construed by non-Filipinos as demonstrated evidence of immigrant unwillingness or inability to adapt, assimilate, or integrate into the larger society and therefore "explanatory" in a superficial sense of their subordinate, socioeconomic status (Okamura, *Beyond Adaptationism* 69-70)

While acknowledging the limitations and difficulties involved in the responses of Filipinos to Hawaii, it must also be foregrounded that the Hawaiian Filipinos' Inappropriate Otherness is a continuous process involving simultaneous and contradictory actions. The assertion of 'difference' via the use of Philippine culture can be seen as only one tactic among many, used in order to evade being adapted, assimilated, or integrated into the hegemonic colonial discourse. Just as the existence of Filipino stereotypes in Hawaii is indicative of the dynamics of colonial discourse therein, so is the implicit assumption that all Filipinos (or all ethnic groups for that matter) aim to be accepted into American society, a stereotype that is again indicative of the hegemonic and hegemonizing movement of the colonial discourse. It is perhaps more accurate to say that Filipinos in Hawaii seek to be included in the discourse of power in Hawaiian and consequently, American society, but on their own terms. The expression and maintenance of Filipino ethnic identity which has been seen as being potentially maladaptive can also be seen as symbolic of the Filipinos claiming their own terms in the space of Hawaiian and American society. This is again a simultaneous and contradictory action where the Filipino, whether he is conscious of it or not, seeks to evade being co-opted into the dominant party's discourse. Therefore, such an assertion of "difference" in the use of Philippine culture is still valid and important, if the Hawaiian Filipino is to maintain his diversity and plurality, his Inappropriate Otherness in what may be the emerging hybrid societies of Hawaii and the United States.

To speak of the Filipino in Hawaii is also to speak of the Ilocano in Hawaii. What has been discussed can be seen as applying not only to Filipinos

in general, but also more specifically, to the Ilocanos. Ilocanos constitute an overwhelming majority of the Filipinos in Hawaii such that Hawaii is known as another "*Kailokuan*" across the Pacific, as if Hawaii were just another Ilocos province. Eighty percent of Hawaiian Filipinos are Ilocanos and this number continues to increase every year: "A large majority of the new immigrants come from the Ilocos region of the Philippines, which has continued the dominance of the Ilokano linguistic group in the Filipino community in Hawaii" (Alegado 23). As has been mentioned, the dominance of the Ilocanos in the Filipino population is not entirely new. Due to their own marginalization back in the Philippines,[32] Ilocanos were among the first to respond to the call for more laborers in the Hawaiian sugarcane and pineapple plantations and they responded in large numbers.

In the case of the Hawaiian Ilocanos, their symbolic claiming of their own terms is not just seen in their observance of native customs and their organizing Ilocano voluntary associations, their claim and their Inappropriate Otherness is quite literally heard and transmuted in their continued use of their native language, Ilokano. This is perhaps the most striking and potentially the most powerful characteristic of the Hawaiian Ilocano: "[t]he Filipino immigrant group's large size, its short term of residency in Hawaii, the attitude of transiency held by many of its members, and isolation from the use of the Philippine languages, especially Ilokano" (Teodoro 44). This predominance of Ilocano is such that the Department of Indo-Pacific languages in the Philippine Studies Center of the University of the Hawaii, now has course offerings in both the Tagalog and Ilokano languages.

It is not surprising, therefore, that there is a significant number of Ilocano associations in Hawaii. Among the Filipino social clubs and mutual aid societies are township organizations of Ilocanos such as Anak ti batac, Marcos Town Association, La Union Circle, and Ilocos Norte Aid Association of Hawaii. The Aglipayan Church, which has a large following among Ilocanos, is a presence in Honolulu.

Among these associations, GUMIL-Hawaii has been described as being

> [a]n organization of Ilokano writers, poets and producers of theatre productions. Some of the best short stories written by GUMIL members

> are published in *Bannawag*, the most widely read Ilokano magazine in the Philippines which has a large circulation in Hawaii. (Alegado 26)

In the discourse of Hawaii, GUMIL-Hawaii can be said to specifically claim its own terms not just in its enunciation of the Ilocano language. More importantly, its act of writing is a powerful act of claiming its own space, peculiar only to GUMIL-Hawaii. The Inappropriate Otherness of GUMIL-Hawaii is personified in the Ilocanos' apparently contradictory condition of producing and consuming Ilocano texts even as they are in Hawaii.[33]

GUMIL-Hawaii as an Inappropriate Other

As indicated in an earlier section of this study, GUMIL-Hawaii has already published "anthologies" covering a period of 20 years from 1973 to 1993. Such regularity in publication is an outstanding characteristic of GUMIL-Hawaii. The history and literature of GUMIL-Hawaii, then, has been thoroughly chronicled ever since its conception in January 1971. However, the publications of GUMIL-Hawaii which are identified as "anthologies" are not "anthologies" in the strictest sense. More than a literary organization with its own characteristic share of beauty contests and award nights, GUMIL-Hawaii published anthologies that are not just chronicles of Hawaiian Ilocanos, Hawaiian Filipinos, and Hawaii.[34] In fact, the first two GUMIL-Hawaii anthologies were more like yearbooks containing essays, pictures, and biographies of prominent Hawaiian Filipinos (more often than not, these Filipinos were Ilocanos). For example, *Dagiti Pagwadan a Filipino iti Hawaii* was the first "anthology" published by GUMIL-Hawaii Activities, and there were biographies of Hawaiian Ilocanos as well.. Such specific, individual, and personal histories are essential. The objectives of GUMIL-Hawaii are also explicated in this volume:

> (1) To study and learn the most effective ways and means of communicating the Ilokano dialect, and inculcate always in all Ilocanos to cherish their native tongue;

> (2) To develop and sharpen those with writing talent as they put into writing what they see, hear, feel, and observe around them, and thus, promoting and advancing the cause of Ilocano literature;
>
> (3) To enable these writers to compile their literary works for publication, for posterity to preserve, cherish, and emulate; such literary works may be: (a) biographies and autobiographies of famous Ilocanos who have made noble achievements for the betterment of Ilocanos in Hawaii; (b) essays and short stories regarding the efforts of these famous Ilocanos; and (c) poetry, novels, dramas, and stories made by the authors themselves and;
>
> (4) To study ways and means of uniting the Ilocanos in words . . . . (Saludes, *Dagiti Pagwadan* 134-135)

From these objectives, one can clearly see the agenda of GUMIL-Hawaii as well as the assumptions behind it. One can say that the agenda is oriented toward preserving and keeping what is identified as Ilocano in an assertion of identity and 'difference' . Implicit in the objectives of GUMIL-Hawaii is the assumption of the importance of the act of writing and acknowledgment of the power and the potential of language, especially in their subject position as Ilocanos in Hawaii. The power of language is manifested twofold: first, in the consumption of these Ilocano texts as GUMIL-Hawaii actively promotes Ilocano readership, and second, in the fact that *Bannawag* is subscribed to and is popular with Ilocanos in Hawaii.

What motivates the writers and readers of GUMIL-Hawaii? What needs does GUMIL-Hawaii fulfill both on the parts of the writers and readers?

> GUMIL-Hawaii is borne of sentiment and necessity . . . The Filipino immigrant feels when he first arrives in Hawaii a sense of enchantment and fulfilment. . . But soon the euphoria of enchantment gives way to nostalgia. She is soon possessed by a deep sense of remembering . . . (Saludes et al., *GUMIL Hawaii iti Dua a Dekada* v).

These motivations and needs of both GUMIL-Hawaii's producers and consumers of Ilocano literature are again indicative of the Inappropriate Other. Two motivations are enunciated here: first, sentiment and second, necessity. The motive of sentiment is indicative of the desire to return to the

past, to the subject position one originally had in the Philippines. There is a simultaneous and contradictory movement in this nostalgic remembering: the Ilocano desires to go back to the Philippines even as he is already in Hawaii. The motive of necessity when seen in relation to sentiment can only come from a strong sense of alienation and marginalization in Hawaii. Thus, it becomes necessary for the purposes of self-preservation to 'remember' and 'reclaim' one's 'difference' in the face of assimilation into the colonial center.

First, writing is claiming one's own space which, though seemingly non-existent in the world outside of the text, can now be concretized and occupied by words. This space is necessarily also a subject position that asserts its being 'different'. Second, writing is claiming the "I" which in Hawaii had become an 'Other'. GUMIL-Hawaii centers, in the act of writing, the Self which had been relegated to the margin by colonial discourse.

In this light, the texts are more than just passive reflections of the life of Ilocanos and Filipinos in Hawaii. The texts become sites of struggle, having been the embodiment of a consciousness that is an Inappropriate Other. The texts are sites of struggles where the Inappropriate Other(s) of Hawaii, Hawaiian Ilocanos, and GUMIL-Hawaii have re-appropriated their Selves.

The Texts as Inappropriate Other

This section foregrounds GUMIL-Hawaii's short fictions as the texts which are the sites of struggles where the Inappropriate Others of Hawaii, Hawaiian Filipinos, and GUMIL-Hawaii have reclaimed and re-appropriated their selves from the othering movement of the colonial center. The dynamics of this reclaiming and re-appropriation of self is discussed in terms of the formal elements of character and setting. The subject position of postcolonialism in the framework of the Inappropriate Other is used to reveal and unfold the image of this reclaiming and re-appropriation in the elements of character and setting of the short stories. This is in keeping with the primary objectives of this study which is to show the manifestations of the Inappropriate Other in the texts, with the purpose of creating a composite and dynamic picture of the face of the Inappropriate Other.[35] For the aims of this study, the common characteristics between the characters and setting of the stories

were used as the basis for naming specific categories and grouping certain variations together. Each individual character and setting, though, still have their own very specific nuances. It is also impossible to entirely separate one element from the other, especially since character and setting find further contextualization in each other. The heading used for the following subsections must be seen only as indications of the element being foregrounded.

The Inappropriate Other in the Characters of GUMIL-Hawaii Short Fiction

As subjects, the characters in the GUMIL-Hawaii texts are very diverse. In keeping with the basis of selection, all the characters have "(m)otifs of departure, nostalgia, incompletion, rootlessness, leave taking and dispossession . . ." (Campomanes 51). Also, in keeping with the criteria, all the characters share a common "place experience." All the characters have two reference points in their consciousness: Hawaii and the Philippines. The characters in the stories have the Philippines "as either (their) original or terminal reference point" (Campomanes 51). More specifically, the characters refer to the Ilocos region as their original or terminal reference point. Implicitly and explicitly, Hawaii is also the original or terminal reference point in their consciousness whether they have been (or have not been) to Hawaii, are in (or not in) Hawaii, are going to (or not going to) Hawaii, or desire (or do not desire) to go to Hawaii. Such specificity of place in the consciousness of the characters is one characteristic of GUMIL-Hawaii short fiction which makes it peculiar and 'different'.

The stories are populated with characters from different denominations which is reflective of the ethnic composition of Hawaiian society (e.g., Japanese, Koreans, Americans, Hawaiians).These characters occupy certain positions in the society where these stories are set. It can be said that all the characters, due to colonialism, are Inappropriate Others in their own right. However, what is foregrounded in this study are the characters who identify themselves, implicitly or explicitly, as being Filipino or Ilocano.[36] These characters are the main concern of this study. The other characters are discussed in relation to these Filipino or Ilocano characters.

The Filipino or Ilocano characters in the GUMIL-Hawaii stories range from the images of the more familiar old-timer and *balikbayan* to those from ordinary families in Hawaii with their everyday and sometimes, mundane concerns; from overtly oppressed characters such as the plantation workers to silent characters who barely speak or who are only referred to by other characters in the texts. The latter specifically refers to the female characters such as the wives or girlfriends of the male characters who were left in the Philippines or brought to Hawaii , the women prostitutes in Hawaii and the lepers in Molokai, the young Filipino women who marry old Hawaiianos and the grandmother who was brought to Hawaii to become both babysitter and housekeeper of her children's families. Aside from the women, silent characters also include the families and communities that one goes home to or leaves behind in the Philippines or in the Ilocos. All of these characters are a palpable presence in the texts.

The characters must be viewed as complex and multi-faceted subjects. A character such as the worker is also a husband who has family in the Philippines. He is also a would-be *balikbayan* who is estranged from his relatives in Hawaii. Therefore, the classifications of characters in these sections are based on the images of the characters that are foregrounded in the texts. Each image holds the possibility of emphasizing and delineating a face of the Inappropriate Other. These facets and images of the characters interact with each other. In the process, they create an authentic picture of the Inappropriate Other.

There are four images which are foregrounded in the stories. These are: (a) the worker; (b) the *balikbayan*; (c) the estranged family member; and (d) the woman. Each character has its own variations.

A. THE WORKER

The image of the worker is a pervasive one among the characters of GUMIL-Hawaii stories. The worker can be found in all the stories, although his experiences are not always foregrounded. In the stories, the Filipino or Ilocano worker occupies a marginal position in Hawaiian society with an

occupation such as postal employee, clerk, secretary, insurance agent, US Navy man, plantation worker, nurse, carpenter, construction worker.[37]

There are two kinds of stories in relation to the image of the Filipino or Ilocano as worker. First, there is the story of the Filipino or Ilocano worker who appears to be aware of his marginality and his resulting oppression. In such stories, the image of the worker as subject to what he perceives to be unfair labor practices and/or ostracism, is foregrounded. The story becomes a chronicle of his struggle against oppressive forces. The story also chronicles his sometimes all too predictable and all too problematic triumph. The image of the Filipino or Ilocano worker in these stories is close to that of being a revolutionary, in a quite stereotypical sense. This is a worker who creates a lot of noise and who overtly calls attention to his marginalization and oppression.

Second are the stories of the silent Filipino or Ilocano worker. This worker is silent because his image as a worker in the stories is in the background. In these stories, the images of being a husband or a *balikbayan* predominate. The existence of both kinds of stories indicates the complexity of the characters and of the colonial discourse they are a part of. Although both kinds of stories are of interest to this study, the first image is emphasized. The implications of silent workers are noted at the end.

