

**MIXED BLESSING:
The Impact of the
American Colonial
Experience on Politics and
Society in the Philippines**

Hazel M. McFerson
Editor

GREENWOOD PRESS

MIXED BLESSING

**Recent Titles in
Contributions in Comparative Colonial Studies**

Imperial Diplomacy in the Era of Decolonization: The Sudan and Anglo-Egyptian Relations, 1945–1956
W. Travis Hanes III

The Man on the Spot: Essays on British Empire History
Roger D. Long, editor

Imperialism and Colonialism: Essays on the History of European Expansion
H. L. Wesseling

The Racial Dimension of American Overseas Colonial Policy
Hazel M. McFerson

Meeting Technology's Advance: Social Change in China and Zimbabwe in the Railway Age
James Zheng Gao

U. S. Imperialism in Latin America: Bryan's Challenges and Contributions, 1900–1920
Edward S. Kaplan

The Kingdom of Swaziland: Studies in Political History
D. Hugh Gillis

The Bringing of Wonder: Trade and the Indians of the Southeast, 1700–1783
Michael P. Morris

Policing Islam: The British Occupation of Egypt and the Anglo-Egyptian Struggle over Control of the Police, 1882–1914
Harold Tollefson

India: The Seductive and Seduced "Other" of German Orientalism
Kamakshi P. Murti

The Betrothed of Death: The Spanish Foreign Legion During the Rif Rebellion, 1920–1927
Jose E. Alvarez

Britain's Sterling Colonial Policy and Decolonization, 1939–1958
Allister Hinds

MIXED BLESSING

The Impact of the American Colonial
Experience on Politics and Society
in the Philippines

Edited by Hazel M. McFerson

Foreword by Fidel V. Ramos

Contributions in Comparative Colonial Studies, Number 41



GREENWOOD PRESS
Westport, Connecticut • London

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Mixed blessing : the impact of the American colonial experience on politics and society in the Philippines / edited by Hazel M. McFerson ; foreword by Fidel V. Ramos.

p. cm.—(Contributions in comparative colonial studies, ISSN 0163–3813 ; no. 41)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0–313–30791–1 (alk. paper)

1. Philippines—History—1898–1946. 2. Philippines—Intellectual life. 3. Politics and culture—Philippines. 4. Philippines—Relations—United States. 5. United States—Relations—Philippines. I. McFerson, Hazel M. II. Series.

DS685.M63 2002

959.904—dc21 00–042654

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data is available.

Copyright © 2002 by Hazel M. McFerson

All rights reserved. No portion of this book may be reproduced, by any process or technique, without the express written consent of the publisher.

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 00–042654

ISBN: 0–313–30791–1

ISSN: 0163–3813

First published in 2002

Greenwood Press, 88 Post Road West, Westport, CT 06881

An imprint of Greenwood Publishing Group, Inc.

www.greenwood.com

Printed in the United States of America



The paper used in this book complies with the Permanent Paper Standard issued by the National Information Standards Organization (Z39.48–1984).

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Copyright Acknowledgments

Grateful acknowledgments are given to the following for permission to print:

Nicanor Tiongson for his translation of Cecilio Apostol, “Al ‘Yankee,” in *Philippine Literature: A History and Anthology*, edited by Bienvenido Lumbera and Cynthia Nograles (Pasig City: Anvil Publishing, Inc., 1997).

Nicanor Tiongson for his translation of Fernando Ma. Guerrero’s “Mi Patria,” in *Early Philippine Literature: From Ancient Times to 1940*, edited by Asuncion David-Maramba (Manila: National Book Store, Inc., 1971).

Leodivico Lacsamana for his translation of Amado V. Hernandez’s “Ang Kulay Ng Pilipino,” a poem published in *Parnasong Tagalog ni A. G. Abadilla*, edited by Efren Abueg (Maynila: MCS Enterprises, Inc., 1973).

Leodivico Lacsamana for translating one stanza of Jose Chavez’s “Kay Rizal,” a poem published in Rosario Cruz-Lucero, “Ang Rebolusyon 1896: Sa Imahinasyong Pampanitikang Ilonggo 1898–1920,” *Diliman Review* 45, no.4, 46, no. 1 (1997–1998).

Leodivico Lacsamana for translating two stanzas of Miguela Montelibano’s “Akong Handum,” a poem published in Rosario Cruz-Lucero, “Ang Rebolusyon 1896: Sa Imahinasyong Pampanitikang Ilonggo, 1898–1920,” *Diliman Review* 45, no. 4, 46, no. 1 (1997–1998).

Leodivico Lacsamana for translating one paragraph of D. A. Rosario’s “Aloha,” a short story published in *Early Philippine Literature: From Ancient Times to 1940*, edited by Asuncion David-Maramba (Manila: National Book Store, Inc., 1971).

Daisy Lopez for her translation of Rafael Palma’s “El Alma De España,” an essay published in *Latidos Del Alma Filipina*, edited by Edgardo Tiamson Mendoza (Manila: Bookmark, 1984).

Leon Gonzales and Aurora Gonzales for their translation of Benigno Ramos, “Ang Kayumanggi,” in *Parnasong Tagalog ni A. G. Abadilla*, edited by Efren Abueg (Maynila: MCS Enterprises, Inc., 1973).

Angela Manalang Gloria, “To a Mestiza,” in *The Complete Poems of Angela Manalang Gloria*, edited by Edna Zapanta Manlapaz (Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1993).

Marjorie Evasco, “Rim of Fire,” in *Ochre Tones: Poems in English & Cebuano* (Marikina: Salimbayan Books, 1999).

Every reasonable effort has been made to trace the owners of copyright materials in this book, but in some instances this has proven impossible. The editor and publisher will be glad to receive information leading to more complete acknowledgments in subsequent printings of the book and in the meantime extend their apologies for any omissions.

To the wonderful Filipino people,
and to my husband, Rino,
who made it all possible.

Contents

Foreword	xi
<i>Fidel V. Ramos</i>	
Preface and Acknowledgments	xiii
1 Introduction	1
<i>Hazel M. McFerson</i>	
PART I: CULTURE AND IDENTITY	
2 Filipino Identity and Self-Image in Historical Perspective	13
<i>Hazel M. McFerson</i>	
3 Race and Culture in Spanish and American Colonial Policies	43
<i>Marya Svetlana T. Camacho</i>	
4 “Benevolent Assimilation” and Filipino Responses	75
<i>Maria Serena I. Diokno</i>	
5 The Role of Education in Americanizing Filipinos	89
<i>Alexander A. Calata</i>	
6 Kayumanggi versus Maputi: 100 Years of America’s White Aesthetics in Philippine Literature	99
<i>Princess Orig</i>	

PART II: SOCIETY AND POLITICS

7	The American Influence on Philippine Political and Constitutional Tradition <i>Wilfrido V. Villacorta</i>	135
8	Shaping the Filipino Nation: The Role of Civil Society <i>Jose Rene C. Gayo</i>	145
9	Women in Philippine Politics and Society <i>Mina C. Roces</i>	159
10	American Rule in the Muslim South and the Philippine Hinterlands <i>Raul Pertierra and Eduardo F. Ugarte</i>	191
11	Cacique Democracy and Future Prospects in the Philippines <i>Julio Rey B. Hidalgo</i>	209
	Appendix 1: Annotated Chronology of Selected Events in Philippine-American Relations	241
	Appendix 2: Treaty of Peace Between the United States and Spain, December 10, 1898	261
	Appendix 3: Benevolent Assimilation Proclamation by President William McKinley, December 21, 1898	267
	Appendix 4: Philippine Exhibitions at U.S. World's Fairs and Expositions	269
	Appendix 5: The Land Tenancy Issue	273
	Index	277
	About the Editor and Contributors	285

Foreword

“We must know where we came from,” it is said, “in order to decide where we are going.” This is true among other things of our attitudes toward other ethnic and social groups. If we have no understanding of the roots of our self-image and image of others, we cannot modify our own prejudices and we are powerless vis-à-vis the false perceptions that others hold of us. This book, which draws among others on the work of many distinguished Filipino scholars, marks a significant advance in the understanding of the formation of racial and ethnic attitudes in our country and of their impact—sometimes obvious, sometimes dangerously subtle—on politics and society in the Philippines.

The precolonial creation-myths of the people of these islands were largely positive in nature. For example, the Filipino legend that the gods overbaked “black” people and underbaked “white” people, until they got it just right in the “brown” Malay race, embodies pride and self-love, but doesn’t carry a mean stigma against other races. Of course, tribal, geographic, and social distinctions existed in precolonial times, but the notion of *racially* superior and inferior groups emerged only with the arrival of the Spanish colonizers and was reinforced when the Americans at the turn of the century brought to the Philippines their own brand of intense racial prejudice of the time. A predictable corollary was the rise of discriminatory attitudes among the Filipinos themselves, in favor of those with a somatic image closer to that of the colonizers, and against those with darker skin, non-Caucasian features, or “uncivilized” behavior. However many positive features the Philippines may owe to Spanish and American influences, it is a fact that through the centuries some of these discriminatory attitudes have become deeply embedded among our own people (albeit to a lesser extent

than in many other countries). These attitudes partly underpin the sharp class cleavages and extreme inequality of income and opportunity so sadly evident in this country. We may not approve of these attitudes, or of their repercussions, but we ignore their reality at our peril. As Karl Marx wrote in 1852, “men make their own history, but they do not make it in circumstances which they themselves choose.”

