**The Hunt and Maharlika**

Trains

Essentializing Uniformity and Identity

* Language: The Hunt : plenty of linguistic diversity. Maharlika: besides the title, none.
* Race, Class and Capitalism : The Hunt (Mary is half White. The same bungalow is occupied by white and brown people – capitalism is latitudinal, myriad. In Maharlika, essentialized by class.
* Train:
* Children: Mary grew up without a father (unconventional). For Carlo’s family, it is very conventional nuclear family (relatable, yet distant).
* Cash: “cash” vs money. Statistics – lump together the vermin as numbers. Same for Oraon.
* Essentializing induces us to suspend disbelief and emotion – crucial to logic of domination. Thus, strategic essentialism might also share the same pitfalls.
* Promote individuality through Self-Narrative: Mary has one, shaped by her unique circumstances. Whereas in Maharlika, everyone follows the groove of nationalism and bigotry. This is why at the end, Carlo struggles with his (originally it is nationalistic, but he starts to question it).
  + “What about you if she’d been killed? I wouldn’t have been”

The hunt itself

* Gets drunk because she doesn’t want to remember
* Bathes naked.
* Religion

Tehsildar

* Has an identity as “contractor” (capitalist) and “Tehsildar Singh” (lustful man)

and as a Hindu

Portrayal of capitalism

* “The Hunt” : myriad. With Prasadji, benign, With the coming of Tehsildar, malicious.
* “Maharlika”: singular, horrible.

Why does she have white blood? Is it her savior?

* No, not Mahasweta’s intention. This is a viewpoint held by the boxed-in, socialized natives, as “Prasadji says, It figures. White blood.”
* Victory isn’t complete (the village still has been plundered).

Marxist feminism – upended

* “that is why she works so hard for wages at the Prasad house” – runs contrary to the theory of unproductive labour and the proletariat

Social ecology (evolution)

Blue Donkey.

**Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory: “The Hunt” teases out each element in Mary’s life. “Maharlika” collapses all of them to one grand narrative.**

**“wild boar” in Maharlika**

**Maharlika also has** differentiated identity (of race): yet lumps vermin into the same category based on class.

Bronfenbrenner : intimacy/importance of spheres.

Social ecology: distinction between kinship (didn’t want to kill their own vermin) and class (no problem killing economically unproductive people)

The two texts peel the layers in different ways (Hunt – gender + race + class, Maharlika: race + class + nation). Common thread: exploitation via class (sufficiently broad enough to essentialize). Feels like The Hunt is bottom up, while Maharlika is top-down (maybe this is why characters are generic enough, the family uses familiar slang, all roles are conventional). This gives Sarmiento the ease to make the narrative in “Maharlika” dystopian, and mockingly satirical, such that it is convincing not only for the character but also the reader. The impartial, stoic tone of the story is persuasive – it could easily have come from one of Datu’s films. There is no narrative commentary, and the reporting is flat – to emphasize the normalization of the slow violence.

* “not that hunting has anything to do with race”- that’s just urban legend
* “… the Phillippines was rewarded by being made a colony of the United States”

Sophisticated tourist attraction – 2nd nature

Slow violence

Carlo pushed to the extreme, thinking he’s going to die : “or were these bloodthirsty strangers really his parents.” Why does Carlo kill the infant and not the adult?

Bourgeuois women as complicit in oppression

* Carlo’s mother (“you should have seen her,” “anything for my babies”)
* Prasadji’s wife (Mrs.Prasad).