There are thus, four main variations of the Filipino or Ilocano worker: (a) the oppressed Filipino or Ilocano worker who is usually a young man making noise about his oppression and marginalization; (b) the old man or woman who migrates to Hawaii and becomes a babysitter or housekeeper of his or her children's families; (c) the oldtimer; and (d) the silent worker.

A.1. THE OPPRESSED FILIPINO OR ILOCANO WORKER

In the stories where the Ilocano worker is foregrounded as being oppressed, the Ilocano occupies a position where manual labor is involved. Thus, he is either an agricultural worker or one who belongs to the service sector. Such sectors are marked not just by low salaries but also by a lack of financial and employment security. Most of these characters have been hired on a temporary contractual basis and those who are under probation find

themselves in only slightly better positions. In all instances, the characters raise their voices against what they perceive to be discrimination and unfair labor practices practiced against them since they are "different," that is, since they are Filipino or Ilocano. The stories are consistent reflections of the marginalization of Filipinos or Ilocanos in the Hawaiian economy. Filipinos or Ilocanos, as reflected in these characters, are confined to the economic areas where they do not have and where they will not have access to the language and discourse of power.[38]

In Mel A. Gonzales' "*Ikkis ni Kayumanggi Iti Paraiso"* [The Scream of the Brown Man in Paradise], Alex Navarro, the protagonist, works as a temporary employee at the Airport Post Office (162-170). His job is to sort the mail. In Amado I. Yoro's "*Ti Nalnaawan a Biahe*" [The Trip Filled with Dew], Isagani Bayani is a worker in a coffee company owned by a Mr. Kealialoha who is identified as a Hawaiian local (7-12). Both Navarro and Bayani are enmeshed in conflicts between themselves (as immigrants) and the locals (in this case, the gap between him and his immediate supervisor, a Japanese named Takao),[39] Both are regular employees and are engaged in an almost literal struggle to liberate themselves from their oppressors. For Bayani, this conflict results in his being thrown out of his home just as his wife, Rozzini, is about to give birth to their firstborn.

Although the marginalization of Filipinos or Ilocanos by the locals is quite obviously portrayed here, the wounds of their marginalization and subsequent struggle run much deeper. Gonzales' main character in "*Ikkis ni Kayumanggi iti Paraiso"*[The Scream of the Brown Man in Paradise] is a good example of this.

Alex Navarro, a temporary postal employee, experiences the gap between him and his Japanese boss and the local regular employees as a divide which he can never cross because the colonial discourse does not allow him to. This divide is enunciated by Steve's harsh words, "Watch your words, immigrant," (Gonzales 67) said before his fistfight with Navarro. Labelling Navarro as an immigrant or more specifically, as an immigrant from the Philippines, classifies him into a stereotype the hegemonic discourse has created in order to label the Other[40] as troublemakers in the workplace (168), thus designating

them as "undesirable" to the hegemonic discourse, especially if it is to maintain the status quo.

Implicit in the stereotype of Filipinos as "troublemakers" is a requirement from the Center for those in the Margins to act homogeneously, making it easier for the Center to control and eventually, coopt them. This stereotype can also be seen as translating into a command from the Center of the colonial discourse. The command, "Do not create trouble in the workplace", is a warning issued not just to Filipinos but also to all other groups occupying the Margins. The power of this command stereotypes Navarro as a troublemaker in the workplace. This command is behind the relief of Takao as postal supervisor, Takao's different treatment of Navarro in contrast to other postal employees being a source of trouble. Thus it can be said that behind the oppressive working conditions and the unfair labor practices is a powerful form of labelling which constructs the Other, in this case Filipinos, as inappropriate according to the dominant discourse's specifications. It is through this labelling that "the native is prevailed upon to internalize as self-knowledge, the knowledge concocted by the master (Parry 38.). It is for this reason that Takao can say to Navarro, *"Iwarasmo ta matam iti aglawlaw, mano ti makitam a kakudilmo"* [Look around you, how many can you see who are of your color?] (168), emphasizing all the more the undesirability and marginalization of the Filipino in the Hawaiian workplace as well as the implicit requirement for him to act according to the dictates of the Center in colonial discourse. The hierarchical relationship between Takao and Navarro also speaks to the hierarchies between and among immigrants in Hawaii, with—at least in this context—Takao in a superior position.

But the workings of the colonizer-colonized relationship cannot be simplified to just assigning the labels of oppressor-oppressed to each of them. The character of Navarro is interesting in its construction as an Inappropriate Other. How does Navarro experience his inappropriateness, his being constructed and labelled as a Filipino immigrant? First, he seeks to be appropriated into the discourse of power. In short, he first seeks to belong, to be constructed as a US citizen. This is his first claim of leverage against Takao: "Too bad, you didn't know that beside my reality as an immi-

grant, I'm now a US citizen" (169), as if his being a US citizen necessarily and automatically makes him Takao's equal, or the equal of any other US citizen. There is the semblance of the American Dream of equality and justice at the end of the story when Navarro seems to have been justified and his oppressors are given their due. But it must be noted that in taking his case to the higher authorities of the postal system, Navarro is relying on the very same system that seeks to coopt and silence him, that constructs him as an "Inappropriate Other."

His marginalization does not end with Takao's dismissal, although this time the colonial discourse employs the tactics of "appropriating" Navarro as a "US citizen" while at the same time marginalizing him in every other way: "[c]onsequently, the colonial presence is always ambivalent, split between its appearance . . . and its articulation . . ." (Bhabha, "Signs Taken for Wonders" 32). Navarro is expected to remain an employee of the postal system when the supervisor tells him, "I hope that you will have a good career in the postal service, Mr. Navarro" (170). This implies that Navarro will always occupy a position which will keep him quite happily and contentedly marginalized.

On the other hand, Navarro experiences amidst his struggles a certain incapacity for speech springing from feelings of imprisonment, especially during those times when he has most need to speak up. This is best expressed in his words: "*nabalud ti dilak iti apges ti riknak"*[my tongue was imprisoned by the bitterness of my feelings] 164). This is an apt metaphor for Navarro's condition of being in that "undetermined threshold place where [he] constantly drifts in and out" (Minh-Ha 218). This is further contextualized in Navarro's use of English, the language of the Center of the colonial discourse. The English he uses is that which is commonly called "broken English":

> Well, same old thing (163);
> Please, man, whoever took my ID, give it back (167);
> You've gone too far and I'm sick and tired of you now. (169)

Navarro is not the only one who speaks English in this way. Takao speaks in "broken English", too: "We don't want any troublemaker around here" (169).

Dennis, Navarro's *Haole* friend, also speaks "broken English": "So how you've been?" (163).

The brokenness of the English that is spoken can be said to be indicative of the fragmentation these characters experience in the hands of colonial discourse. The awkwardness of their use of the Center's language underlines all the more the ambiguity of their position. Such "broken English" can also be indicative of the Margin's appropriation and sublimation of the Center's language for their own intents and purposes. This "appropriation is the process by which the language is taken and made 'to bear the burden' of one's own cultural experience" (Ashcroft et al., *The Empire Writes Back* 38). In this light, the workers' "broken English" could be interepreted as a form of re-appropriation. The characters may have managed to transform the "broken English" into "their English", thus creating a space for themselves in a language where they can sublimate the dominant discourse and redefine their own boundaries, as Selves different and unique from the Others constructed by the dominant discourse.

As an Inappropriate Other, Navarro's internal contradictions are manifold. While he uses his being a US citizen as leverage against Takao, he still attributes his triumph and his fighting spirit to "Pinoy Power" (170). While his understanding struggles against his not being understood by his local co-workers and acknowledges that he is alienated from them such as when he says: "*Nadalus ti pusok ken riknak a makigayyem ngem dida pulos awaten ti kinataok.*" [I had clean intentions when making friends with them but they refused to understand me as a person] (162). He also cannot understand them and alienates them from himself as seen for example when he says, "*Aggar-garaw dagiti bibigda ngem diak mapagbukel ti kayatda a sawen.*" [Their lips moved but I could not understand what they wanted to say.] (162). These contradictions point to a fragmentation in the self-image of Navarro, who now discovers that he cannot appropriate any of the constructs (either "US citizen" or "Pinoy") made for him. His very language is as fragmented and as inappropriate to the experience as he is. What can be seen as a result of the colonial discourse is the mass marginalization and alienation of not just Ilocanos like Navarro but locals like Takao and Steve as well. They have been

alienated from within and from each other. Such alienation is potentially disempowering for all those involved.

There is a certain point of contrast between Alex Navarro and "*Ti Nalnaawan a Biahe's*" main character, Isagani Bayani.[41] Bayani is in a situation and a position no different from Navarro's. His dispossession is even more eloquent as he is powerless when the coffee company deprives him of what he has called his home. But there is a tacit recognition on Bayani's part that the place that he has called home is not, was never, and will never be, his own: *"Ammom met, kayatta man wenno saan, masapul a pumanawta..."* [You know that whether we like it or not, we must leave...] (Yoro "*Ti Nalnaawan*" 9) Bayani is thus imagined, along with his wife (who is pregnant with their long-awaited first child), as a wandering traveler in an allusion to the story of the Nativity in Bethlehem. Bayani cannot find an acceptable space for himself or his wife anywhere, so his wife gives birth outside, in the darkness, in the fields where they find themselves.

This dispossession that results from belonging to a certain specific space is a burden which the Inappropriate Other takes upon himself. If one were to follow the symbols in the story, this dispossession is not without hope. A child is born in that seeming nothingness. While one can argue that Bayani's child will only grow up to be as marginalized as his parents and that his parents actually did him a great disservice, one can also argue that Bayani's child could well signal a break in the discourse, having been born "in the wilderness", out of the space (the "home") the colonial discourse has provided for his parents and on which his parents had relied.

The images of the oppressed Filipino or Ilocano worker in other stories may vary but they do not deviate too much from the characters portrayed by Navarro and Bayani. In *"Adda Supapak ti Tunggal Biddut"* [For Every Fault, There is A Return] (Halaba, "*Adda Supapak,*" 162-165), the main characters are carpenters or construction workers. This time, the Japanese antagonists of the other stories have been replaced by a Korean named Mr. Ra. Although one of the main characters, a Mang Rogel, is a very competent draftsman, he remains outside of the discourse of power too, having remained subservient to Mr. Gaston, the owner of the company he works for. His seeming loyalty

to Mr. Gaston reflects a learned dependence on the dominant member of the discourse. This results in Mang Rogel's inability and helplessness in helping his co-workers.[42]

In "*Kasta La Gayam!*" [So It Is Like That] by Julie V. Gorospe, the conflict is between Djuna, an Ilocana who has already planned out her vacation in San Juan, in the "*nalawa a laplapog idiay Ilokos*" [in the wide fields of the Ilokos] and her boss, Mr. Takimoto who seems to get in the way of her plans. Again, one can see here the awkwardness of the language which Djuna uses in order to express her position:

> I feel so mad! That Boss of ours changed his mind. Imagine! I filed my application last December for my vacation in March and he is telling, I no can go! (232);
>
> I feel so mad and I don't wanna talk to him. I don't even want to see his face this time. (233);
>
> Do you look nice when I'm mourning . . . I had always been so nice to him but he abuses . . . You know, I'm tired of him and right now, I'm planning to quit from my work." (234)

Djuna's colleagues who are also identified as being Filipino or Ilocano speak the same language she does:

> Wha' happen? (232);
>
> Terrible, yeah? (232);
>
> That's all but I know, he could feel your coldness to him." (233) Even Mr. Takimoto speaks in "broken" English:
>
> The three days okey, you can take it. . . But, the extra cannot. You understand? (231)

It is with this kind of language that the margins are able to communicate their very fragmentation. The awkwardness and inappropriateness of their language is emphasized, especially when compared to the standard English

that is spoken by other characters (who may be identified as non-Japanese or non-Filipino).

Djuna's being able to use *"saykolodyi",* i.e. psychology on her boss in order to persuade him that she can go back to the Philippines can be said to be a momentary even inconsequential triumph. This is concretely seen in Djunas's acquiring a debt in Hawaii just so she can live up to the image of the *balikbayan*-worker: ("*Nakautangak payen iti ingagatgatangko iti pasarabok.*" [I had even borrowed money to buy my gifts.] (231). Even her vacation in the Philippines presents a contradiction: Djuna's going home to San Juan as a *balikbayan* from Hawaii is central and necessary to her acquiring prestige and social acceptance for herself, both being inaccessible to her in Hawaii. Looking at the broader picture, the discourse of power has not changed even with Djuna's seeming ability to get even with her boss.

A.2. THE OLD MAN OR WOMAN WHO MIGRATES TO HAWAII

This is a variation of the Ilocano worker who manages to cut across age differences. There are images of grandmothers and grandfathers in the GUMIL-Hawaii stories, who, although already advanced in age, still migrate to Hawaii in order to find work or to become the babysitter and housekeeper of their children's families.

Francisco Ponce's *"Kastoy Gayam"* [So It Is Like This] begins with Tata Damaso being fetched from the airport. The reasons for Tata Damaso's immigration despite his advanced age are clearly enunciated by him:

> *Ti rigat ti biagda ti nangiduron kenkuanna nga aglayas nupay lumakayen. Kayatna a padasen ti biag ti Hawaii bareng lumukmeg ken sumayaat ti biagda."* [Their hardship was what pushed him to leave even when he was already growing old. He wished to try life in Hawaii hoping their life would get better.] (224)

Tata Damaso finds himself an outsider not just in the workforce of Hawaii where he encounters difficulties in finding a job but also in the Ilocano community and more specifically, in the Ilocano family he should belong to. His brother Mang Denis and sister-in-law do not understand him and, after

some time, consider him a burden to the family's finances. The contrast and the contradictions are most emphasized between him and his brother's local-born son, Glen. While Tata Damaso is struggling to find a job in Hawaii so that he can bring his family out of their hardship or perhaps "order"[43] or bring them to Hawaii, his brother's family celebrates the birthday of Glen and buy him a Mercedes Benz as a birthday present.[44]

The layering of the Ilocanos' experience of alienation can be seen in the story. Tata Damaso is separated from his family in the Ilocos who expects him to single-handedly lift them out of poverty. He is estranged from his brother who does not recognize him as one of his own blood, but rather as someone who is "different", someone from the Ilocos who does not know how to use a spoon, someone who does not know how to behave at a birthday party, someone who lacks any knowledge of social conventions, and is therefore, "*kababain"* [an embarrassment]. Implicit in the brother's embarrassment for his brother is his own sense of inferiority as an outsider. His response to this sense of inferiority and to his marginalization is to assume all the appearances of belonging. Tata Damaso is a reminder to his immigrant brother and his family of their failure to "belong" to Hawaii even after years of being there and despite their prestige back in the Philippines.