I have stressed on another occasion three years ago that while much progress has been made since the People Power revolution of 1986, four key challenges remain ahead of us in the twenty-first century: social and economic reforms, global competitiveness, mass poverty, and democratic governance. Although the Philippines were much less affected by the Asian financial crisis than neighboring countries (largely because of fundamental reforms we implemented in 1992 and 1998), the onset of the crisis in mid-1997 intensified these challenges.

Genuine socioeconomic reform requires freeing ourselves from the grip of patronage politics and economic oligarchies and moving further away from arbitrary discretion to self-regulation and accountability. Global competitiveness calls on us to keep an open economy and build our comparative advantage on quality skills and innovation. To fight poverty, a most difficult struggle, we must enable the poor to create their own freedom and take command of their lives, by revitalizing and extending the social reform agenda of the mid-1990s. And the final challenge, that of consolidating further our democratic institutions, can only be met by restoring the authority of the law, resolutely combating corruption, and replacing the politics of personality and opportunism with the politics of people-empowerment. The Philippines does not need a “man on horseback” to rescue the system, but a system to rescue it from men on horseback. In sum, what should worry us Filipinos as a people is not Francis Fukuyama’s “end of history” but rather the “recurrence of history.”

In this important book, combining the historical, the political, and the sociological, Professor Hazel M. McFerson cautions us about the recurrence of the history of divisive ethnic and class prejudices, *vis-à-vis* others and *especially vis-à-vis* our own selves. These prejudices will continue to be a ball-and-chain on Filipino society and hamper the consolidation of a truly national identity grounded on positive values. The economic, political, and social progress of the Philippines depends largely on how well and how quickly we shake off these divisive prejudices. At a time when this country has concluded a joyful centennial celebration of its Declaration of Independence in 1898, and has achieved the second peaceful and democratic transfer of presidential power since the dictatorship was overthrown in 1986, it is my fervent hope that the leadership of this country, beginning from the top—but at all levels—will take this challenge to heart—and act on it.

Fidel V. Ramos
President of the Philippines, 1992–1998
Manila, July 8, 1999

Preface and Acknowledgments

My research is a lived experience. For most of my academic life, both as a graduate student and now as a university professor, I have been interested in issues of race, ethnicity, politics, and conflict as these issues have developed within a particular racial tradition. Over twenty years ago I coined the term “racial tradition” to refer to the complex of beliefs, attitudes, images, taxonomies, laws, and social customs that shape the structure of race relations and racial formation in multiracial societies (McFerson, 1979a, b, 1997).¹ The framework is fully presented in chapter 1 and is used to analyze race, politics, and society in the Philippines during Spanish and American colonialism and in the contemporary period.

I first began to think that there might be factors determining race, ethnic relations, politics, and levels of conflict in societies, other than those then prominent in theoretical explanations when racial tensions surfaced in Boston during the 1970s. During this period I was a graduate student in my hometown of Boston, a multiracial and multiethnic city then in the throes of overt racial conflict. I wondered how the conflict might be the result of Boston’s racial tradition, which is particularly rigid for nonwhites. While white ethnic groups experienced mobility, nonwhites seemed to be consigned perpetually to the bottom ranks of the socioracial status hierarchy even when they had high income, education, and other status prerequisites. One explanation appears to be what I term “racial tradition.” Racial tradition refers to the complex of beliefs, attitudes, images, taxonomies, laws, and social customs that shape the structure of race relations and racial formation in multiracial societies (McFerson, 1979a). Central to the concept of racial tradition are the following: (1) prevailing ideas about

racial group superiority and inferiority as manifested in custom as well as in formal law; (2) the role of race relative to the more conventional variables of stratification, for example, class and culture; (3) the criteria used to classify racial groups, the resultant hierarchy of racial groups, and (4) the centrality to this arrangement of the role of either genotypic or phenotypic definitions of race. One basic implication of the concept is that the intensity of conflict in different systems is partly the result of sharp discontinuities in the socioracial status ranking of individuals belonging to different racial groups. Thus, my interest was in the prevalence of a “white bias,” which transcends class and culture, and led me to pay attention to underlying racial traditions and the role in creating invidious status distinctions on the basis of ascribed characteristics such as ancestry and phenotype. This was overlooked in modernization and plural society theories so popular at the time, neither of which adequately directed attention to racial traditions.

The resulting racial tradition framework and the significance for conflict and politics in multiracial societies was influenced by my travels and residences over the past twenty-five years in a number of multiracial and multiethnic countries in the United States, the Caribbean, the South Pacific, Africa, parts of Europe, and most recently to Southeast Asia. My research in these regions has convinced me that racial traditions are an important aspect of the social, political, and cultural landscapes and that these influence politics, race relations, and conflict in multiracial and multiethnic societies.²

In addition, because many of the countries I have studied, including the Philippines, are former colonial societies, the racial tradition framework is also important for analyzing the racial dimension of specific colonial policies and the continuing impact of conflict, politics, race, and ethnic relations on contemporary postcolonial societies. Colonialism was a power relationship in which European and white American colonizers successfully imposed their Eurocentric racial traditions on the colonized all over the world over many centuries. As a result, “white bias” is still a salient feature of many Western and non-Western societies, regardless of the phenotypic and genotypic makeup of the society.

Growing up in what is now the predominantly African American section of Roxbury in Boston fueled my interest in comparative ethnic and race relations early on. During my childhood and into my young adult years, the African American population of Boston was relatively small, and, notwithstanding the often acrimonious race relations of contemporary Boston, white and nonwhite ethnic and racial groups lived in fairly close contact in some neighborhoods. Throughout my primary and secondary education, I attended “integrated” schools where my classmates were predominantly white, with a sprinkling of African Americans and Asians—initially Chinese Americans who were later joined by Koreans, a few Japanese, a sprinkling of Filipinos, and a handful of Latin American immigrants. My teachers were predominantly white, and, interestingly, the integrated school was located in the midst of the rigidly segregated Orchard Park Housing Project. White students lived on one side of a wide field

on the “white” side of the project, while I and my black peers lived on the “black” side on the other side of the field. Asians lived in neutral areas, usually attached to family-owned businesses, which all of the races patronized.

An exception to this residential pattern was a neighboring family—a Filipino family—who, in the Boston racial tradition were characterized as “black” on account of their brown skin and Malay features. We children played together, and I formed my initial impressions about Filipinos from this contact. Eventually the opening up of housing opportunities outside of the project saw many neighbors leave for “whiter” pastures, and contact was lost. But I remembered my Filipino neighbors, and when the opportunity to apply for a Fulbright Fellowship in the Philippines presented itself, I sought the opportunity and was successful.

As I recount in chapter 2, the preconceived notions of Filipinos, which I developed during my childhood, were not sustained during my visits and a two-year residence in Manila and travel around the Philippines. I quickly became aware that the racial tradition to which Filipinos were assigned in the United States did not carry over to the Philippines itself or to Filipinos’ self-images. I was surprised, for example, that in Manila, at least, Filipinos who fit the phenotype of my childhood friends were rare. And as I traveled around—particularly to upscale hotels, restaurants, and shops—I noticed that brown Filipinas of Malay phenotype were not the ideal of feminine beauty in the eyes of many Filipinos. Front desk personnel and other employees of high-status establishments, including airlines personnel, sales clerks, and the myriad of employees in the financial district of Ortigas Center, for example, were light-skinned, mixed-race mestizos and were distinctly non-Malay in physical appearance. This was also true of many of the uniformed students I observed at private elementary and secondary schools, as well as university students attending many of the universities that I visited; these were also the physical types depicted in the mass media.

I had witnessed a similar pattern during my visits and residences to Puerto Rico during the early seventies, and dark-skinned Puerto Ricans in common with their Malay counterparts, clearly took a back seat to the paler groups in society. In fact, my African phenotype characterized me as unique in both countries. I had examined the racial dimension of American colonialism in Puerto Rico in an earlier book (McFerson, 1997), and the apparent similarities made the Philippines and the impact of American colonialism on politics, institutions, and society an attractive research topic to examine within the context of the “racial tradition” framework in Southeast Asia. Although this book is solely about American colonialism and its legacy in the Philippines, there are a few similarities with Puerto Rico that are briefly worth noting.

Both countries were initially colonized by Spain, and this was superseded by American acquisition as the result of the Spanish-American War in 1898. Both countries were awarded to America as prizes of war in the dispute between Spain and the United States. As a result of the Treaty of Paris, a defeated Spain had to relinquish these colonies, both of which were assigned to the United

States. The Philippines were acquired by the United States in the Treaty of Paris for \$20 million, while Puerto Rico was ceded under the Treaty of Paris and the Monroe Doctrine. In spite of these similarities in the social setting of the Philippines and Puerto Rico, however, the political histories of the two countries could not be more diverse.

Many Filipinos strongly resisted their acquisition by the United States, and this is a continuing theme in contemporary politics, as became apparent during the day-long seminar of Filipino scholars that I convened at my host institution, the University of Asia and the Pacific, Manila, to examine the impact of American colonial policy on Philippines society, institutions, and politics. Even though a number of non-Filipino scholars have extensively studied the country, many accounts are woefully simplistic and few are written by Filipinos. Thus, it is hoped that this book will add a new dimension to the discussion of American colonialism in the Philippines.

I owe a debt of gratitude to many Filipinos for their friendship and kindness during my stay in their country. First and foremost, special appreciation is noted to the Council for the Exchange of International Scholars (CEIS), Washington, D.C., and the Philippine-American Education Foundation, Makati, Manila, who awarded me the Fulbright Fellowship. I am also grateful to George Mason University, Department of Public and International Affairs, which granted me a leave of absence. I also thank the University of Asia and the Pacific, Pasig City, Manila, which hosted me as a Fulbright Scholar. Special thanks to all of my colleagues at UA&P, especially Dr. Susana E. Manzon, Managing Director, Public and International Affairs, Dr. Jose Rene C. Gayo, Dean of the School of Management, Clarisse Peteza for secretarial assistance, Luisita Cordero and Rey Trillana, Director and Assistant Director, respectively, Institute of Political Economy. Special thanks also to Erlinda Paez, Academic Director, College of Arts and Sciences; Corazon Aseniro, Managing Director for Finance; Virginia Olano, University Registrar; and Thelma Perez, Managing Director for Administration—all of whom took me on a much-appreciated cultural tour shortly after my arrival to give me a glimpse of life outside of Manila.

A special affectionate acknowledgment to my students, the "Batch of 2000," who shared their warmth and enthusiasm about life and learning with me, and from whom I also learned much. Special thanks also to Dr. Mary Racelis, director of the Institute of Philippine Culture, and senior professorial lecturer, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Ateneo de Manila University, and chair, board of directors, Community Organizers Multiversity, Manila; Dr. Cynthia Bautista, executive director, Center for Integrative and Development Studies, and Sociology and Anthropology Department, University of the Philippines, Diliman, Quezon City, Manila; Dr. Emma Porio, associate professor and chair; Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Ateneo de Manila University, Philippines, and Dr. Luzviminda B. Valencia, former chair of Sociology and Political Science, University of the Philippines at Dilliman. They always responded kindly to my requests for yet another piece of advice or the name of yet another

person to contact. Also a special thanks to Mrs. Virginia Benitez Licuanan. I am also deeply grateful to former President Fidel Ramos, whose historic accomplishments include the second peaceful transfer of presidential power in the contemporary Philippines, and whose insights constitute the foreword to this book.

Finally, this book was conceived and edited in the spirit of the eminent Filipino historian and scholar, O. D. Corpuz, who has decried rightly the tendency of many “modern exchange scholars” to pick the brains of Third World academics in host countries (1989: 1:395).³ This collection is a departure from that unfortunate tradition in that all of the contributors, except only for myself, are Filipino scholars and academics. My major thanks, of course, go to them, as well as my personal hope that through this example the wealth of knowledge and direct understanding possessed by Filipino scholars and academics may be better used and more fairly recognized by the international community in the years to come.

NOTES

1. Hazel M. McFerson, “Plural Society in the U.S. Virgin Islands,” *Plural Societies* 10, no. 1 (spring 1979); “Racial Tradition and Comparative Political Analysis,” *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 2, no. 4 (October 1979); *The Racial Dimension of American Overseas Colonial Policy* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group, 1997).

2. See, for example, my “Rethinking Ethnic Conflict,” *American Behavioral Scientist* 40, no. 1 (September 1996); “Ethnicity Conflict and Unstable Equilibrium in Fiji: The Roots of the 1987 Coup,” in Rutledge Dennis, ed., *Research in Race and Ethnic Relations*, vol. 7 (Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, 1994); “Part-Black Americans in the South Pacific,” *Phylon* 43, no. 2, (June 1982).

3. O. D. Corpuz, *The Roots of Philippine Nationalism*, vols. 1 and 2 (Quezon City, Philippines: Akhali Foundation, Inc., 1989).

REFERENCES

- Corpuz, O. D. 1989. *The Roots of Philippine Nationalism*. Vols. 1 and 2. Quezon City, Philippines: Akhali Foundation, Inc.
- McFerson, Hazel M. 1979a. “Plural Society in the U.S. Virgin Islands.” *Plural Societies* 10, no. 1 (spring).
- . 1979b. “Racial Tradition and Comparative Political Analysis.” *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 2, no. 4 (October).
- . 1982. “Part-Black Americans in the South Pacific.” *Phylon* 3, no. 2 (June).
- . 1994. Ethnicity Conflict and Unstable Equilibrium in Fiji: The Roots of the 1987 Coup.” In Rutledge Dennis, ed., *Research in Race and Ethnic Relations*. Vol. 7. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- . 1996. “Rethinking Ethnic Conflict.” *American Behavioral Scientist* 40, no. 1 (September).
- . 1997. *The Racial Dimension of American Overseas Colonial Policy*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group.

Introduction

Hazel M. McFerson

The Philippines' historical and political developments to be covered have been discussed at length in several other works (Agoncillo, 1969; Blount, 1913; Constantino, 1975; Corpuz, 1989; Karnow, 1989; Salamanca, 1968; Stanley, 1974; Steinberg, 1982; Wolff, 1961). They will be analyzed here only through the novel prism of the impact of the superimposition of the rigid American "racial tradition" onto the class stratification inherited from Spanish colonial times. Therefore, political evolution or contemporary events only tangentially related to the book's main argument will be covered, but very briefly and only as necessary to preserve minimal continuity. The reader interested in a full account of these developments is referred to any of the comprehensive works mentioned above. (Karnow, 1989 has an especially comprehensive and readable account of historical and political events.)

The Philippines is a vibrant country of contrasting images that resonates from its dual colonial past. It is a cliché to point to the contrasts in evidence in all developing (and some developed) countries. Yet, the Philippines has income inequality of obscene proportions, and the contrasts are sharper than elsewhere, and very, very Filipino in nature. Consider the following kaleidoscope:

- The famous golden arches of McDonald's fast food restaurants, Burger King, Kentucky Fried Chicken, etc., and convenience stores such as Seven Eleven and Dunkin Donuts, alongside Lapid's chicarrones stalls,¹ "Lydia's Lechon,"² notices announcing the start of the Durian season,³ and Chinoy (Chinese-Filipino) vendors selling glasses of *Tausi* (a dessert), from two pails balanced from a pole carried over their shoulder.

- The ubiquitous “jeepneys”—locally manufactured jeeps originating from those left by the Americans after World War II, which have been elongated and turned into popular transportation, each with elaborate ornamentation and named after the owners’ hopes and dreams, such as “The American Dream,” “A Hard Day’s Work,” and “Praise The Lord”—a hybrid of the practical American past and Filipino creativity.
- In provincial towns, *carabao* (water buffalo) carts creeping alongside BMWs and Mercedes-Benz, whose occupants are shielded from view by dark tinted windows.
- Rampant consumerism, with giant (and ostentatious) shopping malls everywhere—some with ice-skating rinks in a tropical climate—alongside vital religious festivals and a deep-rooted Catholicism and Catholic-related cults.
- A Christmas shopping season, complete with Asian red-suited, white-bearded Santa Clauses welcoming Chinese and Malay children in sandals and shorts to sit on their laps amidst bamboo huts covered with pastiche “snow.”
- Mushrooming luxury condo skyscrapers in the business district of Makati and Mandaluyong—whose terraces are unusable because of the fumes oozing from cars underneath and the filthy rivers and canals.
- The prevalence of “Taglish,” the combination of English and Tagalog on television and everyday discourse, while an increasing share of the population is proficient neither in correct English nor in correct Tagalog.
- The astonishing Filipino propensity to forgive contrasted with the national lynching party of early 1999 that successfully sought the execution of Leo Echegaray, a house-painter convicted of defiling his teenage stepdaughter, while wealthy Congressman Ramos Jalosjos, convicted of raping an eleven-year-old girl, was given blatant preferential treatment including a prison sentence and reelection by his constituents.
- Wrongdoing by the elite on a monumental scale, in contrast to the EDSA People’s Revolution of 1986, which was a beacon and inspiration for democracy and nonviolent political action, but whose gains are daily threatened by the renewed tolerance for institutionalized corruption and arbitrary decision-making.
- Matronly elite *mestizas* arbitrating social events at club luncheons at posh Manila hotels, while darker Filipino chambermaids toil for the equivalent of \$5 for a twelve-hour shift.

Where did such contrasts come from? A small minority of Filipinos consider the American arrival and its aftermath an unmitigated disaster. An equally small minority see it as a gift from God. But the vast majority of Filipinos are ambivalent. Some lean, on balance, toward a negative assessment, others toward a positive one, but most feel a combination of resentment and kinship, of rejection of “Americanism” and yearning to be considered “like” Americans. Unfortunately, Americans consider Filipinos Asian (when they consider them at all); but other Asians consider them short and slim copies of the Americans. This is an uncomfortable place to be. To describe the Filipino attitudes toward the United States, the traditional terminology of a “love-hate” relationship is too strong and imperfect in any case. Similarly, the frequent flippant summary of the Filipino colonial experience as “four hundred years in a convent and fifty

years in Hollywood” both confuses and oversimplifies a complex and often brutal reality. Thence, the title of this book (and its underlying theme): the American arrival constituted a “mixed blessing” for the people of these islands.