This embarrassment is not just suffered by Mang Denis. It is felt and experienced by Tata Damaso, as well: "*Madi koma ni Tata Damaso . . . ta bainenna ti bagina* . . ." [Tata Damaso would have refused . . . because he was embarrassed for himself . . .] (Ponce, "*Kastoy*" 228). Such a statement is indicative of Tata Damaso's own alienation from himself.

Aside from the character of the old man, there is also the character of the old woman who migrates to Hawaii. The old woman is always portrayed as a grandmother (or *lola*) brought to Hawaii so that she can take care of the grandchildren and keep house. These old women's oppression comes from their alienation first, from their very own families both those in Hawaii and those they leave behind in the Philippines, and second, from their non-acceptance in Hawaiian society. They are portrayed as being uneducated and incapable of more than the most elementary English, factors which marginalize them even more.

In the case of the old men and women who migrate to Hawaii to work (whether paid or not), it is interesting to note that the contradictions in themselves and the fragmentation of their self-image spring from a sense of impermanency and transiency with regard to their stay in Hawaii. Hawaii is but a transient image in their minds. The stories which have old men and women as their main characters are always rich in nostalgia and references to the home and the family they left behind. All the characters expect their stay in Hawaii to be only temporary. They expect to spend their last days back home. Tata Damaso expects to go back home to his wife after he has "ordered" his children to Hawaii. Nana Maria, the main character in "*Ina,*" (Halaba "Ina" 195-200) says at the end of the story, "*No agsublinto iti Hawaii, kiddawennanto kenni Lucy a no matay idiayto Filipinas iti pakaitabonanna – iti abay iti amada.*" [When she returns to Hawaii, she will tell Lucy that when she dies she will be buried in the Philippines – beside their father] (200). Much of this same line of thought is expressed by Nana Sela in "*Ti Langit ni Nana Sela*" [The Heaven of Nana Sela] (Halaba "Ti Langit," 13-19) and by the unnamed grandfather in "*Awis*" (Yoro "Awis" 213-217).

Although this sense of impermanency and transiency can be considered as another characteristic of the Inappropriate Other, it is not without its cost. The old men and women eventually find out that their romantic images of home and their images of Hawaii, which are central to their construction of their selves, are not congruent with reality. Nana Maria must deal with the fact that her husband had died while she was away. Nana Sela in "*Ti Langit ni Nana Sela*" (Halaba "Ti Langit" 13-19) must face a home that has changed in her three years of absence and which is no longer the heaven she knew.[45]

A.3. THE OLD-TIMER

Perhaps the most recognizable image of the Filipino or Ilocano worker in Hawaii is that of the old-timer or *manong*. The old-timer historically belongs to the first wave of immigrants who arrived in Hawaii to work as pineapple and sugar cane workers. Usually single young men upon their arrival, they spend years working in the fields and end up as old men living in the outskirts of Hawaii—poor, sick, abandoned, and all but forgotten by their family in

the Philippines and their compatriots in Hawaii.[46] Of the 41 selected stories, only three dealt directly with the phenomenon of the old-timer in Hawaii. Mario Albalos'"*Dagiti Maudi nga Adlaw ni Tata Florencio"* [The Last Days of Tata Florencio] and Amado I. Yoro's "*Ni Lakay Saulo, ti Abong-Abong ken ti Sangasudo nga Arbis"* [Lakay Saulo, the Makeshift house and a Cup of Drizzle] both have main characters who are old-timers. The stories also foreground the plight of the old-timer. On the other hand, Pelagio Halaba's "*Idi Sapulek ni Apong Lakay"* [When I Searched for Apong Lakay] is the story of a young man's search for his long-lost grandfather, an old-timer in Hawaii. The young man's search and eventual reconciliation with his old-timer grandfather are the highlight of the story.

What does it mean to be an "old-timer"? Examining the term old-timer, one discovers that it is a hollow, even empty label reflecting the hollowness and emptiness of the lives of the old-timers. Formerly labelled as pineapple or sugar cane workers by the capitalist-imperialist system that transplanted them from the Philippines and put them to work in Hawaii, these workers are now labelled "old-timers", a catch-all term for the migrant worker who is no longer useful to the system after having lost his physical strength. Having lost their economic value in the colonial system that existed in the pineapple and sugar cane plantations of Hawaii, the old-timers are relegated to the margins of the margins.

Both Tata Florencio and Lakay Saulo in the story, "*Ni Lakay Saulo, ti Abong abong ken ti Sangasudo nga Arbis* experience their being old-timers as a time of almost complete dispossession. Tata Florencio is not just forgotten in Hawaii, he is also alienated from his very own relatives back home who, in his perception, are greedy and only look to him as a source of money. His alienation from his relatives and unwillingness to return to the Philippines because of his relatives is a conscious choice for Tata Florencio: "*Ad-adda laeng nga umababa ti biagko no kaludludonko ida."* [My life will only shorten if I am with them.] (Albalos "Tata Florencio" 179). Lakay Saulo, on the other hand, has been deserted by his wife who only saw in him a way to reach Hawaii: "*Ngem basolna kadi no tinarayan ti dangnga nga asawana? Inaramatna laeng a rangtayda nga umay iti Hawaii."* [Is it his fault that his foolish wife left

him? He was only used as a bridge so that she could come to Hawaii.](Yoro "*Lakay Saulo*" 153) Both Lakay Saulo and Tata Florencio are dispossessed in all respects, literally and figuratively. The state of actually not having anything or anyone left in life is very real to both of them. Thus, in terms of their own self-image, Lakay Saulo and Tata Florencio practically consider themselves non-existent, having been erased and re-named as "old-timers" by the system they used to work for and having been forgotten by or alienated from their own families back home and from the other Filipinos in Hawaii. This effectively silences them: "*Apay a kastoyen ti nagbanagan dagiti adu nga ayat ken pamategna . . .?"* [Why has this happened to all the love and caring he had given . . .?] (Yoro "*Lakay Saulo*" 153).

It is interesting to note where the fragmentation of the self-images of Tata Florencio and Lakay Saulo spring from. Both of the stories are rich in recollections of home and their past days as pineapple or sugar cane workers. There is a very strong sense of nostalgia on the part of the old-timers. They long for what they once had or what they could have had. This indicates that the consciousness of both characters exists in the past, an observation that would be congruent with the discourse's insistence that as "old-timers" they no longer exist. The tension then would be between society's insistence of their non-existence and the old-timers' recognition, at certain points in the story, of their own lives in the images and dreams which are still very much alive for them. This is concretized by Tata Florencio's conscious act of bequeathing to his friend, Oreo Cadelinia, all the wealth he had saved through the years, in a written will. This conscious act is an assertion on the old-timer's part of his own life and dreams and the power he is yet able to exert over them. Lakay Saulo, on the other hand, is able to insist that no one can dictate what he is to do, even as an old-timer: "*Saanakto a pumanaw ditoy a kampo . . . Awan ti makaibaga ti kayatko nga aramiden"* [I will not leave this camp . . . No one can tell me what I want to do.] (Yoro "Lakay Saulo" 154). The old-timer grapples with a consciousness that lives in the past and in a world outside of his makeshift shelter that has created a present where he is considered non-existent. The total dispossession which the old-timer experiences is indicative of the fragmentation of his self-image. How can one

call anything his own when he has nothing to possess? This fragmentation silences him and limits him to the utmost margins. It is striking to note that the homes of these old-timers are located in the margins of Hawaii where they can hardly be reached and where they can hardly reach the city centers. This is an apt metaphor for the marginalized condition of the old-timers in Hawaii.

When the old-timers are finally given recognition and therefore, some semblance of identity, at least by the local Ilocano community, they are able to somehow evade being defined or identified. At the last minute, Tata Florencio dies, leaving it up to Oreo Cadelinia to remember him, memory having the tendency to iconize and therefore, define what can only be the ghost of his own self. The story of Lakay Saulo ends with him being photographed by the Commission which is about to give him an award, a photograph being only a frame for his person. Lakay Saulo is also very reluctant to leave his makeshift shelter, his only sense of timekeeping being the medallion on which his date of arrival in Hawaii is engraved.

As Inappropriate Others who have been almost completely dispossessed, marginalized and alienated by colonial discourse, the old-timers are characterized by a complete separation from both their former colonial master (who no longer has any use for them) and their colonized homes (which also has no use for them). In this sense, the old-timer may be the best metaphor for the Inappropriate Other, especially as he is able to recognize that he cannot return to his images of the the Philippines and the world of plantation Hawaii, nor can he belong to the present. Potentially, such separation could point to two things: first, their being relegated to the margins of the margins where they are effectively silenced;[47] or second, their emergence from the margin of the margins as inappropriate others somewhat independent of both margin and center who can be critical of both margin and center and their very own position.

In summary, the Ilocano worker, whether he be an old-timer or an oppressed Ilocano worker, characterizes the Inappropriate Other as one who finds he has been dispossessed, imprisoned, and marginalized by the labelling of the discourse he had first sought to belong to. This marginalization

is most evident in economic terms. But more importantly, it is psychological. The Inappropriate Other finds that he cannot appropriate any of the constructs that had been made of him, for him, and that his self-image is, therefore, necessarily fragmented. This alienates him from his very own self and from others, leading to a certain sense of impermanency and transiency over his ambiguous state.

A.4. THE "SILENT" ILOCANO WORKER

As mentioned earlier, the image of the Ilocano worker is a prevalent one in GUMIL-Hawaii stories even if it is not always highlighted. What this category specifically refers to is the Ilocano whose "worker aspect" has been relegated to the background in favor of other themes and elements such as family, reconciliation, and love. The implications of this backgrounding of the "worker aspect" of all the characters in the GUMIL-Hawaii stories are taken note of, in this section. In relation to this, some characteristics of the silent Ilocano worker need to be mentioned.

First, the variety of work in which the Ilocano is involved is manifold. The Ilocano is portrayed as a US navy man, nurse, insurance agent, laborer, clerk, waiter, these being among the few occupations that are directly mentioned in the stories. Otherwise, the work which the Ilocano is involved in is not really described or named. This is what happens in most of the stories where the "worker aspect" of the Ilocano is not foregrounded.

Second, if the work of the Ilocano is unnamed, the work is usually described in terms of the character leaving the house usually in the morning and arriving usually late at night, suggesting that the character has actually gone off to work. The work is also described circumspectly, in terms of the group of friends which the character brings home or goes out with. When a colleague is introduced in the story, the colleague is usually the boss and the boss is usually someone who is different, in the sense that he is neither Ilocano nor Filipino. The nationalities of the bosses range from American to Hawaiian to Japanese, the Japanese being the more prevalent one.

Work is also mentioned in the story in relation to its economic implications on the family. Complaints about the low wages and the lack of financial

security as a result of it usually surface in arguments between husband and wife or brother and sister (in stories which foreground the reconciliation of estranged families), in the problem of a *balikbayan* headed or already at home (in stories which foreground the *balikbayan* story), or in the concerns of the family left behind aired primarily through letters or remembered by the main characters themselves.

In foregrounding other themes such as love and family, the stories are able to mark the economic reality of the Ilocano worker that is the major determinant of his position in the colonial discourse. A much closer look at the stories reveal that behind the problems which the Ilocano faces in love and family are economic forces and a discourse which is greater than the Ilocano and which, whether he is aware of it or not, determines his actions and decisions. It is because of this non-recognition of the economic factor involved in his decision that the Ilocano can be successfully "othered" by the Center. Resolving his problems in love and family does not change his economic positionality; if anything, it is just glossed over. Such glossing over can be said to be indicative of how Ilocano characters have come to accept the status quo where their economic condition and marginalization are ~~is~~ already a given. That their current status is perceived to be a given which can no longer be changed can be said to be symptomatic of the "myth of universality [which] is . . . a primary strategy of imperial control . . . " (Ashcroft et al., *The Post-Colonial Studies* 55). Under this myth of universality, the Ilocano is expected to accept that all Ilocanos belong to and are appropriate only for the position that is made available for him in Hawaii.

An interesting example of this is the use of the word "order," a word which recurs in most of the stories. For the stories which foreground love and the reconciliation of families, "ordering" the loved one from the Philippines (as in ordering a commercial product from a store or catalog) is a dream or is, in the consciousness of the character, supposed to fulfill his desire to be reunited with the loved one. In practice, "ordering" refers to the migration regime of family reunification in the United States where (naturalized) American citizens and permanent residents may sponsor relatives for immigration to the United States. But the term "order" also has implica-

tions on the colonial discourse. Here one again witnesses the fragmentation of the Inappropriate Other. He wishes to be reunited with his loved one, even as he relies on the very same discourse that has kept them apart in the very first place. The word "order" also connotes a certain force akin to that of a command. When the Ilocano character enunciates his "ordering" a loved one from the Philippines, he does so with the force of a command and his capability to "order" is perceived as a source of power both for him and the one he is "ordering." Yet, even if he is using a power of the Center for his own ends, the balance of power is still the same. The center of power is still not his and is even reinforced by his act of "ordering" because the capacity to "order" is granted by the Center and ultimately, whether or not a relative can be "ordered" from the Philippines depends on whether or not the Center approves the application.

Thus, the Inappropriate Other in the silent Ilocano worker characterizes itself as a mass of contradictions and ambiguities, especially marked by a glossing over of his own marginal position.

B. THE *BALIKBAYAN*

The *balikbayan* may be operationally defined in terms of the words "*balik*" and "*bayan.*" Literally, this means someone who returns to his native land or homeland after having resided in a foreign land. Residence in a foreign land for a period of time seems to be central to the concept of *balikbayan.* This excludes Filipinos who leave the country temporarily for a relatively short period of time and who have no intention whatsoever of residing abroad. This would include tourists, students, and other visitors who are only abroad temporarily. But the word *balikbayan* has acquired new meanings and nuances through the years, especially with the growing phenomenon of Overseas Contract Workers (OCWs) and the increased mobility to and from countries. Therefore, it would be simplistic to look at the *balikbayan* as just one who returns to his home country after a period of residence abroad. The phenomenon as well as the presence of *balikbayans* have implications on the colonial discourse and can be said to be products of the dynamics of postcolonialism in the world today.

The image of the *balikbayan* is prevalent throughout most of the stories of GUMIL-Hawaii. If one were to extend the definition of the *balikbayan* a bit further to one who wishes to return home to the Philippines, or more specifically, to the Ilocos, and if one were to extend the definition to include those who keep the concept of a nation called Philippines as a point in their consciousness, then the image of the *balikbayan* (or the would-be *balikbayan)* could well be said to apply to almost all of the characters in the stories, even if this *balikbayan* aspect is not the one that is foregrounded in the story. Almost all the characters in the stories express their desire, whether implicity or explicitly, to return to that point in their consciousness which they variously call "home", "Filipinas", and/or really specific places in the Ilocos.

In the stories where the image of the *balikbayan* is foregrounded in the main character, the *balikbayan* has adapted several variations, specifically: a) the young man who returns to or searches for his sweetheart or wife in the Philippines; b) the Hawaiiano who marries a young woman and thereafter returns to Hawaii or lives in relative comfort in his hometown[48] and c) the balikbayan-visitor for whom a return to Hawaii and therefore, a temporary short stay at "home" are already a given. In this case, the *balikbayan* could be a visitor, returning to the Philippines regularly for special occasions (e.g., funerals, weddings, and so forth) and for holidays or the *balikbayan* could be a first-time *balikbayan* visitor. As the main character, the visitor is portrayed as being a second-generation Hawaiian Ilocano, born and raised in Hawaii and brought back to the Philippines by parents who want him to discover and get in touch with his roots. It is interesting to note that the primary motivations of these characters range from the desire to be reconciled with a loved one to the desire to recover one's roots and be re-introduced again into the society of one's father or mother.

The *balikbayan* who makes the conscious decision to return to the Philippines as a result of what he recognizes to be his marginalization in Hawaii is not a facet of the *balikbayan* which is foregrounded in most of the stories. All but one of the stories foregrounds the Ilocano as returning for reasons of love and family. Instead of a conscious return for reasons of love and family, Maestro Jose returns as a reaction to his marginalization

in Hawaii.. In this regard then, the story *"Sibibiagto Latta Dagiti Tugot Iti San Eugenio"* [The Footprints of San Eugenio Will Remain Alive] by Mario Albalos is an interesting and perhaps necessary study of the dynamics and contradictions of what can be said to be an emerging consciousness and self-image of or in the *balikbayan* who makes the conscious decision to return to the Philippines because he recognizes his marginalization in Hawaii.

Jose Basay, who is later called "Maestro Jose" in the story, decides to go home to San Eugenio instead of working as a dishwasher in Hawaii. He becomes the maestro at the town's elementary school. His townmates do not understand his decision to return home and he is looked upon as someone who is strange, even crazy. Even his sweetheart, Vieta, leaves him to marry a *balikbayan* and seek her fortunes in Hawaii. But Maestro Jose persists in what he perceives to be his mission of educating the young of the town, foregoing marriage and a family life in the process. He becomes the principal of the elementary school and is a model teacher, devoting his time to his students and donating his own money (and eventually, his inheritance from his old-timer-father) to the school. The story ends with Maestro Jose, now an old man, being honored by the town.

There are subtleties in the story which point to the complexity and the fragmentation of Maestro Jose's character and self-image. For one , one can say that the *balikbayan* who is Maestro Jose is quite explicitly an Inappropriate Other, in its very alienation from Hawaii and from San Eugenio where he has gone home. The experiences of Hawaii which Maestro Jose recounts are invariably experiences of oppression, echoing the sentiments of the oppressed Ilocano worker: "*Maipalagip manen dagiti rigatna iti Hawaii. Sinangitanna ti kasasaadna. Nastrekna amin a pagsapulan ngem adda patingga ti pasensia.*" [He was reminded again of his hardships in Hawaii. There, he cried over his sorry state. He tried all sorts of jobs but even patience has its limits.] (Albalos "Sibibiagto Latta" 74). Maestro Jose's marginalization and oppression in Hawaii is not simply because of the color of his skin but also because of his economic status as an immigrant there. He is marginalized and othered by people from other countries in the mad race for survival in a foreign land.

In the hybrid state that is Hawaii, the "enemy", the one who marginalizes and oppresses, is no longer easily identifiable, can no longer be identified. One can no longer pin down this act of marginalization to simply the *Puraw* [the White]. The movements of the colonial moment now manifest themselves in much more complex ways. Thus, Maestro Jose recounts a Japanese he worked for as a dishwasher who had already appropriated the language of the dominating party and alternately called him, a "fuckin' slow . . . idiot" and a teacher with a "banana head." One can see in this Japanese's appropriation of American curse words a certain distortion in its use. The image of a Japanese cursing a Filipino in American slang only points to the alienation of both from each other and to the mass alienation of individual and collective peoples that is a result of colonialism. Maestro Jose notes, though, that the Filipinos or the *Kayumanggi* seem to be the most marginalized and oppressed group in Hawaii: "*Nakastrek a yard boy ngem kasla ari dagiti Puraw a mangmandar kenkuana. Iti konstraksion adda latta pagdumaan ti panagtratar iti Kayumanggi kadagiti Hapones, Puraw, Intsik; Portugese ken Hawayano.*" [He got a job as a yard boy but the White he worked for acted like he owned him. In construction, there was always a difference in how the Filipino was treated as compared to the Japanese, the White the Chinese, the Portuguese, and the Hawaiian.] (Albalos "Sibibiagto Latta" 76). Although this may be construed as subjective on Maestro Jose's part, what remains as the more important point is Maestro Jose's recognition of his subject-position and in this recognition, he is able to differentiate and assert himself not just vis-a-vis the American White but vis-a-vis the Japanese, the Chinese, the Portuguese and the Hawaiian, as well. Maestro Jose's throwing the plate at his oppressive Japanese employer can be said to be symbolic of his claiming his own space, a space where no one who is "different" is allowed to tread, much less, stamp on. It is a claiming of space that is necessarily violent and therefore, resulting in the fragmentation of Maestro Jose's character. From Maestro Jose's subject-position in Hawaii (the setting being another factor in his marginalization), one can only conclude that this marginality from the point of view of his being a worker in that place is already complex and multi-layered.

The multi-layeredness of his marginality becomes even more prominent when he proclaims that he is different from "them", from the Filipinos who stayed behind whom he perceives to have agreed to be oppressed by the non-Filipinos:"*Sinangitanda amin ti gasatda. Agbabawida ngem kadakuada ta mabainen nga agawid. Kabutengda ti anniniwanda."* [They all cried over their fate. They regret going there but most of them are ashamed to go home. They are afraid even of their own shadows.] (Albalos "Sibibiagto Latta" 75). Reading between the lines, one realizes that the Filipinos who choose to stay behind because of their fear of going home and not meeting the expectations or the constructs which people have of them back in the Philippines, are themselves alienated. Their choice to literally stay within the setting which marginalizes them despite their desire to be free of it is an indication of their being Inappropriate Others. The shadow of their former selves, which is what the colonial discourse makes of those it seeks to co-opt into its hegemony, is a ghost which these Inappropriate Others cannot dodge and an Other of their Selves which they cannot recognize.

Back in San Eugenio, Maestro Jose is also alienated from his townmates who do not understand him. The townspeople think he must be crazy to turn down the opportunity that Hawaii presented in order to come home and teach in grade school. He is not considered as an Insider in the town and Maestro Jose takes pains to show that he is different from the townspeople. His progressive ideas about educating the youth for the future are alien in a town where gambling is seen as its only hope. But one can also see through this into the perceptions Maestro Jose has built of the town which, in a sense, alienates the town from him.

The construct Maestro Jose has built of the town while he was away constitute the town as a place needful of formal and informal education (which he can provide). The children must be taught at school. The story can be said to contain a very strong moralistic voice, a voice that fails, in the process, to question the assumptions and the discourse behind these perceptions, in the first place. Considering that the town itself has been marginalized by colonialism, it is not surprising that the colonial country, in the form of Hawaii, is perceived as a place where individual progress is possible.

This marginalization is all the more felt by the townspeople of San Eugenio because of the very inaccessibility of Hawaii, more specifically, the inaccessibility (primarily due to economic reasons) of the means to even get there. Maestro Jose does not fit into the stereotype of the construct the townspeople have of a *balikbayan* from Hawaii thus intensifying their alienation from each other. The fragmented image of Maestro Jose results in a gap between the two parties, which neither can-quite bridge. Not even Maestro Jose's star student, Geronimo, can understand him even if he is very keen to listen and question the teacher. This fragmentation of both Maestro Jose and San Eugenio from the separate points of view of both parties can be said to add to the multi-layeredness of marginalization, this time, not just of Maestro Jose.

The fragmentation of Maestro Jose's self-image is all the more concretized by the contradictions and ambivalences that Maestro Jose deals with and is never quite able to resolve in himself. Even as he decries the oppressive treatment he suffered as a dishwasher in Hawaii, a closer reading will reveal that he himself has a low regard for such a position: "*Laglagipem a maysaak a maestro. Nasakit a panunoten no usarek laeng ti adalko ti kalangiking dagiti pinggan ken baso iti hotel. . .* " [Remember that I am a teacher. It is a painful to think that I will just see my learning in the tinkle of plates and glasses in a hotel.] (Albalos, "Sibibiagto Latta" 74). This indicates that Maestro Jose is more deeply interpellated into the discourse he is struggling against than he thinks. Maestro Jose's low regard for the title "dishwasher" is proof of the fragmentation of Maestro Jose's self-image. Another contradiction, indicative of such an interpellation, is again seen in how Maestro Jose views both women and the aspiration one is entitled to: "*Nangato unay dagiti arapaapmo. Ket dayta nga arapaap ti mangsabidong iti napintas nga ugali ti maysa nga Ilokana . . .* " [Your aspirations are too high. And that is what poisons the beautiful attitude of an Ilocana.] (Albalos, "Sibibiagto Latta" 75).

These ambivalences and contradictions cannot be defied by both the Insider and Outsider and even by the Inappropriate Other himself. When Maestro Jose is honored and called upon to speak, "*kayatna ti agsao ngem adda agsullat iti karabukobna,*" [he wanted to speak but something was stuck

in his throat] (Albalos, "Sibibiagto Latta" 83). He cannot speak. When he finally finds his voice, Maestro Jose's speech, true to the guerrilla tactics of the Inappropriate Other, manages to deflect attention away from himself. He speaks of the youth and of the importance of education but he never speaks of himself. He cannot speak of himself if he is to maintain his ambivalence and inappropriateness, his simultaneous and constant act of revealing and concealing himself as both Self and Other, alternately marginalized and centered by a discourse he is interpellated in but which he struggles against.

The other stories which have their share of *balikbayan* main characters validate and further describe the Inappropriate Other in the person of the *balikbayan*. First, it must be cited here that the construct of the *balikbayan*, at least from the point of view of people back home, is economic; the *balikbayan* is seen as the source, not just of financial security but of social prestige, as well. This is a contradiction when one contrasts this with the reality that the Ilocano *balikbayan* main character faces . In Artemio T. Ignacio's "*Nabileg Dagiti Arapaap*," Cesar, one of the main characters, is encouraged by his father to marry his former sweetheart, Saniata, who had married a Hawaiiano and returned to San Esteban as a widow with child. : "*Duklapamon, barok, ta manmano a sumirip ti kasta a gasat . . . Dimon a panunoten a balo wenno inay-ayam ti sabili a lalaki. Asawaemon no mayat pay kenka ta bareng alaennakanto idiay Hawaii ket kawittennakaminto met ken inam.*" [Get hold of her, my son for luck rarely comes this way. Forget that she is a widow or that another man may have played with her. Marry her if she likes you, hopefully she will take her with you to Hawaii and then you can also bring your mother and me.] (54). Saniata's marriage to a Hawaiiano, in the first place, was for economic reasons and is thus attached to the image of the *balikbayan* as a source of financial security and social prestige.

It is interesting to note the images the *balikbayan* Hawaiiano has of his "home." In contrast to Maestro Jose who has made the conscious decision to return to the Philippines because of oppression in Hawaii, the return of the Hawaiianos is a nostalgic return. The Philippines is invariably attached to memories of their youth and their being *balikbayan* is a belated return to the youth or to the images they hold in their consciousness of the land they have

left behind. Uncle Angelo in Carlo Magbual Laforga's "*Idi Nagbalik Hawaii ni Uncle Angelo*" [When Uncle Angelo Returned to Hawaii] decides to return to the Philippines for good after he has fallen in love with someone while on his short vacation, there to spend the last of his days in happiness. On the other hand, Tata Joaquin, one of the main characters in Artemio T. Ignacio's "*Ti Mili, Ti Danum ken ti Angin*" [The Plant, the Water and the Air], brings back to Hawaii a woman he had gone back to marry after a vacation in the Philippines. His explanation to his daughter reflects a desire to go back to what was: "*Nasingpet ken mapagtalkan a kas kadaydi inam ni Mercedes, anak . . Agpadada la unay ti kababalin ken agkaidadda pay.*"[Mercedes is as kind and trustworthy as your mother, child. They have the same features and are about the same age.] (93). The same is true of the young men who return to their sweethearts or wives in the Philippines.[49] In the characters' descriptions of "home" as well as in their nostalgia and longing for it, one can see how the characters have already determined how they will belong to the images they have constructed of "home." Such a construction of "home" is necessarily a construction of their own selves, a construction which is incongruent to the actual reality they face once they return home. Looking at the words "*balik*" and "*bayan*" as constituting the character of the *balikbayan*, one will see that there is no real return (*balik*) for the *balikbayan* since the nation (*bayan*) that exists as a point in his consciousness does not, in reality, exist anymore. As a result of his specific colonial moment, the *balikbayan* does not and can never return for there is nothing of his imagined country to return to. This apparent incongruency fragments the consciousness and self-image of the *balikbayan*. He becomes an Inappropriate Other who "turns the inside out or the outside in, she is, like the two sides of a coin, the same impure, both-in-one insider/outsider" (Minh-Ha 218).