The thread running through the diverse chapters of this book is provided by a core argument founded on the following propositions:

- “Racial traditions” (see chapter 2) were an integral aspect of Spanish and American colonial policies in the Philippines, and the legacies remain strong to this day.
- The “flexible” Spanish racial tradition included a combination of class, culture, and ethnicity.
- After the Spanish-American War of 1898, the “rigid” racial tradition of the United States, with the determinant role it assigns to race (largely in terms of genotype) and the minimal role of class or culture, was exported to the Philippines.
- However, owing to a “cultural” affinity between the early *individual* American colonial administrators and the Filipino *ilustrado* (educated) elite and *mestizo* commercial intermediary class, the U.S. administration did not result in breaking up class-based distinctions, as it did in other overseas territories. This is a key difference between the colonial impact on the Philippines and on other American territories.
- Consequently, whereas in other American territories race *replaced* class as the determinant of social stratification, in the Philippines it was *superimposed* onto the Spanish class and cultural distinctions.
- As a result, class and cultural distinctions were reinforced and consolidated through American intervention. The extreme elitism characteristic of Filipino economy and society persisted and became impervious to the influences that in other Asian countries (e.g., Thailand) led to a progressive weakening of traditional elite structures in the twentieth century.
- The heritage of these developments has had a significant influence on Filipino racial attitudes and images and on the “white bias” evident today among all groups, especially among the upper classes.⁴
- Similarly, the nature of Filipino politics has remained heavily conditioned by the extreme inequality of access to resources (especially land), imitation of American patterns of political activity, and, as noted, the influence of American racial attitudes.

Hence, as former President Fidel Ramos (a central figure in the 1986 People Power revolution and instrumental since then for the sustainable restoration of democracy) eloquently puts it in his foreword, genuine independence and sustained economic progress in the Philippines will depend partly on the extent to which these attitudes evolve—contributing indirectly to reducing the enormous disparities in economic and thus political, power.

In turn, in my view, such an evolution of attitudes will come from the middle class, which is already playing a major role in affecting social change and democratization in the country, much as the American middle class fostered social and economic change in the United States. The growth of the middle class will fill the vast chasm between the privileged elite and the bulk of the population

and provide a more solid underpinning to political accountability in the Philippines, as well as the basis for sustained economic progress. For this to happen, continued peaceful and democratic transfers of presidential power must follow the precedent set by the two transitions made possible by Corazon Aquino in 1992 and by Fidel Ramos in 1998.

The various chapters of this book illuminate different aspects of the basic argument. They are assembled in two parts, respectively on culture and identity and society and politics. The mixed inheritance from the Spanish and American colonial experience forms the background, and the specific influence of the more recent American period provides the main focus.

Chapter 2 sets the stage for subsequent analyses by identifying the key characteristics of the Spanish racial tradition, which was supplanted by the American racial tradition. This is illustrated in the evolution of the “mestizo” ideal in popular Filipino culture and the denigration of Malay physical standards of beauty by both the Spanish and American colonizers. In chapter 3, Marya Svetlana T. Camacho examines specifically the Spanish imprint on culture, identity, and the cultural concomitant of race in establishing the framework and hierarchy of social and ethnic relations. In chapter 4, Maria Serena I. Diokno examines the meaning of “Benevolent Assimilation”—the justification for American colonialism in the Philippines—and Filipino responses. She demonstrates among other things how the polarizing climate generated by the Filipino-American War of 1899–1902 made compromises impossible. In chapter 5, Alex A. Calata examines the “benevolent” aspect of the American influence through the education policies that formed the cornerstone of American colonial administration immediately after cessation of the hostilities. Implemented first by military teachers, and later by the “Thomasites,” education has played a significant role in Americanizing Filipinos and on patterns of social stratification. Chapter 6 traces the impact of American colonialism on Philippine literature and theater. Princess Orig documents the persistence of the “white bias” in the works of contemporary Filipino authors and playwrights and the extent to which this bias has contributed to the decreasing preference for indigenous cultural and literary characters in favor of white American ones in the Filipino literary imagination.

The topics of politics and society begin with Wilfrido V. Villacorta’s examination in chapter 7 of the American influence on the constitutional superstructure of the Philippines. In chapter 8, Jose Rene C. Gayo delves into the foundation of the structure of political institutions, by describing the impact of American colonialism on the creation of civil society and social development organizations, which were playing such an important role in civic education in urban areas of the United States at the turn-of-the century. In chapter 9, Mina C. Roces discusses the impact of the American period on the role of women in Filipino politics. It was during the colonial period, between 1902 to 1946, that women made an entrance into the public sphere, first as suffragettes demanding the right to vote and pressuring for prowomen legislation and, later, as active politicians and behind-the-scenes power brokers.

Chapters 10 and 11 focus on the plight of indigenous people and other marginalized groups. Raul Pertierra and Eduardo F. Ugarte illustrate the roots of the contemporary conflict in the Muslim South and in the hinterlands, whose proud people have steadfastly resisted attempts to dominate them, beginning with resistance to the Spanish, and continuing to the American and postcolonial periods. Finally, Julio Rey B. Hidalgo focuses on the political behavior of “caciques” within the context of the “American style” democracy that was transplanted to the Philippines during the closing years of Spanish rule and became institutionalized during American colonialism. The purchase of lands owned by the Spanish friars from the Vatican during the Taft colonial administration (1901–1903) was intended as the first step in a program of land distribution.⁵ But, because Taft left the Philippines in late 1903 to become secretary of war, the beneficiaries of the purchase turned out to be not the landless peasants, but the wealthy “caciques” (large-scale “tenants” of church lands and landlords elsewhere). The social and political influence of this class continues to dominate Filipino politics under a democratic veneer and with the resigned acceptance of the bulk of the population. But major changes are in the making and future prospects are positive, provided that peaceful transfers of presidential power continue.

POSTSCRIPT: PEOPLE POWER, PART 2

After this book had been essentially completed, a remarkable series of events occurred in the Philippines, validating anew several of the themes echoed in these chapters. President Joseph Ejercito Estrada was forced to resign in January 2001 by a massive popular outpouring of revulsion at the vast and mounting corruption of his administration.

Estrada, nicknamed “Erap,” had succeeded Fidel V. Ramos in 1998 as the third freely elected president since the fall of Ferdinand Marcos. Marcos had been overthrown after twenty years in power by the 1986 nonviolent People’s Power Revolution, which brought to the presidency Corazon (Cory) Aquino—widow of the martyred Benigno (Ninoy) Aquino, Marcos’s main and most principled political opponent.⁶

Similar to when Marcos was first elected, Estrada, a former “good guy” action-movie hero, was seen by the common Filipino as a new hope to break open the stranglehold of the old families and established elite on the economy and society of the country. His open womanizing, heavy drinking habits, extraordinarily limited qualifications—all were glossed over and forgiven in the expectation that, finally, government policy would begin to redress the chasm between the tiny privileged minority and the 75 million Filipinos—most of them poor to a greater or lesser extent. The alliterative campaign slogan: “Erap para sa Mahirap”—Erap for the Poor—resonated loudly among the vast majority that had been effectively disenfranchised by elite politics for the entire history of the archipelago by Spanish colonial elites for 400 years, then by local *ilustrado*

elites supported by the American administration, and after independence by the sons and daughters of the very same privileged groups.

The deeply ingrained contempt of the Filipino elite for the common people, the genesis of which is described in the various chapters of this book, is most vividly illustrated by an extraordinary comment made in February 2001, *on television*, by then-Senator Miriam Defensor Santiago, responding to extensive criticism of her support for Estrada during the impeachment trial:

Why should I be bothered by these Filipinos who are raising these protests against me? These same Filipinos who have not even stepped foot in Harvard or Oxford. I would be bothered if my professor in Cambridge were to take exception to my legal interpretation of a judicial matter. But to be bothered by a Filipino who may not even know that a Harvard exists, who can't even pass the UP [University of the Philippines] entrance test, who wouldn't even understand discussion of such a high level even if they tried, why should I be bothered? I have no time to listen to *this species of lower life forms*. (Italics added)⁷

And so Estrada won a free and fair election in 1998 by a resounding margin, as Marcos had in 1966. And, as in the case of Marcos, the majority was cheated once again of its hopes. This time, however, it took only two years for the Filipino people to correct their mistake. (It helped, too, that the end of the Cold War removed any U.S. interest in supporting a friendly dictator, as had been the case of Marcos, whose close relationship with Ronald and Nancy Reagan is a matter of record.)

The consensus of informed opinion in the country is that almost immediately after his election Joseph Estrada began using the extraordinary powers of the Philippines presidency (much stronger than even those of the American president) for his personal advantage and that of his cronies, and renegeing on campaign promises of programs to help the poor. (This author, who then lived a few houses away from Estrada's opulent main residence, saw first-hand how delegations of poor people, coming to appeal to their hero, were turned away brutally from the gated entrance of the residential "village.")

By early 1999, the return to power of former Marcos cronies and the resurgence of brazen official extortion and corruption at the highest levels led the respected commentator for the *Philippines Daily Inquirer*, Conrado de Quiros, to conclude that nothing less than a "full Marcos restoration" was underway.⁸ From that point on, matters got worse.

By late 2000, Estrada had alienated the majority of his supporters with fiscal policies favoring the rich; had failed to deal with the slowdown in economic activity; and had validated the worst fears of his opponents concerning the creation of closed circles of influence and privilege, increasing lack of transparency in decision-making, corruption of a degree and scope remarkable even by the rather tolerant standards of Filipino government, and discretionary application of the rule of law to reward friends and punish opponents.⁹

The first cat was let out of the bag when provincial governor Luis (Chavit) Singson went public with the accusation that the president himself was getting a cut of the proceeds from the illegal numbers' game *jueteng*, in exchange for protection. Other accusers then came out of the woodwork, and the mounting evidence led the House of Representatives to impeach Estrada in November 2000. The ensuing trial in the Senate brought to light a fascinating array of accusations—the president had opened secret bank accounts under false names; dozens of expensive mansions were built for him or his several mistresses; phony companies and foundations were set up to launder money; paper bags and shoeboxes full of cash were delivered personally at the Presidential Palace of Malacanang, and so on. Nonetheless, on January 16, 2001, the Senate voted by an 11–10 majority against requiring the banks to reveal the names of the holders of various accounts that witnesses had linked to Estrada, thus effectively assuring his acquittal.