The *balikbayan*'s being a stranger to what is identified as his native culture is highlighted by stories which have first-time visitors as their main characters. The characters, usually young men who are prevailed upon by elders to marry a girl from the Philippines, experience their estrangement as a non-familiarity with the customs of the folks at home, finding such customs to be too strange, irrational, even comic. This is true with Marianing in

Danilo Bautista's "*Ramut ti Kaputotan*" [The Roots of Ancestry] and Marlon in Pacita Saludes' "*Ilokana Dayta, Marlon*" [She's an Ilocana, Marlon]. This estrangement cannot be resolved by marriage to a local girl.

In summary, the Inappropriate Other in the *balikbayan* is a fragmented other, alienated from the culture and society he has constructed as his "home." His fragmentation and alienation are the result of the incongruency between the images he has constructed or the point in consciousness which he has labelled as "home" or "*bayan*" and the actual reality which he faces once he returns. This fragmentation is also the result of an unconscious interpellation in a system which he consciously struggles with or refuses. For one who has, consciously or not, participated in the discourse of colonialism, there can be no return to the original "home" or "*bayan*", imaged as the residence of what is pure, good, and true. This non-return and the layering of marginalization are the indications of the *balikbayan* as an Inappropriate Other.

C. THE ESTRANGED FAMILY MEMBERS

The estrangement of families is a common theme in GUMIL-Hawaii stories. This estrangement is a full-scale conflict between husband and wife, between parent and child and between siblings, which more often than not leads to separation. Although most of the stories end with an O. Henry kind of surprise reconciliation, it is interesting to note that the setting (Hawaii) which in itself is estranged, becomes the place where the conflicting members encounter and reconcile with each other. What is again presented here is a contradiction that is the mark of the Inappropriate Other for the character/s seek to be reconciled with their estranged family in the very land and within the very system that is behind their estrangement. Can a place of estrangement be a place of reconciliation? Can the crevices or the gaps in the earth between family members be bridged in a land that they cannot claim as their own?

In Mel A. Gonzales' "*Lubuag ti Daga*" [A Crevice of the Earth], Myro is estranged from his natural father. Myro had been "ordered" to Hawaii by his sister and mother. Hawaii is also the place where his father, who had abandoned them for another woman, lives. Hawaii becomes the place where

father and son meet again. The reasons for their estrangement from each other are very clear, especially from the point of view of Myro. He cannot forgive his father for abandoning them for another woman. The moment of truth comes when Myro is asked by his mother to donate blood to his natural father. Beneath the feelings of resentment and anger Myro has, there is a conscious non-recognition of his father. Once the father left for Hawaii with another woman, he ceased to exist in the consciousness of Myro. It can be said that Hawaii and his father's symbolic co-option into the colonial discourse has succeeded in erasing the construct of the father for the son. This is all the more aggravated by Myro's perception that his father did not help at all in his upbringing. Thus, "*(a)wan ti amak!"* [I do not have a father!] (160). The moment of reconciliation occurs only when the son learns in a sudden surprise revelation from his mother that his father, in fact, provided for him through the years:

> *Daydi nausarmo a kuarta id umayka ditoy Hawaii, ti bayad ti immuna a kotsem, ti pinagbayad idi naoperar ti apenditisimo, ken ti naisagut kenka a lima ribu a dollar idi nagkasarka, amin dagitoy annakko . . . ni amam ti naggapuanda.* [What you used when you came to Hawaii, the payment for your first car, the payment for the operation for your appendicitis and the $5000 gift at your wedding my child . . . these came from your father.] (161)

It must be noted here that it is only when the father assumes the economic responsibility of fatherhood that he is recognized. The economic as defining the relationship in a family can be seen in the stories which foreground the cases of estranged families in Hawaii. One can also see here a fragmentation of the son's image of the father, even as they are both and perhaps, because they are both in Hawaii.

In Artemio Ignacio's "*Naapgad ti Arbis idi Kalman*" [The Salty Tang Of Yesterday's Rain] where the conflict is between brother and sister, Lucing wants an economic return from what Manuel, the younger brother, has perceived to be an investment of goodwill. Here, one can clearly see the estrangement of both brother and sister. Manuel perceives Lucing as having changed such that she has become a complete stranger to him and is already

"different" from him: "*Nasaysayaat koma pay a diak immay ditoy Hawaii tapno diak naduktalan 'ta bansitmo . . . Kinunkunam a naimbagka unay a kabsat. Negm baliktad gayam.*" [It would have been better if I had never come to Hawaii, then I would have never found out your foul odor . . . I thought you were such a good sister. But you were just the complete opposite.] (71). The colonial moment of being transplanted and then being in another country necessarily makes them strangers to and different from each other. The renaming and reconstruction of selves according to the constructs of the colonial discourse also means a renaming and reconstruction of the very construct of family which holds them together. Thus, "*(a)wan ti kinnabsatan ditoy! . . . Hawaii ditoyen.*" [There are no brothers or sisters here! This is Hawaii.] (71)

The contrast between this negation of family and the constructs of family which the character has result in a fragmentation of his self-image, his image of the other members of the family, and his image of the family itself. The breakdown of the family as a social unit resulting from colonial discourse is a successful means of weakening the marginalized and disempowering them. The fragmented family is composed of members who, though living together in Hawaii, are actually psychologically separated from each other the moment they step on Hawaiian soil. This separation among families and the inner fragmentation it causes in the characters cannot be bridged nor healed by an outer reconciliation.

In the case of estranged families, the face of the Inappropriate Other is one which is strange and unrecognizable because of the heterogeneity of its difference/s. The Inappropriate Other considers himself as separate from others and even from his very own self. The fragment of the Inappropriate Other can never be reconciled in the homogenous or whole sense: "(t)he colonized subaltern subject is irretrievable heterogeneous" (Spivak "Can the Subaltern...?" 26). But it can, perhaps, glean its strange and varied identity from that same fragmentation.

D. THE WOMAN

The image of the woman can be found in all the GUMIL-Hawaii stories. Women characters can be found in the stories, no matter what their theme.

It can be said, though, that the women are relatively foregrounded only in the love stories of GUMIL-Hawaii. A majority of the 41 stories used in this study can be said to be "love stories." They deal with the theme of love or the romantic relationship between a man and a woman. Usually, the woman is left behind in the Ilocos, or in the Philippines, as the man earns a living or is "ordered" to Hawaii. The woman who is left in the "home" country usually plays any of the following roles in the male main character's life: first love, sweetheart, fiancée, or wife. If the woman is not playing the role of the loved one left behind in the Philippines, she is playing the role either of a prostitute in Hawaii or a resident in a leper colony in Molokai (one of Hawaii's outlying and smaller islands) or a worker.

To start with, the woman is portrayed very romantically and nostalgically when she plays the character of the loved one left behind in the Philippines. However, she is portrayed either as an outsider (as in the case of the prostitute and the leper) or as one who is in conflict with her husband or as the "other woman" when her character is already located in Hawaii. From these observations, one already has an idea of how the image of the woman is constituted in colonial discourse. One can also gauge the problematic relationship that exists between Woman (as an economic, political, and cultural construct) and woman (the flesh and blood reality). Such a discussion involves a critique not only of the discourse of colonialism (in the tradition of postcolonialism) but also of the discourse of patriarchy (in the tradition of feminism).

One must enunciate here the complex relationship between patriarchy and colonialism, and therefore the relationship between postcolonialism and feminist criticism.[50] The colonial subject and the woman share a commonality in their both being "Othered" by the center. This Othering comes in various forms of domination. Women "thus share with colonized races and cultures an intimate experience of the politics of oppression and repression . . . feminist and post-colonial discourse both seek to reinstate the marginalized in the face of the dominant . . . ." (Ashcroft et al., *The Post-Colonial Studies* 249). But one must be very careful in saying that feminism and postcolonialism share a common project. While both seek to liberate the marginalized, the

liberation specifically of the so-called "Third World Woman" is problematic because it brings with it an altogether different agenda from the more dominant Western feminist movement. Which comes first—the liberation of the Third World Woman from patriarchy or from colonialism?[51] The lens of postcolonialism situates the so-called Third World Woman as a historical subject living in very specific societal conditions, very different from that of another woman who is situated historically in the West. In this sense, one can see postcolonialism and feminism as a dual process that can be said to sometimes blend and sometimes be critical of each other's discourses. The cultural liberation which is among the goals of postcolonialism is not possible without the liberation of women. The Third World Woman, at this point, can be seen as subject to double victimization both by patriarchy and colonialism. She is subjected to both hegemonizing discourses and this certainly has enormous implications on her positionality and marginalization.

One can already sense this "double victimization" of the woman in the text by the very fact that the woman is usually silent in the GUMIL-Hawaii stories themselves. In most of the stories involving woman characters, the woman who is left behind in the Philippines is addressed, spoken or referred to, but never speaks. Thus, she continues to be described and constructed from what can be assumed to be a male point of view (which is usually identified to be that of the main male characters). One can also trace here the fragmentation of Woman (as image or construct) vis-a-vis woman (as a flesh and blood reality.)

In Amado I. Yoro's "*Naimbag a Paskuam, Salidumay*" [Merry Christmas, Salidumay], Daniel in Hawaii addresses a letter (in the first person) to Salidumay in Sta. Romana, Ilocos. The letter is filled with Daniel's remembrances of their happy times together in Sta. Romana. The selection of memories and the words which Salidumay is allowed to speak in the letter are made by Daniel and are made primarily with himself as the audience. This effectively silences Salidumay, limiting her character to the one that is constructed by the point of view of Daniel. This silencing and, consequently, the limiting of the woman in the stories are also true of the characters of Gloria in Letty Pascua's "*Adda Kaibatogan ti Panagibtu*" [There Is A

Limit to Suffering] (Pascua, "Adda Kaibatogan" 171-174), Auntie Lorenda in "*Idi Nagbalik-Hawaii ni Uncle Angelo:* [When Uncle Angelo Returned to Hawaii] (Laforga, "*Idi Nagbalik Hawaii*" 193-197), Celia in "*Naapgad iti Arbis idi Kalman*" [The Salty Tang Of Yesterday's Rain] (Ignacio, "Naapgad" 66-72), Mercedes in "*Ti Muli, ti Danum ken ti Angin*" [Grain, Water and Air] (Ignacio, "*Ti Muli*" 91 -98), Marissa in "*Ubbingda Pay*" [They Are Still Young] (Saludes, "*Ubbingda Pay,*" 219-223), Gunding in "*Krus ti Masakbayan*" [The Struggles to Come] (Ponce, "*Krus ti Masakbayan*" 36-37) and Lorena in "Bon Voyage" (Ponce, "Bon Voyage" 38-40). For the greater part of the stories, these women are silent, the construction of their characters having been narrated by the main male characters in the story.

In these stories, the Philippines is turned into the source of an image of the ideal woman in the consciousness of the male colonial subject. It is not so much that the woman is left behind and is therefore, located in the Philippines but rather, that the Philippines is described in terms of and in the tone used by the point of view for describing the women who are left behind. In the following passages from "*Naimbag a Paskum, Salidumay*", one can see how the place, Sta. Romana to which the narrator Daniel wishes to return, is already closely identified with the image of the woman Salidumay:

> *Napintas ti dissuor ti Taltaloktok. Nalangto dagiti muyong. Nabiag latta dagiti kabakiran.* [The cliffs of Taltaloktok are beautiful. The plants are always fresh. The forests are always alive.]
>
> *Wen, Salidumay, kas kenka, addaak ditoy, ammok nga addaka sadiay; addaka kaniak. Ammok nga addaak sadiay a kas ti kaadam . . .* [Yes, Salidumay, like you, I remember, you have left a memory in our village. Even if I am here, I know you are there; you are with me. I know I am there the way you are there.] (210)

This reference to place in terms of the location of Salidumay signals the identification of Salidumay with what can be described as a romanticized construct of the good, the pure, and the beautiful Philippines which Daniel wishes to belong and return to. Therefore, the construct of the good, the pure, and the beautiful is already parallel and synonymous to the constructs

of both the home country (the Philippines or Ilocos) and the woman in the consciousness of the main male character. The feminization of the home country by the main male characters successfully makes them subjects of the colonial discourse since they have othered "woman—Home" and in the process alienated themselves from the constructs they have created.

This alienation and marginalization of the women in the GUMIL-Hawaii stories is all the more glaring in the stories where the woman is already located in Hawaii. In Hawaii, the women play the roles of "problem wife"; "other women"; "prostitute" and "leper."[52] Flordeliza in Ponce's "Bon Voyage" is Ramses' other woman in Hawaii with whom he has a child but from whom he separates after his wife arrives in Hawaii. In stereotypical fashion, Flordeliza is portrayed as still being in love with Ramses even after so many years. In another story, Ponce's "*Krus ti Masakbayan [The Struggles to Come]* , Mercy is Ramses' other woman; not only is she the other woman, she is also a wife who doubles as a prostitute, having been driven to such an occupation by the need to keep up with the lifestyle in Hawaii. Halaba's "*Ket Nakasarak Iti Kalapati*" [And He Met a Dove] is again the story of a wife who is also a prostitute—Rosa Maria having married a Japanese in Hawaii. The dual faces of prostitute and/or wife would be interesting for a feminist reading. In Amado I. Yoro's "*Ti Nagkaysa a Lubong ni Salome Alegre*" [The Singular World of Salome Alegre] and Mario A. Albalos' "*Ni Padre Vidal Ciriaco Iti Lubong Dagiti Agkukutel*" [Padre Vidal Ciriaco and the World of the Lepers] , women play the role of lepers, shunned by society. In contrast to the romanticized version of the women left behind in the Philippines, the women in Hawaii are depicted and given a negative value by the colonial discourse. Consistent in all the stories is the vein of thinking that implicitly insists that what is true, good, and beautiful (formerly embodied in the women) is destroyed or sullied once it steps on foreign soil. This negative portrayal of the woman in Hawaii signals a strong desire for a return to the unattainable construct of the woman (the true, the good, and the beautiful) back at home. Such a contrast also reveals quite stereotypical biases with regard to the woman who lives or is residing abroad. It seems that it is expected that she would become somewhat "loose" in her morals. The reali-

zation of the incongruency between the construct and the actual could be the moment when the colonial subject becomes conscious of his fragmentation. This moment is more explicitly seen in the stories where the young man returns to the Philippines in order to be reunited with his sweetheart or in order to meet someone whom he can marry. Bert, in Halaba's "*Pinagbaliw ti Nasaem a Pasamak*" [The Reversal of an Unfortunate Event] discovers that the Linda he marries and brings to Hawaii is not the woman he had perceived her to be, nor is Bert the man Linda expected. This non-meeting of expectations results in a crisis in their marriage. Marlon who has idealized Marissa all these years in Saludes' "*Ubbingda Pay*" finds out that it is not at all that easy to marry and bring Marissa to Hawaii. He also finds out that she has plans and limitations of her own which he never knew while he was in Hawaii. In the end, the wedding plans do not push through and he returns to Hawaii without Marissa.