The Filipino people, convinced to a moral certainty that at least some of the senators had been bribed to vote to exclude the evidence, erupted—magnificently and nonviolently, just as they had done fifteen years earlier. Demonstrations took place in sizes not imaginable in the West—culminating in an estimated 2 to 3 million people blanketing almost 10 miles of the Metro Manila “beltway” EDSA; the influential Catholic Church demanded Estrada’s resignation; the business community followed suit; and, with Estrada’s popular support having withered away during the previous two years, the Armed Forces declared that they were withdrawing their support as well. This was the final handwriting on the wall for Estrada, who stepped down on January 20, in favor of Vice-President Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo. (By a typically Filipino twist of history, Gloria is the daughter of Diosdado Macapagal, the president who had been defeated by Ferdinand Marcos in 1966.)

It would have been far preferable for the health of the Philippines polity and governance had Estrada been duly convicted by a majority of the Senate and removed in accordance with the rule of law rather than by popular uprising—no matter how justified and broad-ranging such popular uprising was. Several foreign commentators have lamented the forced resignation of a duly elected head of state. This point of view is understandable, but those holding it are oblivious to the political realities of the Philippines. In light of the inescapable conclusion that Estrada was getting off the hook by bribing some senators with the very money that had been accumulated through illegal and corrupt means, the manner of his removal was, if not legal, clearly legitimate. Also, it is a triumph for the Filipino people that this vast national upheaval took place, and succeeded, *without any loss of blood*.

It is to be hoped that the present and future presidents of the Philippines will spontaneously wish to run an effective and clean government and abide by the good governance principles of transparency, accountability, the rule of law, and participation. However, the Second People’s Power nonviolent revolution has given notice that presidents will not be allowed to do otherwise—certainly not

to the same unbridled extent as their predecessors Marcos and Estrada. In the meantime, economic recovery and political stability in the country will continue gradually to fill the space between the tiny elite and the vast majority, creating a larger and larger middle class to serve as the economic and social foundation of an eventual prosperous and democratic Philippines.

NOTES

1. Rendered chicken or pork fat made into crisps and eaten as snack foods.
2. Whole spit-roasted pig.
3. A large, globe-shaped fruit with a sweet, soft flesh. When ripe it has a strong odor that is overpowering even to those for whom it is an acquired taste.
4. An interesting study would be the extent to which this did not develop among the Muslims, in part, because of their rejection of both Spanish and American values.
5. President Taft negotiated directly with the Vatican. As a result of an audience that he had in 1902 with Pope Leo XIII in Rome, he secured the agreement of the Church in principle to the transaction at a mutually agreeable price. The following year the deal was concluded finally and nearly half a million acres and 60,000 tenants passed into the government's hand for a price of over US\$7 million. But it proved impossible to reach an agreed price for some of the friars' lands located in heavily populated areas, especially around Manila. But in no area did the land reform movement achieve the desired results. As noted by D.J.M. Tate: "the greatest obstacle in the way of genuine land reform lay in the existence of the entrenched opposition of the traditional landed classes in the Islands, whose position became strengthened rather than weakened under United States rule. Wealthy, influential and well-informed landowners were the first to know of new lands suitable for development and ruthlessly indulged in barely legal maneuvers to acquire such sites for speculative purposes. As Jacoby observed, 'it proved extremely difficult to conduct a progressive land policy in an almost feudal environment.'" (*The Making of Modern South-East Asia*, vol. 2, *Economic and Social Change* Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1979, p. 474.) Also see Renato Constantino (1975), chapter 27, and Michael J. Connolly, *Church Lands and Peasant Unrest in the Philippines: Agrarian Conflict In 20th-Century Luzon* (Manila: Ateneo De Manila University Press, 1992).
6. Marcos was elected in 1966 and re-elected in 1970. Precluded from running for a third four-year term, to stay in power he declared martial law in 1972 and ruled as a dictator for the following fourteen-years. Under the post-Marcos constitution, Philippines presidents are elected for a single term of six years. Cory Aquino was succeeded in 1992 by Fidel V. Ramos, who then presided in 1998 over the second peaceful transfer of presidential power since the Marcos dictatorship.
7. Interview by Vicky Morales on Philippines television program "I-Witness," February 24, 2001. As it happens, Senator Defensor Santiago's Harvard association was reportedly limited to attendance at a summer workshop at the Harvard Law School, which is open to all comers on a space-available basis.
8. Personal communication to the author.
9. Including, for example, strong-arming of the business community to boycott advertising in the *Philippines Daily Inquirer*.

REFERENCES

- Agoncillo, T. A. *A Short History of the Philippines*. New York: Mentor, 1969.
- Blount, James H. *American Occupation of the Philippines 1898/1912*. New York: Putnam, 1913; reprint, Manila: Solar Publishing Corporation, 1986.
- Constantino, Renato. *The Philippines: A Past Revisited*. Private printing, 1975.
- Corpuz, O. D. *The Roots of Philippine Nationalism*. Vols. 1 and 2. Quezon City, Philippines: Aklahi Foundation, Inc., 1989.
- Karnow, Stanley. *In Our Image: America's Empire in the Philippines*. New York: Ballantine Books, 1989.
- Salamanca, Bonifacio. *The Filipino Reaction to American Rule, 1901–1913*. Hamden, Conn.: Shoe String Press, 1968.
- Stanley, Peter W. *A Nation in the Making: The Philippines and the United States, 1899–1921*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1974.
- Steinberg, David Joel. *Philippines: A Singular and Plural Place*. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1982.
- Wolff, Leon. *Little Brown Brother: How the United States Purchased and Pacified the Philippine Islands at the Century's Turn*. New York: Doubleday, 1961.
- Zaide, G. F. *Philippine Political and Cultural History*. Manila: Philippine Education Company, 1957.

PART 1

CULTURE AND IDENTITY

Filipino Identity and Self-Image in Historical Perspective

Hazel M. McFerson

“the Mestizo girls are often of wonderful beauty.”¹

“On the American conquest of the Philippines . . . the American press regularly presented all Filipinos . . . as blacks—which suggest graphically that the sensation of power and supremacy was the same, whether on the American continent or overseas.”²

“You’re not afraid of black people; in fact, you wish you were black.”³

THE QUESTIONS

The above quotes capture evolving views on race, beauty, and power in the Philippines. Jose De Olivares, a Spanish chronicler, attributed mestiza beauty to the “more agreeable cast of countenance inherited from their Spanish fathers,” and compared them unfavorably to Chinese and other mestizo groups, in whom “[t]he Malay predominates . . . and shows plainly in the rather unpleasant scowl of their [dark] faces.”

The darker skin of the Malay majority also influenced American attitudes and policies and was manifested in attempts to “negrify” Filipinos. The emphasis in both the Spanish and American cases was on the relationship between power and the ability to impose alien standards of beauty in a colonial society. Both the Spanish and the Americans imposed their own image of beauty—an image different from that possessed by the Malay majority. The stereotyping of the

phenotype of the latter as undesirable was seared into the minds of Filipinos and remains pervasive in the culture of the country.⁴

Height and size also determine attractiveness for both men and women. In part, this results from associating taller stature with foreign (colonial) ancestry and a smaller size with the diminutive stature of “negritos.” Service employees, especially in upscale hotels and commercial establishments, are typically much taller than the average Filipino. It is common in help-wanted ads to specify height and other physical requirements. For some occupations, this may be justified by the specific job requirements; in most cases, it simply reflects the aesthetic preference of the wealthier Filipino customers. This internalization of an imported beauty image different from that of the Malay majority highlights the man-made nature of socioracial constructions and categories. Finally, the contemporary quotation in note 3 above acknowledges implicitly negrification, but gives it a positive value. Perhaps racial self-images are changing in the Philippines. Perhaps not.

The newcomer driving from the airport through the heavily populated streets of Manila is taken aback by the prominence of billboards depicting phenotypically white models extolling products such as Derma Cream, a skin whitening cream, which promises to “whiten” the already fair skin of the Filipina poster model. Her countenance contrasts dramatically with the darker appearance of Malay and Chinese phenotypes bustling along the streets. The pervasiveness of white phenotypes as the ideal is reinforced by the staff and elite Filipino patrons encountered in upscale hotels, shops and restaurants, few of whom reveal the pure traits of Malay ancestry.

On my first visit to the Philippines in May 1997, I aroused staring and extreme curiosity from Filipinos of all ages and genders.⁵ The unabashed curiosity of Filipinos stood in stark contrast to the nonintrusive behaviors encountered elsewhere in East Asia (e.g., Korea and Japan) or in Southeast Asia (e.g., Thailand). I had assumed that Filipinos, of all Asians, would be most familiar with my African female phenotype in light of their colonial ties to the United States. To what extent, I wondered, was the Filipino reaction simple curiosity vis-à-vis a different-looking person? And was the curiosity a benign corollary of the scarcity of phenotypically African women in the Philippines, so that the few who are encountered are assumed to be celebrities, given that the images of African American women have been shaped by such television programs as “Oprah” and “The Cosby Show”?⁶ Or was it a manifestation of a less benign attitude? And if the latter, was the underlying prism racial, class-based, or a combination? A historical perspective informed by the concept of “racial tradition” may help provide the beginning of an answer.⁷

The concept of “racial tradition” refers to the complex of beliefs, attitudes, images, taxonomies, laws, and social customs, which are enforced by the dominant group and shape the structure of race relations and racial identity formation in multiracial societies.⁸ Among other things, the dominant group has the power to influence aesthetic preferences and standards of beauty. The very idea of

racial superiority and inferiority in colonial societies has resulted from uneven power relations. The aesthetic preferences are initially social constructions that eventually take on a life of their own, even after the formal end of colonialism. That Europeans were the dominant group through much of the world for so long has meant in most societies that European aesthetic standards became the ideal, as colonized people sought to replicate European concepts of beauty, particularly for women.⁹ Typically, after decolonization, these standards tend to persist in former colonies and thus perpetuate the artificial phenotypes of racial “superiority.”¹⁰ Has this been the case in the Philippines as well?