This fragmentation as a result of the incongruency between the construct and the actual may explain why the main male characters, paradoxically, attach to the woman the fulfillment of their feelings of incompletion. This is the case of Tony in Pascua's "*Adda Kaibatogan ti Panagibtur* [There Is A Limit to Suffering]," Daniel in Yoro's "*Naimbag a Paskuam, Salidumay* [Merry Christmas, Salidumay]," Marlon in Saludes' "*Ubbingda Pay* [They Are Still Young]," Manuel in Ignacio's "*Naapgad ti Arbis idi Kalman* " [The Salty Tang Of Yesterday's Rain]," and more. This feeling of incompletion without the woman is characteristic of almost all the main male characters of the story. This longing to be reunited with the woman, when seen in the framework of colonial discourse, cannot and will not be fulfilled. In fact, there can be no congruency between the actual and the constructed images of the woman as home and therefore, there can be no fulfilment of the male patriarchal and colonial subject's fantasy of a return to the pure, the good, and the beautiful. In this sense, this makes Inappropriate Others of all the parties involved, caught as they are in the discrepancy between reality and the imagined. Continuing to desire the construct of the woman as home (a desire which cannot be fulfilled) only signals the colonial subject's cooption and continued marginalization by the prevailing discourse. The recognition

of the unattainability of this desire which necessarily results in the subject's fragmentation may be the first step which the colonial subject can take, if he wishes to be liberated from the colonial discourse.

In summary, the Inappropriate Other manifests itself in the characters via the following motifs or characteristics: (1) the desire to belong to the center of the colonial discourse, even as he enunciates his 'difference'; (2) dispossession, marginalization, and rootlessness concretized in experience such as oppression and economic hardship; (3) the fragmentation of one's self-image because of the incongruency of the images in one's consciousness with the actual reality; (4) alienation from the Center, the margins and from one's own self as a result of the fragmentation and (5) sublimation of the power of the colonial center using such strategies as the appropriation of language and the insistence on being accepted in one's own terms.

The Inappropriate Other(s) in the Setting(s) of GUMIL-Hawaii Short Fiction

In the selection of stories for this study, one foremost consideration was the criteria used by Campomanes which he cited as recurring in most of the writing produced by Filipinos in the United States, that is, that the literature or the stories have "the Philippines as either the original or terminal reference point" ("Filipinos in the United States," 51). The stories of GUMIL-Hawaii somewhat exhibit this characteristic—the word "somewhat" is used here because it is necessary to delineate the extent by which the Philippines is the original or terminal reference point of the stories. As mentioned earlier, Hawaii is also a terminal and reference point in the stories. The setting in the stories is more than just a point in place and time; it is an active determinant of the lives and decisions of the Filipinos or Ilocanos, thus making Hawaii and the Philippines or Ilocos closer to being characters. The inappropriateness of the time sense of the Filipino or Ilocano characters has already been pointed out earlier. Now, it is necessary to point out the peculiarities of such a place—"place [being] . . . a complex interaction of language, history and environment" (Ashcroft et al., *The Post-Colonial Studies* 391).

First, it must be noted here that the Ilocano characters have acquired a new vocabulary in their acquiring a new geography in their consciousness.

This new vocabulary is colonial in origin, if one considers the history of Hawaii. This new geography which the characters have acquired is informed by the places which Hawaiian Ilocanos frequent. It is also indicative of the characters relation to the urban center in terms of the margin-center relationship. Where are the characters? The new vocabulary of the characters is rich in Hawaiian words. There are the lookouts which lovers frequent or where lovers are reconciled in the stories—Manoa Valley lookout and Kalaupapa Lookout. There are the beaches—Waimanalo Beach Park, Waikiki Beach, and Ewa Beach. There are the streets where they live, the highways they usually take and the landmarks by which they determine directions[53]—Kam Highway, St. Anthony Church, Schofield Barracks, Tripler Hospital,[54] Tanaka Store, Farrington High School, Davis Pacific Center, Pali Tunnel, King St., Bishop St., Waikiki St., and Wilder St. There are the parks which oldtimers and "lonely hearts" frequent—Sand Island Park, Aala Park, and Lonely Hearts Park. There are the outlying areas (outlying in relation to Honolulu) whose locations are not explicitly described in the stories—Wainae, Ewa, Pearl City, Marapepe Colony, Molokai, Oahu, and Waialua. Central to the lives of the Ilocano characters is the Honolulu International Airport where the *balikbayan* and newcomers are welcomed or sent off. In the consciousness of the characters, the Honolulu International Airport is a reference point for their arrival and departure to and from Hawaii and consequently, their arrival and departure from what they perceive to be the center, Honolulu. The characters only arrive and depart from Honolulu. They never stay in the city.

This vocabulary names a landscape, which in the consciousness of the Ilocanos, is that of the Ilocos. While using Hawaiian terms and words as locators within the colonial geography, the Filipino or Ilocano character is actually referring to the Philippines or the Ilocos. It is with thi frame of reference that the Filipino or Ilocano character looks at Hawaii. This "dual" setting or this non-differentiation between the Philippines or Ilocos and Hawaii that makes the setting an Inappropriate Other, having become a hybrid of sorts of these geographic locations. While there certainly is fragmentation in the use of a colonial vocabulary and in one's presence in a colo-

nial geography alone, there is also a re-appropriation of the geography (and subsequently, the vocabulary) and a refusal to become a specific point in the colonial map. The movement of the Inappropriate Other in the setting is an evasive one, as it seeks to find "home" in displacement. Also, on a more concrete level, the locations in most of the stories are certainly set in the margins of Hawaii, away from Honolulu, the urban center. The Ilocanos seem to be occupying the outlying islands and the places at the margins and not the center, Honolulu.

Second, despite this change of geography and this new vocabulary, however, the characters still refer to Hawaii as they would refer to the Ilocos, comparing and contrasting the two separate settings and dwelling more on how the Ilocos and Hawaii are similar rather than on how they are different:

> *Madamdama, immulog ni Nana Sela. Rinukitna dagiti inaplat a bulong ti kamote.* Sabagay, nakunana iti bagina, kas met la Filipinas iti Hawaii. Adu ti kapad-padada a Filipino ken adda met ditoy dagiti natnateng sadiay. [*After a while, Nana Sela came down the stairs. She meticulously cleaned the aphid-eaten camote leaves.* Anyway, she thought, the Philippines is like Hawaii. There are a lot of fellow Ilocanos in Hawaii and one can find here the vegetables that grow back home.] (Halaba, "*Ti Langit*" 18)

If one were to read only the italicized portion, it would be difficult to tell whether the speaker is in Hawaii or not. This is also the case in the other stories. Such "dual" settings and such non-differentiation between the Ilocos and Hawaii make the settings of the GUMIL-Hawaii stories, Inappropriate Others. The settings have become hybrids of both Hawaii and Ilocos even as they do not belong to either of the two. One can also see here the re-appropriation of the geography and the vocabulary of Hawaii into the terms of the Ilocano. There is an insistence on the Ilocanos' part that Hawaii be seen in their terms.

Third, although the characters are physically located in Hawaii, their consciousness (or psychological location) is very much in the Ilocos or in the Philippines. This is evident in the themes of nostalgia which are very prevalent in most of the stories of GUMIL-Hawaii. Upon a closer reading of the stories, one will discover that the lives of the characters as described

by them is not at all different from the lives that they had back in Ilocos. As mentioned earlier, incongruency between life in the Ilocos and life in Hawaii is the main source of conflict in the stories. Therefore, in the consciousness of the characters, s/he is or at least, desires to still be in the Ilocos, playing with game roosters, planting vegetables, going home to the wife and children after a day of working in the field, and so forth. Quite consciously, the characters search for the Ilocos or the Philippines even as they are in Hawaii: "*Kasla agbirbirok dagiti matana no sadino a parte ita ti Filipinas"* [It was as if his eyes were searching for what part could be the Philippines.] (Pascua, "Adda Kaibatogan" 171). It is often quite clear to them that they are not really in Hawaii and that they do not belong there: "*Kasla adda iti kararuak iti Filipinas"* [It is as if my soul is in the Philippines.] (Laforga, "*Idi Nagbalik-Hawaii*" 196).

One sees here the contradictions that are the mark of the Inappropriate Other and the fragmentation that is borne of this. One must look at the Ilocano character in Hawaii as a duality even as he looks at his setting as being "dual." In the imagery of the Ilocano, it can be said that his heart (or his consciousness) is in the Philippines even as his body (and the economic implications of his working in Hawaii, at that) is in Hawaii. In this way, the Ilocano characters do not to belong to either of the two places and neither to the past (the Ilocos) nor the present (Hawaii).

Fourth, it must be especially noted here that the fragmentation in the consciousness and the self-image of the Ilocano characters occurs with the separation of the "dual" setting, that is, of the Ilocos from Hawaii, with the recognition that the present setting (Hawaii) is different from the referent setting, the Ilocos (*"Hawaii ditoyen . . ."* [This is already Hawaii]) (Ponce, "*Krus*" 36) and with the acknowledgment of one's separation and alienation from "home":

> *Apay nga adda taaw? Apay nga adda panaginnadayo? Inalimonko dagiti kasla kayatna a rumuar nga a sainnek iti barukong. Linadpak ti agngayangay a luak. Ngem naturay ti iliw, Salidumay.*" [Why are there expanses? Why is there separation? I swallowed the sob that threatened to erupt from my chest. I wiped away my tears. But homesickness is so strong, Salidumay.] (Yoro, "Salidumay" 207)

In the stories, the declaration that "*Hawaii ditoyen*" is usually followed by an experience of estrangement and alienation, seen for example between family members[55] and loved ones.

Fifth, the Ilocano characters experience the setting with a very strong sense of displacement, that is, of not being "in their own space." The Ilocanos "do not in fact have a privileged authentic space . . . [they are], among other things, [a] people who have made an alien authenticity their own" (Lee, "Cadence, Country, Silence" 163). In the duality of the setting (Hawaii or Ilocos) and the re-appropriation of both vocabulary and geography into the language of the Ilocano, even at the cost of self-fragmentation and displacement, one can see the Ilocanos' attempt to "find words for [his] space-lessness. Perhaps that was home" (Lee, "Cadence, Country, Silence" 163).

The Inappropriate Other, then, manifests itself in the setting in: (1) the presence of a colonial geography and consequently, a colonial vocabulary in the consciousness of the Ilocano, a geography and vocabulary that is re-appropriated in language; and (2) a sense of displacement in the consciousness of the characters and in it a groping for a sense of home.

Conclusion

This study draws importance from the need to recognize and chronicle the specificity and diversity of the texts of GUMIL-Hawaii in order to remain authentic to the project of postcolonialism. This is also important in order to position and assert the continued presence of this kind of literature in the still growing body of "hybrid" literatures, specifically that of Filipino American and Asian American literatures. The research made use of 41 selected short stories from the following publications of GUMIL-Hawaii: *Utek ni Kayumanggi* [The Mind of the Brown Man]; *Bin-I* [Seedling]; *Dawa* [Sprout]; *GUMIL-Hawaii Iti Dua A Dekada* [GUMIL-Hawaii in Two Decades] and *Beggang* [Ember].

The terms of the specific context of the selected contemporary short fiction of GUMIL-Hawaii shed light on the Inappropriate Otherness of the texts as all the terms involved are Inappropriate Others in their own right. These terms are: (1) Hawaii; (2) Hawaiian Filipinos, and (3) GUMIL-Hawaii.

Hawaii is an Inappropriate Other with its continuing marginalization from the Mainland, even if it is already the 50th state of the United States. Hawaii also has a long history of colonization. The Hawaiian Filipinos are Inappropriate Others because of their continuing history of marginalization, oppression, and "othering" in Hawaiian society even as they struggle to assert their "difference" from all the other "ethnic" groups in Hawaii. GUMIL-Hawaii is an Inappropriate Other because of its peculiarity as an Ilocano literary and social association, publishing and consuming Ilocano literature even as it is based in Hawaii. We find that the Inappropriate Others manifest themselves in the characters and settings of the selected short fiction of GUMIL-Hawaii as fragmented Others which cannot appropriate any of the constructs made for them, both by the Margin and Center of colonial discourse. The faces of the Inappropriate Other are borne out of the experiences of displacement, dispossession, oppression, and marginalization of characters and settings made subjects of the colonial discourse. In this ongoing struggle, the Inappropriate Others emerge as hybrids, "different" from the Center and the Margins. The Inappropriate Others are their own selves in this kind of "Othering." They seek to find "homes" in this "space-lessness" through which they are able to maintain their plurality and their deceptive evasion of the colonial discourse.

The contexts of the texts in their Inappropriate Otherness shed light on the Inappropriate Otherness of the texts. In light of the specific terms of the context, the texts are the sites of struggle where the Inappropriate Others of Hawaii, the Hawaiian Filipinos, and GUMIL-Hawaii are re-appropriating and in a sense, renaming their own Selves.