RACE IN FILIPINO FOLKLORE

As noted in chapter 1, although largely Malay in origin, the Philippines is a plural society inhabited by different ethnic, cultural, religious, linguistic and regional groups. The prehistoric “peopling” of the Philippines resulted from the great movement of population from the Asiatic mainland to the different islands of the vast Pacific area. Marcelo Tangco identified five principal racial types: Negritos, Australoids, Oceanic Negroids, Indonesians, and Malays. These are further segmented into more than 100 known subgroups spread over the 7,100 Philippine islands¹¹ and are identified principally by their language, region of origin, or physical characteristics. The three major distinct groups are Christians, Muslims (mainly in the Sulu archipelago and in southwestern Mindanao), and the so-called communities of indigenous people (Lumads), living in the hilly and mountainous interiors of Luzon, Mindoro, Negros, and Panay in the Visayas and Mindanao. There is also a large Chinese community and an Arab population, both of long duration.¹² The Filipinos of today are virtually “a race of races.”¹³ Predominantly Malay in racial ancestry, they also have Negrito, Indonesian, Indian, Chinese, Japanese, Arab, European, and American “bloods.”¹⁴

A brief examination of legends and myths of creation in Filipino folklore is important in documenting views of physical beauty and aesthetic preferences for skin color. The precolonial Filipino myth of creation exhibited an aesthetic preference for the brown Malay ideal, but without negative aspersions for the other races. According to the Filipino historian Gregorio F. Zaide, there are two myths of creation, which provide insight into views on color. The first myth recounts:

Long, long ago, there were no people on earth. There lived only a god and a goddess. One day they became lonesome because there were no people inhabiting the plains and hills. They took some clay, moulded it into figures, and baked them in fire. Having no experience in baking, they overbaked the clay figures. They moulded other clay figures and baked them. Owing to their first failure, they became overcautious and took away the figures from the fire before these figures could be baked right. For the third time, the deities made other clay figures. This time, having had enough experience in baking,

they were able to make the figures just right. Then they breathed life into all the clay figures. Out of the overbaked sprang the black race; out of the underbaked figures came the white people; and out of those clay figures which were perfectly baked originated the brown people. The brown-complexioned Filipinos are thus the perfect product of the gods' toasting experiment.¹⁵

And, according to the second myth:

Lalake and Babae [the first man and first woman in the world] married and many children were born to them. These children proved to be lazy. One day the father, angered by their indolence, chased them with a stick. The children fled to escape their father's wrath. Some fled a short distance and remained in the country, while others ran to far-away regions. Those who remained in the country became the Filipinos whose skin was brown like that of the earth. Those who fled to a region where the climate was cold became the white people; those who took refuge in a country where the soil was red became the red race; and those who settled in a hot region turned black and became the black people.¹⁶

Other folk tales, however, reveal some negative preoccupations with dark skin. For example, among the Mandaya (a fair-skinned, thick-lipped, broad-nosed people found along the mountain range of Davao) a pregnant woman is encouraged to eat rattan shoots or young coconuts if she wishes her child to have a fair complexion.¹⁷ Another fair-skinned group, the Ilocano, have a similar belief that "discourages pregnant women from eating dark-skinned fruits lest the child is born dark."¹⁸ Yet another legend has it that "when a brown maiden delivers a white, handsome boy or a fair-skinned beautiful baby girl, the baby is sired by an *encantado*" [a magic spirit].¹⁹

An insight into local notions of race and color is provided by the different views of the Aeta.²⁰ The various groups comprising this ethnic category are believed to be the original inhabitants of the archipelago. They are also known as "negritos" ("little black ones" in Spanish) and are also called "black" in various Philippine languages (*itim* in Tagalog and *itom* in the Visayas). The Aeta are a dark-skinned, short mountain people, of small frame, with kinky hair, broad noses, and large black eyes, who are believed to have backtracked north-west from Melanesia or Papua New Guinea or migrated eastward from India or Africa. Aeta women were depicted by early European and American ethnologists as short, squat, bare-breasted, bushy-haired, and in a savage state.²¹ Inter-marriage between Aetas and other groups has occurred, as an American ethnologist observed in 1904: "The number of pure types is . . . rapidly decreasing on account of intermarriage [particularly with] the Bukidnon or mountain Visayan. They are of very small stature, with kinky hair. They lead the same nomadic life as the Negritos."²² And the 1918 census noted that "the evidence seems to indicate that the Indonesians brought few women with them, and took their wives largely from the pygmy groups."²³

Aetas feature prominently in the folk tale "Agtá" ("Black Man"), about su-

pernatural beings: “There is another kind of invisible being, [these are] ugly *encantados* [spirits] called agta. They live in big trees that are like mansions. When you pass by, you must ask permission or they will harm you.”²⁴ Another legend (“Agta is Kind When Not Offended”) recounts: “The agta, who is as dark as a negro, is generally helpful and is disposed to help you in cutting timber and carrying to your place—if you do not offend him by ignoring him as though he does not exist or by taking him for granted.”

Quite contrary to the colonial stereotype of Aetas as physically and intellectually inferior, another Filipino folk tale—“A Negro Slave”—depicts them as overcoming prejudice by mental brilliance and quickness of thought. Of unknown date, the tale is about a black man who was owned by three princes. Although “he was called a slave, he was not really one: he was only nominally a slave; for the princes, especially the youngest, whom he loved most, treated him kindly.” The “Negro” always answers complicated and tricky questions in a clever manner:

The king said to him, “Will you have your head cut off . . . ?” He answered, “Yes, if I cannot answer your questions; but let us see!” “All right,” said the king. Then he asked, “Who owns this kingdom?” The [Negro disguised as the] prince answered, “God owns this kingdom.” The king was surprised at his bold reply. However, he could not say that it was not God’s, for that would be untrue; therefore he could not compel the prince to answer that it was his, the king’s. The next question was this: “How much am I worth?” The prince answered, “You are not worth more than thirty pieces of silver.” The king was furious when he heard this, and said that, if the prince could not give a good reason for his insulting words, he would be put to death instantly. “Yes, yes!” said the Negrito. “Our Saviour was sold for that much: therefore you, who are inferior to the Saviour, cannot be worth more than he was sold for.” “Well, then,” said the king “answer this third question, and you shall be married to my daughter: Can you drink all the fresh water in the world?” “Yes,” said the prince. “Well, then,” said the king, “drink it.” “But here,” answered the prince, “in many parts of the world the water of the ocean mixes with the fresh water: so, before I drink, you must separate the fresh water from the salt.” As the king was unable to do this, he acknowledged himself vanquished.²⁵

The tale underlines the wisdom of the Negrito, who, by means of a special ring, was able to make his skin white and was able to present himself as “exactly like the face of his young master,” who was trying to win the hand in marriage of the beautiful daughter of a neighboring king. The Negrito’s success, the outcome of his brilliance, is rewarded by the prince who gives him 5,000 pesetas and promises him that he will urge the princess to give her consent to the marriage of the Negro with her maid of honor. The next morning the prince and the princess were married, and the following day the Negrito received the maid of honor for his wife.

Another generally benevolent view of the Aetas is embodied in the widely celebrated annual Filipino folk festival, the Ati-Atihan. The festival originated in the thirteenth century on Panay island, then inhabited by “black, kinky-haired

Negritos called Ati (Aeta), who led a peaceful life . . . [But] [w]ith the arrival of the Borneans their rustic life was broken by the economic struggle for existence."²⁶ Today, the Ati-Atihan festival is a renowned regional celebration attracting upwards of 50,000 visitors, expressing gratitude to the Santo Nino (the Baby Jesus) and to the Aeta themselves for sharing their harvest during a famine (reminiscent of the origins of the American holiday of Thanksgiving).²⁷

In contrast with the Filipino attitudes, colonial views of the Aetas were strongly negative from the outset. Writing in 1690, a Spanish writer described them as "black and barbarous mountaineers who inhabited the tops of the mountains, like brutes," and continued:

All of these people are black negroes, most of whom have kinky hair . . . flat noses and . . . thick, projecting lips. They go totally naked, and only have their privies covered with some coverings resembling linen cloths. . . . Their food consists of fruits, and roots of the mountain; and if they find, perchance, some deer, they eat it in that place where they kill it. That night they make their abode there, and after they grow tired of dancing, they sleep there—all helter-skelter, like brutes. Next day the same thing happens, and they sleep in another stopping-place.²⁸

Their origins were thought to be "interior India, or citra Gangen, which was called Etyopia; for it was settled by Ethiopian negroes. . . . Consequently, there being on the mainland of India nations of negroes." He concluded that "their chief abode with their own name might be the island of Negroes."

The "uncivilized" Negritos (as well as the Igorots of the Luzon highlands) were regularly compared unfavorably by the Europeans to the "civilized nations" of the Tagalog, Pampanga, Visayas, and Mindanao. All of the latter groups have in common Malay ancestry, as manifested in "their color, and the shape of their faces and their bodies; by the clothes and venture in which the Spanish conquistadors found them; by their customs and ceremonies," according to a sixteenth-century Spanish chronicler.²⁹ But it was the Aetas who were regarded with disdain. These stereotypes were reinforced after the arrival of the Americans. A white American ethnologist at the turn of the century wrote that probably no group of "primitive" men has ever attracted more attention from the "civilized" world than have the "pygmy blacks." He described them as a "weak [race of] reckless fishermen, [who] "have everywhere left their imprint on the peoples who have absorbed them."³⁰

As an especially telling illustration of the virulent racism at the turn of the century, and the contrast with local attitudes, listen to Mrs. Campbell Dauncey, an English woman in Manila relating her description of the Aetas:

These people are very small . . . and they have quite black skins, irregular faces of *real nigger type*, with big heads of fuzzy black hair . . . Sometimes in the Filipino race a child is born with curly locks instead of the usual straight, Chinese-looking hair, and this curliness is considered a great beauty, and tremendously admired; which is very strange, as, of course, such a trait is only a reversion to some strain of the despised negro; but

the Filipinos are far too stupid to know that. In fact, if the hair is so curly as to be positively woolly, they are more pleased than ever [emphasis added].³¹

Americans also denigrated the Igorot, a light-skinned Austronesian group of Mongol stock, who were labeled as “wild people of the archipelago” in the second American census.³² They have come to epitomize the “savage” Filipino, and they, too, are marginalized and disparaged by many contemporary Filipinos.³³ The Igorots are currently undergoing a proud revival in their new identity as “Cordillerans.” However, the negative connotation of the name is only a reflection of the negative stereotyping of the people themselves. Indeed, just as “Cordillerans” means mountain people in Spanish, the term Igorot derives from the local word “golot” or mountain. The status of the Igorots in the contemporary Philippines provides a complement to the Aetas, as both are included in the “Other” in the socioracial hierarchy of the country. (Chapter 10 discusses in some detail the people and society of the central highlands of Luzon.)

As noted, these racially negative and contemptuous sentiments are in sharp contrast with the ambivalence or even benevolence exhibited toward Aetas in Filipino folklore. A similar dialectic has characterized the different ideals of the Filipino woman as either “fair mestiza” or brown “Madonna of the Slums,” discussed later in the chapter.

THE SPANISH RACIAL TRADITION

By the time Manuel de Legaspi took possession of the islands in 1564, forty years after Magellan’s voyage, he found an ethnically plural society, which also included Indians, other Asians, and a few Europeans. People of other nations, attracted by the rich soil and comparatively healthful climate of the Philippines also settled in the islands. As a result, interracial marriage and concubinage occurred and produced generations of mixed-race people.

The Philippines were a “second-order” colony, ruled from Mexico. Thus Spanish racial classifications and attitudes in Mexico and various Caribbean colonies are directly relevant. The Spanish racial tradition in Central and South America emphasized “limpieza de sangre” [“cleanliness of the blood,” from African or “Indio” physical characteristics]. Pure Spanish ancestry was the ideal. In practice, however, the “flexible” colonial Spanish racial tradition in the Caribbean and Central and South America was influenced greatly by slavery and social relations with native women. “Indio” and, later, African women were routinely taken as concubines, and the offspring of each were classified differently. Terms of classification in the Spanish racial tradition, then as now, included a bewildering array of *blancos*, *mestizajes*, *indio claro*, *indio oscuro*, *prietos*, *pardos*, *negros*, *morenos*, *triquenos*—terms that highlight the different degrees of Spanish and African and Indian mixtures. The Spanish racial tradition emphasized classification based on phenotypic criteria, including gradients of

color and physical features as reflected in the terminology above, rather than genetic ancestry per se.

As discussed further in chapter 3, in contrast with the genotypical classification of the “rigid” American racial tradition, the Spanish tradition was “flexible”: mixed-race individuals were recognized as such (rather than indiscriminately lumped into the lower socioracial group). They were accorded intermediate socioracial status, midway between that of the subordinate Indian or African mother and that of the dominant Spanish father, and thus were ranked higher than the indigenous parent. Consequently, through sexual relations with the Spanish master, an individual woman could raise her own social status slightly and that of her mixed-race offspring significantly. However, in common with the Aztecs, Toltecs, Mayas, Aymaras, and Incas of Central and South America, most part-Filipinos were denigrated as “indios,” denied permission to speak Spanish, don apparel worn by the Spaniards, and generally not able to assert equality with the latter in any other way.

Nevertheless, Spanish colonial society in the archipelago was highly stratified. Regional and linguistic groups were perceived as either “civilized” or “uncivilized,” classifications that coincided with color. As noted, at the bottom of the hierarchy were the negroid Aetas, whose color, size, and traditional hunting and gathering culture all ranked low.³⁴ A 1691 report listed Criollos Morenos [creole blacks] in the mestizo class, but was unsure about their origin. Revealingly, it stated that, while “some make them the descendants of those blacks [Aetas] of whom we shall speak later . . . [and others] make them the descendants of those slaves who were formerly held here by the petty rulers . . . if they had been of so vile an origin [they would not be] so well received and so well regarded.”³⁵

At the apex of colonial society were, of course, the Spanish-born of “pure” ancestry, followed by “Creoles”, that is, Spaniards born in the Philippines (sometimes also termed Filipino-Spaniards). Next in the socioracial hierarchy came light-skinned Spanish mestizos, typically the offspring of Spanish men and Malay women or, less often, Chinese women. (Virtually no mestizos were fathered by “Indio” men or by men from other indigenous groups, such as the Igorots or Negritos.) Lower still were the “Sanglely mestizos,” descended from Indian [Malay] women and Chinese men. This group ranked low because of the Spanish prejudice against the Chinese. A higher-ranked kind of mestizo group were the “Japanese,” who “result from the Japanese who were shipwrecked on these islands in former years.” The 1691 report observed: “They are of better conduct than the others, since they have a better origin.” Among the indigenous groups, the Tagalogs were viewed more favorably than the others because of their culture and social organization, even though they “originated directly from the Malays.”³⁶

Culture and class were important modifiers of phenotype, however: A well-spoken Tagalog with “good Spanish manners” would typically enjoy higher socioracial status than an uneducated mestizo. By the beginning of the nineteenth century, the term “mestizo” had expanded to include “not only the descendants

of Spaniards by Indio women and their progeny, but also those of the Chinese, who are in general whiter than either parent, and carefully distinguish themselves from the Indians.”³⁷

Hence, while brown Malay women were mothers of the mestizos, their status and supposedly greater beauty and higher culture flowed from their paternity. For De Olivares and other Spaniards, this was described thusly:

Among the Mestizo girls of Spanish fathers there are many who possess a wonderful beauty. They are lithe and graceful in form and figure, with soft olive complexions, scarlet lips and teeth white as pearls; long, wavy, jet-black hair, and dark languishing eyes that glow with the subdued passions of the tropics. Many of these girls have been highly educated in the convents, and possess a culture and refinement of manner equal to that of the best American and European society.³⁸

In this description is found the seed of the “mestiza ideal,” in which lighter skin and non-Asian features were and remain highly desirable. The Spanish mestizo (*Tisoy*) were associated with intelligence and industriousness; the women were beautiful and the men were “large and handsome.”

In comparison, mestizos with Chinese fathers (*Chinoy*) ranked low and even though they were often wealthy, were disdained by the Spanish, and were “compelled by force of circumstances to associate with their father’s people.”³⁹ The men of this group were described as having “the mongrel stamp of countenance,” and the “better class” of natives [Tagalogs] were said to despise them. Yet, their economic activities and role as economic intermediary made them tolerable to colonial society, as evident from the existence today of a significant Chinese-mestizo community of longstanding in the Philippines.⁴⁰

Although exaggerated to some extent, there is certainly some resentment among today’s Filipinos against the Chinese (although not directed against the part-Chinese with a long association and identification with the country). This phenomenon is not too dissimilar from the resentment against the Lebanese intermediary class in West Africa or the Indians in East Africa and parts of the Caribbean. It is in part related to contemporary economic friction and attitudes, but is also an inheritance from the colonial period.

Historically, it was the Spaniards and not indigenous Filipino groups who carried out massacres and expulsions of the Chinese over the course of Philippines history. The strategy of division and fragmentation typical of all colonial regimes is illustrated in the following account by a Spanish chronicler: “The Chinese mestizos will within a century have grown to at least one million by natural increase and immigration from China; and will possess the greater part of the wealth of the islands. They are the proprietors, merchants, and educated people of the country, and will dominate public opinion. This class has no sympathy for Spain and will be difficult to subdue. Therefore, the moral force of the natives must be preserved, and *the rivalry between the two classes fomented*” [emphasis added].⁴¹ This strategy may not be purely of historical in-

terest after all. One could argue that today anti-Chinese sentiment is fostered deliberately (certainly, tolerated) by the contemporary ruling elite, even as it uses the Chinese as convenient intermediaries in the economic arena.