My analysis of GUMIL-Hawaii texts strongly hints at the violence of colonialism. That colonialism is a violent discourse was first explicitly pointed out by Frantz Fanon.[56] It can be said that there are several ways of looking at the violence of colonial discourse. One can look at it in a very literal manner and assign the terms of "oppressor–oppressed" and "colonizer–colonized" to the parties involved in the discourse, with the dominant party being the oppressor (and also the "colonizer") and the subordinate party being the oppressed (and also the "colonized"). In the case of this

study, the oppressor-colonizer would be the United States or the American and the oppressed-colonized the Philippines or the Filipino-Ilocano in the specific context of Hawaii. One can then point out the workings and the effects of this oppressor–oppressed or colonizer–colonized relationship in the contemporary short fiction of GUMIL-Hawaii and in the contexts of such texts. The violence of such effects should be named: discrimination of Filipinos or Ilocanos in the Hawaiian workplace; economic and literary marginalization; the presence of forgotten old-timers in Hawaii; out-migration from the Ilocos and a resulting "brain drain" in the Philippines; broken and estranged families; oppressed "Third World women", among others. This kind of violence of the rights of human beings can be pointed out as one of the historical and still, very real effects of colonization. But this point of view holds the danger of being simplistic and moralistic for implicit in such a point of view is a position that holds that the oppressed is the only victim, and that the oppressor should seek to rectify the "sins" that they have committed against the oppressed. This point of view also holds the danger of ignoring the revolutionary aspects of colonial violence, which is that out of the struggle between the parties involved in colonial discourse, something new can be born.

Colonization is a violent process in the sense that its discourse has made Inappropriate Others out of everyone who is involved (whether they be Ilocano, American, Japanese, and so forth), estranging them not just from each other but also, and more importantly, from their own Selves. The post-colonial world is filled with strangers who don't know each other or themselves. Those who are enmeshed in the colonial discourse are faced with a self that is fragmented and broken. The violence and the lasting effect of the process is even more strongly underlined by the fact that there can be no real decolonization in the sense of a return to the pure native or the original which existed before the moment of othering by colonial discourse. Those within the colonial discourse find that there are no homes to which they can return, and that the point/s which they occupy in the in-between space of the constructs of Margin and Center are always shifting and moving. In this light, there is not really any one subject who can be identified as belonging

entirely to the Center or to the Margin. Instead, all those involved in colonial discourse are always struggling to re-appropriate and eventually, reclaim the Selves which had been othered by colonial discourse. These Selves can be said to be marked by Inappropriate Otherness. They find the Selves in their being Inappropriate Others. In this process, the project of postcolonialism which seeks to dismantle the Center/Margin binarism of colonialism becomes truly revolutionary, as it seeks not just to overturn or interchange the balance of power but rather to go beyond the very oppressive structures which make strangers of everyone involved in it.[57]

Notes

1. GUMIL-Hawaii was founded in Honolulu, Hawaii on January 16, 1971. The preamble, the objectives, and the history of the organization can be found in *Dagiti Pagwadan a Filipino iti Hawaii* (GUMIL-Hawaii, 1973), GUMIL-Hawaii's very first "anthology." GUMIL-Filipinas, on the other hand, was founded in Baguio City in 1968.
2. Ilocanos, however, have been writing from Hawaii for years, even before the founding of GUMIL-Hawaii. This is shown in Marcelino Foronda Jr.'s *Recent Ilocano Fictions in Hawaii: a study in the Philippines-American Cultural and Literary History* (De La Salle UP, 1977) and in stories and poems by Hawaiian Ilocanos that found their way to the *Bannawag* magazine before 1971. The founding of GUMIL-Hawaii, however, marked the first time that Ilocano writers in Hawaii (and in the USA, for that matter) were formally organized and published in GUMIL-Hawaii anthologies.
3. The term "peculiar" here is meant to highlight GUMIL-Hawaii literature's being different and having characteristics unique to itself. It is not meant in the same sense as "queer," "weird," "freakish," "exotic," or "eccentric."
4. This is an identification usually made in history textbooks. It must be emphasized that such a view, though employed here for the purposes of simplification, is potentially simplistic.
5. The United States can also be said to have had a colonial period in its history.
6. Bill Ashcroft, et al., editors, *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader* (Routledge, 1995). Postmodernism's major project is "the deconstruction of the centralised, logocentric master narratives of European culture" (117). A selection of readings on postmodernism and postcolonialism can be found in Part Four of the aforementioned book (117-150).
7. This kind of literature is the subject of great interest in the field of postcolonial studies. It is of interest to postcolonial critics for its reference to: 1) the reality of displacement as among the results of colonization, and 2) the reality that people do write and speak from places where they are displaced and which are no longer "native" to them.
8. Such categories are still problematic. Asian American literature cannot be seen as one homogenous body. While affirming that Asian Americans, in a sense, share common history, one must also recognize that Asian American literature is as plural as the people who write it. Therefore, recognition of Asian American literature is also recognition of Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Indian, Filipino American literature. It is at this point that such issues as "what is Asian American?" and consequently, "what is Filipino/American?" arise and are even more persistent.

9. The definition of Filipino American literature as simply "literature written by Filipinos in the United States" fails to capture the dynamism of a literature which, though underrepresented in anthologies and studies on Asian American literature, is very much alive.
10. Benedict Anderson in *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (Verso, 1983) discusses the makings of community and nationalism. It is significant to note here that Anderson stresses that community and nationalism do not exist per se, but are points in one's consciousness, paradigms created by society.
11. For a background on political criticism, read Terry Eagleton's *Literary Theory: An Introduction*, especially the "Conclusion: Political Criticism "(Basil Blackwell, 1983, pp. 194-217).
12. Stuart Hall, "New Ethnicities," *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*, edited by Bill Ashcroft (Routledge, 1995, pp. 223-227). For a short and concise statement of Derrida's notion of difference, see the chapter on "Post-structuralist Thought" in John Lechte's *Fifty Key Contemporary Thinkers: From Structuralism to Postmodernity* (Routledge, 1995, pp. 107-109).
13. It is not just Ilocano that is marginalized but the other Philippine languages such as Bisaya, Ilonggo, Kapampangan, and even varieties of Tagalog, as well.
14. Philippine English is recognized and accepted as a form of Asian English.
15. 15. See Charles Larson, "Heroic Ethnocentrism—The Idea of Universality in Literature", *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*, edited by Bill Ashcroft, et al. (Routledge, 1995, pp. 62-65).
16. Bhabha refers to such an Other as a Third Space. The concept of a Third Space which belongs to neither the space of the Center nor to the space of the Margin can be a useful illustration of the dynamics of the colonial relationship and of the placement of GUMIL-Hawaii literature, as well.
17. See Timothy Brennan, "The National Longing for Form," *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*, edited by Bill Ashcroft et al. (Routledge, 1995, pp. 170-175).
18. Rafael's book, *Contracting Colonialism*, examines the role of language in the religious conversion of the Tagalogs to Catholicism during the early period of Spanish rule. By focusing on the linguistic aspects of conversion, Rafael probes the complex webs of power relationships, of submission and resistance which characterized the Philippine colonial experience. See also Reynaldo Ileto's *Pasyon and Revolution: Popular Movements in the Philippines, 1840-1910* (Ateneo de Manila UP, 1989).
19. GUMIL-Hawaii started publishing in 1973; *Dandaniw* was published in 1974; *Bullalayaw* in 1977.
20. *Utek ni Kayumanggi* was published in 1978, *Bin-I* in 1983, *Dawa* in 1990, *GUMIL-Hawaii Iti A Dekada* in 1991, and *Beggang* in 1993. All the books were published by GUMIL-Hawaii in Honolulu, Hawaii.

21. Such geographical separation can be said to be true not only of Hawaii but also of the state of Alaska. Alaska was only admitted to the Union on January 3, 1959. It is geographically closer to Canada than to the United States (the "mainland"). The history of Alaska and of the Filipinos who live there should make an interesting study.
22. See State of Hawaii Department of Education, *The Shaping of Modern Hawaiian History* (1980, Unit 2).
23. The Great Mahele (land division) introduced the concept of private property in Hawaii, 1848. Because of the Great Mahele's transformation of communal property to private land, foreigners were able to secure permanent control of the large land holdings necessary for effective plantation development and in the process, displacing Hawaiians. More and more native Hawaiians were forced to sell their labor to the foreigners, becoming laborers and plantation workers on the land they once owned. This plantation system also required a plentiful supply of labor which the native Hawaiians could not provide. As a result, a powerful campaign was started by plantation workers to bring in immigrant laborers (who provided cheaper labor) into Hawaii. These laborers were recruited from China, Japan, Korea, and the Philippines.
24. Hawaii is a small state as compared to other states such as California and New York. It may not have been (and may not be) expected to exceed its limitations. This would work all the more in the dominant power's project of keeping Hawaii in the margins.
25. This writer, however, has certain reservations about some statements which Takaki makes. In the first place, there could not have been any white "working class" in Hawaii because the HSPA actively campaigned for immigrant workers whose rates were cheaper. The only white people in Hawaii were the plantation owners and managers who were considered as competition as far as working in the fields was concerned. The competition would be among most in the same "level", i.e., competition would be among the white owners only. Following the thread of these ideas, one can say that Asians in Hawaii were still the subject of "racism and violence." This cannot be glossed over.
26. The agents received from 10 to 15 pesos for each laborer hired. This use of local agents eventually made recruitment abuses rampant. See Teodoro, *Filipinos in Hawaii* (11-12).
27. Hawaii was deceptively called "The Land of Glorya" [The Land of Glory].
28. The Asian American experience in plantation Hawaii constitutes the chapter, "Raising Cane: The World of Plantation Hawaii," in Takaki's groundbreaking book (132-176).
29. The Filipinos were not the only ones to protest the system in plantation Hawaii. The Japanese had already gone on strike as early as 1909.

30. The preponderance of Filipinos in the United States is true not just in Hawaii but in mainland USA, as well. Filipinos represent the fastest growing Asian American group in the United States today, and its numbers are expected to exceed that of the biggest Asian American group, the Chinese, by the end of the 20th century. For more on this and the implications of the growing population of Asian Americans and Filipino Americans in the United States, see James T. Fawcett and Benjamin V. Carino, editors, *Pacific Bridges: The New Immigration from Asia and the Pacific Islands* (Center for Migration Studies, 1987).
31. See Jonathan Y. Okamura, "Filipino Educational Status and Achievement at the University of Hawai'i," *Social Process in Hawaii* (1991, pp. 107-129).
32. The Ilocanos can be said to share a history of marginality. They are geographically marginalized—the Ilocos region being located in the narrow coastal plains of the northern part of Luzon; the land is rocky and narrow, contributing all the more to the hardship of Ilocano farmers and in contrast to the Tagalog farmers who occupy the wide fertile central plains of Luzon. For more on this marginalization, see L. Shelton Woods, "The Ilocanos and the 1896 Philippine Revolution," *Saint Louis University Research Journal,* vol. 27 (June 1996, pp. 176-199).
33. That *Bannawag* enjoys a large circulation in Hawaii points all the more to the peculiarity and Inappropriate Otherness of the Hawaiian Ilocano.
34. Pacita Cabulera Saludes seems to be the moving force behind GUMIL-Hawaii. She has edited all of the GUMIL-Hawaii anthologies.
35. The formal elements of fiction have been useful as a springboard in the analysis and criticism of the texts.
36. It must be observed that in the stories, the terms "Filipino" and "Ilocano" are used interchangeably, hinting at a consciousness in which the two terms are seen as one and the same thing: the Filipino is an Ilocano and the Ilocano is a Filipino.
37. Most of these are blue-collar jobs. The pay rates are hourly and in some of the stories, the Ilocano characters complain, at least once, of the impermanency and the lack of financial security of their jobs.
38. This is also true of Filipinos/Ilocanos on the mainland. Severino A. Lazo's "No Maan-anak Ti Dakes," *GUMIL-Hawaii Iti Dua a Dekada* (GUMIL-Hawaii, 1991, pp. 28-32), although set in California, tells of the marginalization of the Filipino/Ilocano even if he already has relatively more social power than his counterpart in Hawaii.
39. This could allude to the Filipino trait of being *matakaw* which means greedy.
40. "Filipino" is the term by which Navarro identifies himself.
41. *Bayani* also means "hero."
42. These characteristics are reflected in the characters of other stories, although the stories would give the reader a very good idea of the variety and kind of work the Ilocano is involved in, as well as his working conditions. In "*No Maan-*

anak ti Dakes", the Ilocano is a security guard working in California. In "*Sibib-iagto Latta Tugot Iti San Eugenio"*, the main protagonist works as a dishwasher in Hawaii. In other stories such as "*Naapgad ti Arbis"*, the Ilocano is unemployed.

43. The word "order" refers to the act of petitioning for one's family or loved one to join the petitioner as an immigrant in Hawaii or the USA. "Ordering" for one's family has become central to the idea of reuniting with the family and having a better life in what is still perceived to be as "the land of milk and better honey."
44. A friend of mine from the United States once observed that Filipinos there have the habit of buying branded cars like a Mercedes- Benz despite having very meagre incomes. These Filipinos seem to perceive the Mercedes-Benz as a status symbol for the purpose of "showing off" to other Filipinos in the US.
45. It is not just the grandmothers who are brought to Hawaii to care for their grandchildren. Grandfathers are also brought to Hawaii as in Amado Yoro's "*Awis"* where the grandfather is invited to the graduation of one of his grand-children in Hawaii. The story and his character share the same characteristics as the ones earlier described.
46. This is not, of course, the only fate of the first-wave immigrants to Hawaii. Some of the old men manage to go home to the Philippines. In this case, they are called "Hawaiianos" who do manage to marry young women. After the marriage, the Hawaiianos either go back to Hawaii with their young wives or settle in their hometowns in relative prosperity. In Hawaii, there is also the "Operation Manong" which seeks to find oldtimers who have been abandoned in shacks located in out-of-the-way places in Hawaii. If they have families back in the Philippines, they are sent back home. If they have none, Operation Manong takes care of them.
47. See Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, "Can the Subaltern Speak?" *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader* (24-28).
48. For more on the phenomenon of Hawaiianos marrying young women from their hometowns, see Rene D. Somera, "Marriage and the Ilocano Oldtimer," *Philippine Studies* vol. 34, no. 2 (1986, pp. 181-195).
49. A more detailed discussion of the nuances and specificities of the *balikbayan* who returns to the loved one he has left behind in the Philippines is in a later section of this chapter.
50. For a more thorough discussion of the relationship between patriarchy and colonialism, postcolonial and feminist criticism, see the section, "Feminism and Post-Colonialism" in Ashcroft et al., *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader* (Routledge, 1995, pp. 249-282).
51. This is the question foregrounded by Kirsten Holst Petersen's "First Things First: Problems of a Feminist Approach to African Literature", *Kunapipi* vol.6, no.3 (1984), pp. 35-47.

52. It is interesting to note here that the counterpart of the prostitute in the stories is the military man (usually from the US Navy) while the counterpart of the leper in Molokai is the pastor or the priest. These relationships may refer to actual ones. The relationship of the priest to the leper may have Biblical allusions.
53. Typical of the Filipino's perception of location, directions that are given to places in the stories are described in terms of landmarks.
54. Round Top Drive is described in reference to Kennon Road, a winding road in the northern mountains of the Philippines that connects the city of Baguio to the lowland provinces.
55. See Ignacio, "Naapgad" (66-72).
56. See Frantz Fanon's *Black Skin, White Masks* (Grove P, 1967) and *The Wretched of the Earth* (Grove P, 1963).
57. Editorial note: This monograph is based on Beatriz Lorente's MA thesis, completed in 1997. To this date, it has remained one of the few early, important studies on GUMIL-Hawaii literature viewed distinctly from the perspective of diaspora and not just "literature overseas." This, even before the relationship between literature and diaspora was seriously considered as a thematic field in itself, making for a new dynamism in the writing by Filipinos living abroad. The publication of this monograph was delayed by a host of production problems, but in the end, we decided to publish it in the hope that more scholars would be encouraged to engage with the diasporic dimension of Filipino lives and their literature.

References

Alegado, Dean T. "The Filipino Community in Hawaii: Development and Change". *Social Process in Hawai'i*, vol. 33, 1991, pp.12 - 38.

Albalos, Mario A. "*Dagiti Maudi nga Adlaw ni Tata Florencio*", *Utek ni Kayumanggi*, edited by Pacita Cabulera Saludes and Amado I. Yoro. Honolulu: Gumil-Hawaii, 1980, pp. 176-184.

---. *Mga Uban at Rosas*. Reymar Publishing House, 1990.

---. "*Sibibiagto Latta Dagiti Tugot Iti San Eugenio*", *Dawa*, edited by Francisco T. Ponce, Mel A. Gonzales, Felipe P. Abinsay, Jr., and Carlo M. Laforga. Honolulu: Gumil-Hawaii, 1989, pp.73-83.

Almirol, Edwin B. "Filipino Immigrants and Voluntary Associations." *Philippines Studies,* vol. 34, 1986, pp. 41-60.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Verso, 1983.

Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin, *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-Colonial Literatures*. Routledge, 1989.

---. *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*. Routledge, 1995.

Bautista, Danilo. "*Ramut ti Kaputotan", Bin-i*, edited by Pacita Cabulera Saludes. Honolulu: Gumil-Hawaii, 1984, pp. 211-221.

Bhabha, Homi K. "Cultural Diversity and Cultural Differences." *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*, edited by Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin. Routledge, 1995, 206 - 212.

---. "Signs Taken for Wonders". *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*, edited by Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin. Routledge, 1995, 29 - 35.

Campomanes, Oscar V. "Filipinos in the United States and Their Literature of Exile." *Reading the Literatures of Asian America*, edited by Shirley Geok-lin Lim and Amy Ling, Temple UP, 1992, pp. 49-78.

---, and Todd Gernes. "Carlos Bulosan and the Act of Writing." *Philippine Studies,* vol. 40, 1992, pp. 68-82.

Carino, Benjamin. *Filipinos in Oahu, Hawaii*. Population Institute, East-West Center, 1981.

Duckworth-Ford, Robert A., "Cutting Seed Cane," University of Hawaii at Manoa Library Digital Image Collections, accessed April 28, 2021, https://digital.library.manoa.hawaii.edu/items/show/29694.

Eagleton, Terry. *Literary Theory: An Introduction*. Basil Blackwell Ltd., 1983.

Fawcett, James T., and Benjamin V. Carino, editors. *Pacific Bridges: The New Immigration from Asian and the Pacific Islands*. Center for Migration Studies, 1987.

Fanon, Frantz. *Black Skin, White Masks*. Grove P, 1967.

---. *The Wretched of the Earth*. Grove P, 1963.

Foronda, Marcelino, Jr. *Recent Iloko Fiction in Hawaii: A Study in Philippine-American Cultural and Literary History*. De La Salle University, 1977.

Gonzales, Mel A. "Lubuag ti Daga", *Utek ni Kayumanggi*, edited by Pacita Cabulera Saludes and Amado I. Yoro. Honolulu: Gumil-Hawaii, 1980, pp. 158-161.

Gorospe, Julie V. "Kasta La Gayam!"*Utek ni Kayumanggi*, edited by Pacita Cabulera Saludes and Amado I. Yoro. Honolulu: Gumil-Hawaii, 1980, pp. 231-235.

Halaba, Pelagio B. "*Adda Supapak Ti Tunggal Biddut*", *Bin-i,* edited by Pacita Cabulera Saludes. Honolulu: Gumil-Hawaii, 1984, pp. 162-165.

---. "*Ina*", *Utek ni Kayumanggi*, edited by Pacita Cabulera Saludes and Amado I. Yoro. Honolulu: Gumil-Hawaii, 1980, pp. 195-200.

---. "*Ti Langit ni Nana Sela*", *Dawa,* edited by Francisco T. Ponce, Mel A. Gonzales, Felipe P. Abinsay, Jr., and Carlo M. Laforga. Honolulu: Gumil-Hawaii, 1989, pp. 13-19.

Hall, Stuart. "New Ethnicities" The Post-Colonial Studies Reader, edited by Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin. Routledge, 1995, pp. 223 – 227.

Ignacio, Artemio T. "*Naapgad ti Arbis idi Kalman*", *Dawa*, edited by Francisco T. Ponce, Mel A. Gonzales, Felipe P. Abinsay, Jr., and Carlo M. Laforga. Honolulu: Gumil-Hawaii, 1989, pp. 66-72.

---. "*Nabileg Dagiti Arapaap*", *Dawa*, edited by Francisco T. Ponce, Mel A. Gonzales, Felipe P. Abinsay, Jr., and Carlo M. Laforga. Honolulu: Gumil-Hawaii, 1989, pp. 51-58.

---. "*Ti Muli, Ti Danum ken ti Angin*", *Dawa*, edited by Francisco T. Ponce, Mel A. Gonzales, Felipe P. Abinsay, Jr., and Carlo M. Laforga. Honolulu: Gumil-Hawaii, 1989, pp. 91-98.

Ileto, Reynaldo Clemena. *Pasyon and Revolution: Popular Movements in the Philippines, 1840-1910*. Ateneo de Manila UP, 1979.

Laforga, Carlo M. "*Idi Nagbalik Hawaii ni Uncle Angelo*", *Bin-i*, edited by Pacita Cabulera Saludes. Honolulu: Gumil-Hawaii, 1984, pp. 193-197.

Lechte, John. *Fifty Key Contemporary Thinkers*. Routledge, 1995.

Lee, Daniel. "Cadence, Country, Silence: Writing in Colonial Space." *boundary 2,* vol. 3 no.1, 1974, pp. 151-168.

Minh-ha, Trinh. "No Master Territories". *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*, edited by Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin. Routledge, 1995, pp. 215–218.

Okamura, Jonathan Y. 1991. "Beyond Adaptationism: Immigrant Filipino Ethnicity in Hawaii". *Social Process in Hawaii* vol. 33, 1991, pp. 56-72.

Okamura, Jonathan Y., Amefil R. Agbayani and Melinda Tria Kerkvliet, editors. "The Filipino American Experience in Hawaii." *Social Process in Hawaii,* vol. 33, 1991.

Petersen, Kirsten Holst. "First Things First: Problems of a Feminist Approach to African Literature", *Kunapipi* vol.6, no.3 (1984), pp. 35-47

Parry, Benita. "Problems in Current Theories of Colonial Discourse." *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*, edited by Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin, New York: Routledge, 1995, pp. 36 – 44.

Pascua, Letty R. "*Adda Kaibatogan ti Panagibtu*", *Utek ni Kayumanggi*, edited by Pacita Cabulera Saludes and Amado I. Yoro. Honolulu: Gumil-Hawaii, 1980, pp. 171-174.

Ponce, Francisco T., "Bon Voyage", *Gumil Hawaii Iti Dua A Dekada*, edited by Pacita C. Saludes, Jeremias A. Calixto, Ricarte A. Agnes and Carlo M. Laforga. Honolulu: Gumil-Hawaii, 1991, pp. 38-40

---. "*Kastoy Gayam*", *Utek ni Kayumanggi*, edited by Pacita Cabulera Saludes and Amado I. Yoro. Honolulu: Gumil-Hawaii, 1980, pp. 224-229.

---. "*Krus ti Masakbayan*", *Gumil Hawaii Iti Dua A Dekada*, edited by Pacita C. Saludes, Jeremias A. Calixto, Ricarte A. Agnes and Carlo M. Laforga. Honolulu: Gumil-Hawaii, 1991, pp. 36-37.Ponce, Francisco T., Mel A. Gonzales, Felipe P. Abinsay, Jr., and Carlo M. Laforga, editors. *Dawa.* Honolulu: Gumil-Hawaii, 1989.

Rafael, Vicente L. *Contracting Colonialism: Translation and Christian Conversion in Tagalog Society under Early Spanish Rule.* Ateneo de Manila UP, 1988.

Saludes, Pacita C. "*Ilokana Dayta, Marlon*", *Beggang*, edited by Jeremias A. Calixto, Carlo M. Laforga and Pacita C. Saludes. Honolulu: Gumil Hawaii, 1993, pp. 23-30.

---. "*Ubbingda Pay*", *Utek ni Kayumanggi*, edited by Pacita Cabulera Saludes and Amado I. Yoro. Honolulu: Gumil-Hawaii, 1980, pp. 218-223.

Saludes, Pacita Cabulera, editor. *Bin-i.* Honolulu: Gumil-Hawaii, 1984.

---. *Dagiti Pagdawan A Filipino Iti Hawaii.* GUMIL-Hawaii, 1973.

---. *Idi Kalman ken Ita.* GUMIL-Hawaii, 1976.

---. *Tugot II.* Badoc-Pinili Aid Association of Hawaii, 1989.

---, and Amado I. Yoro, editors. *Utek ni Kayumanggi.* GUMIL-Hawaii, 1960.

---, Jeremias A. Calixto, Ricarte A. Agnes and Carlo M. Laforga, editors. *GUMIL-Hawaii Iti Dua A Dekada.* GUMIL-Hawaii, 1991.

---, Jeremias A. Calixto, Ricarte A. Agnes and Carlo M. Laforga, editors. *Guyod Dagiti Ramut.* Annak ti Kailokuan iti America, 1995.

---, Jeremias A. Calixto and Carlo M. Lalorga, editors. *Beggang.* GUMIL-Hawaii, 1993.

San Juan, Epifanio, Jr. *Writing and National Liberation: Essay in Critical Practice.* U of the Philippines P, 1991.

---. "Filipino Writing in the United States: Reclaiming Whose America?" *Philippine Studies*, vol. 41, 1993, pp. 141-166.

The Shaping of Modern Hawaiian History. Hawaii State Department of Education, 1980.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. “Can the Subaltern Speak?” *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader,* edited by Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin. Routledge, 1995.

Sollors, Werner. “Who is Ethnic?” *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*, edited by Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin. Routledge, 1995, 219 - 222.

Somera, Rene D. “Marriage and the Ilocano Oldtimer.” *Philippine Studies,* vol. 34, 1986, pp. 181-195.

Takaki, Ronald. *Strangers from a Different Shore: A History of Asian Americans.* Penguin, 1989.

Teodoro, Luis V., Jr. *Out of This Struggle: The Filipinos in Hawaii.* U of Hawaii P, 1981.

Woods, L. Shelton. “Ilocanos and the 1896 Revolution.” *Saint Louis University Research Journal,* vol. 27, 1996, pp. 176-199.

Yoro, Amado I. “*Awis*”, *Utek ni Kayumanggi,* edited by Pacita Cabulera Saludes and Amado I. Yoro. Honolulu: Gumil-Hawaii, 1980, pp. 213-217.

---. “*Naimbag a Paskuam, Salidumay*”, *Utek ni Kayumanggi,* edited by Pacita Cabulera Saludes and Amado I. Yoro. Honolulu: Gumil-Hawaii, 1980, pp. 207-212.

---. “*Ni Lakay Saulo, ti Abong-Abong ken ti Sangasudo nga Arbis*”, *Bin-i,* edited by Pacita Cabulera Saludes. Honolulu: Gumil-Hawaii, 1984, pp 152-157.

---. “*Ti Naalnawan a Biyahe.*” *Dawa,* edited by Francisco T. Ponce, Mel A. Gonzales, Felipe P. Abinsay, Jr., and Carlo M. Laforga. Honolulu: Gumil-Hawaii, 1989, pp. 7-12.

About the Author

BEATRIZ P. LORENTE was an assistant instructor in the English Department of the Ateneo de Manila University when she wrote the MA Thesis that is the basis of this monograph in 1997. Currently, she is a lecturer in the Department of English of the University of Bern. She is the author of *Scripts of Servitude: Language, Labor Migration and Transnational Domestic Work* (Multilingual Matters, 2018) which was a finalist for the 2020 American Association for Applied Linguistics Book Award. She is also an editor of *Figures of Interpretation* (Multilingual Matters, 2021).