Chinese mestizos figure prominently in the nationalist history of the Philippines, including primarily Dr. Jose Rizal, the national hero and writer, and Emilio Aguinaldo, the first president of the Philippines and military leader in the Filipino-American War.⁴² The composer of the Philippine national anthem, Julian Felipe, was a Chinese mestizo, as was the owner of the Banda de San Francisco de Bulacan, which performed the anthem at the first flag-raising ceremony in Kawit, Cavite. Indeed, the scholar Teresita Ang See observed that Chinese mestizos were brought up as Malays by their mothers and fought in the revolution as Filipinos and not as mestizos. The impact of their ethnic origin was in the financial resources of this more affluent group, which allowed them to send their sons for studies abroad where they absorbed the liberal ideas that led them to push for reforms and eventually launch the revolution.⁴³

In addition to Spanish and Chinese mestizos, many people of Arab descent also settled in the islands centuries before the Spaniards and they, too, contributed to the ethnic population mix.⁴⁴ Spanish records, however, contain no reference to the progeny of these settlers, nor do they identify a separate Arab mestizo group. All of these mixtures have resulted in the renowned grace and charm of Filipinas and account for much of the Philippines' reputation as the "land of beautiful women."

RACE AND SPANISH COLONIAL ICONOGRAPHY

In keeping with the colonial system, the Malay phenotype of copper skin, rounded nose, and long, flowing black hair was deliberately excluded from religious art in the Spanish colonial period. From the sixteenth century, and as a matter of policy, the Spanish sought to imbue religious art with European images and replace indigenous icons with European ones. As the Church was the sole patron of the arts, with the monastic orders its implementing agents, art became a handmaiden of religion, serving to both propagate the Catholic faith and to support the colonial paradigm of racially superior and inferior groups.⁴⁵ An exception was the Black Nazarene of Quiapo, *Nuestro Padre Jesus Nazareno de Quiapo*, a highly popular icon, whose day is Friday. The life-size image of Christ is named for the dark wood of which it is made. Every Friday, thousands of devotees visit Quiapo Church at the center of Manila from very early morning, many walking on their knees the length of the nave to the feet of the Black Christ. Another example is the brown-toned *Nuestra Senora del Carmen*, which was brought to Manila by the Recollects about 1617. But, in the main, Church supervision of religious art existed precisely to prevent the development of "unorthodox" images. Aside from the obvious tendency to replicate Spanish iconography, it simply would not do for a subject people to worship a God made in their own image.

With the opening of the Philippines to international trade in the late nineteenth century (ensuing from the building of the Suez Canal, which also weakened the dependence on Mexico), the emergence of a privileged mestizo class increasingly influenced art. Foreign merchant houses established themselves in Manila and stimulated the cash economy. The new environment enriched principally merchants and money lenders, most of whom were Chinese mestizos (*Chinoy*), as well as Spanish mestizo (*tisoy*) wealthy tenants of monastic land, who converted their lands from traditional produce to the new export crops, such as sugar, coffee, abaca, hemp, and copra. The merchant economy and the additional income from export crops underpinned the rise to the largely mestizo *ilustrado* (“cultured”) class, whose members became the new patrons of the arts. However, this group, too, favored the Eurocentric images encountered during their study in European universities. Their contact with European culture imbued them with new tastes geared to Western aesthetics and created a class of connoisseurs of Western forms. The Eurocentric bias of “official” art became less crude and artistically more interesting, but was hardly less intense than in earlier times. Borderline white images were dominant in the *ilustrado*-financed paintings of artists such as Justinano Asuncion, Juan Arceo, Simon Flores, and Antonio Malantac.

From the earliest times, however, some Filipino artists resisted Spanish attempts to cast all religious icons in a European mold. Religious folk art embodying Malay images drew inspiration from indigenous sculpting styles typified by the angular and squat “*anitos*” with round, bulging eyes.⁴⁶ Today’s religious folk art rests in part on this long tradition. Indigenous imagery of the brown Malay in art periodically emerged to challenge mestizo dominance, reflecting the natural connection of the majority of the people to icons resembling themselves. The best-known example is offered by Damian Domingo, who opened his studio in the Binondo section of Manila as the country’s first art school, the Academia de Dibujo y Pintura in the first quarter of the nineteenth century. His paintings of *tipos de pais* (physical types of/in the country) presented Filipinos reflecting the range of the social hierarchy, occupations, and social classes, including that of Malays. But the recognition of Malay imagery in art did not survive Domingo’s death, and Spanish images remained dominant, as his school was reopened under the supervision of the Sociedad Economica de Amigos de Pais, which brought Spanish art professors from Spain, and the European classical tradition was introduced in the Philippines. The school imported oil paintings and sculptures from Europe to serve as models for local students, and these images have continued to nurture the mestizo ideal.⁴⁷

EXPORTING THE AMERICAN RACIAL TRADITION

Into this complicated and nuanced pool of racial mixtures and variable degrees of discrimination, the Americans landed with a dull splash in 1898. The American racial tradition and a concern with “white racial purity” was at the heart of

America's domestic and overseas colonial territorial relations.⁴⁸ Racial practices and classifications, which evolved in the United States, were transported to the overseas colonial territories. At the end of the nineteenth century in the United States, extreme racial violence was common including lynching.⁴⁹ In 1896, two years before the United States invaded the Philippines, the Supreme Court decision in *Plessy v. Ferguson* institutionalized racial segregation and established the doctrine of "separate but equal" Jim Crow laws. More directly relevant to the Philippines, the decision also established as the supreme law of the land the rigidity of the genotype-based American racial tradition, in which mixed-race people of *any* degree of part-African ancestry were relegated to the lower "Negro" socioracial caste.⁵⁰ (Homer Plessy was phenotypically white, precisely the reason why he was chosen to test the constitutionality of post-Reconstruction segregation laws in the Southern states.) During the same period, Asians in the United States were also experiencing racism, discrimination, and physical violence. This, too, had consequences for American views of Filipinos who were regarded as both Asian and "akin to negroes."⁵¹

During the debate on the Paris Peace Treaty of 1898, U.S. senator MacLaurin expressed fears that the possible annexation of the Philippines would mean the "incorporation of a mongrel and semi-barbarous population . . . inferior to, but akin to the negro in moral and intellectual qualities and in [a lack of] capacity for self-government." Another early American view of the Filipinos was that of Major-General Joseph Wheeler, who observed shortly after arriving in the Philippines in 1898: "Many of the people resemble the negro in appearance, but that is as far as the similarity goes. For all the practical purposes of civilization, the mirthful, easy-going African is superior to these treacherous and blood-thirsty hybrid Malays."⁵²

It is illustrative of the rigid racial tradition that, beginning with the 1903 census conducted by the Americans in the Philippines, the characteristic "lumping together" of different socioracial groups began—as "Negritos" and "American Negroes" [the latter as troops in the Spanish-American War] were classified together, without distinction, under the heading "black." The mixed-race ancestry of many Filipinos was clearly at variance with white American preoccupation with "racial purity." (The American racial tradition contained a strong antimiscegenation prohibition, which was the law of the land in many parts of the United States until 1967, when the U.S. Supreme Court in *Loving v. Virginia* decriminalized interracial marriage in the remaining American states that still had antimiscegenation laws.)⁵³ A few years later, however, bowing to the complex ethnic realities of the islands and to American dependence on educated mestizos to help run the administration, the next census in 1918 contained the racial designations of Yellow, White, Negro, Half-Breed, and Brown.

The Americans certainly did not eagerly embrace Chinese-mestizos in the Philippines, but their policies toward the community marked an almost total

reversal of Spanish colonial policies, and most economic and social restrictions on the Chinese were removed. Nevertheless, the Chinese were denied citizenship and excluded from immigration (as also in the mainland United States at the time). Although exclusion was never fully effective, most of the present-day Chinoys in the Philippines are descended from those who entered during the American period.⁵⁴ The Chinese held the position of middlemen in mercantile activities. Today, there are tensions between Filipinos and Chinoys, as the Fil-Chinese are termed, but, as noted earlier, they are economic rather than racial tensions. Upon arriving in Manila, Wheeler concurred with the Spanish assessment that commended mestizas of Spanish, rather than Chinese, fathers as desirable and representative of the “best elements” in Philippine society.⁵⁵ He noted that the impression that the former made upon American soldiers and officers was “very favorable.” Wheeler’s narrative continues in an invidious manner and makes clear the extent to which the masses of Filipinos, and to some extent, the Chinese, were “negrified” in his and the views of many Americans.

THE FEMALE IMAGE IN COLONIAL PERSPECTIVE

At the turn of the century, the colonial view of the Filipina was mixed. De Olivares writes: “There are many grades and classes of women in the Philippines. Some are highly cultivated and almost as beautiful as the divine creatures who impart so great a charm to American society, but a majority . . . [belong to a] lower grade of civilization, and some are but little above the condition of beasts of field and forest.” These nuances were to disappear quickly under the weight of the all-leveling American racial attitudes. Listen to this:

[The] Filipina is “one of the unloveliest of women . . . a carabao [water buffalo]. [Her nose] is flat and thick-skinned, and good only for breathing, with cavities haplessly visible. . . . [Her eyes] are not very large, but they are black and beady and unreadable. [Her brow] is insignificant and hair grows low upon it. Her lips and teeth are of a hue best expressed by bronze-vermillion. Such is the combined stain of tobacco and the betel nut. [Her hair] is dead black and without luster.”⁵⁶

This beauty-contest judge did not seem to dislike Filipinas, however, but “only” their physical appearance: “This is. . . the face of the Filipino woman with the pock-marks. There are a good many things about her. In some respects she is uncannily good, to an extent which white men cannot understand in a dark woman. Her virtues will not be forgotten, but as a race she is the most thoroughly and largely pockmarked creature imaginable.”

Still, lust transcended these horrible and pockmarked disabilities for “though she is not lovely to look at, and shrinks from him—well, the white man remembers she is a woman.” Just such a “remembrance” accounted for the rapid

emergence of a new type of mestizo, the mixed-race white American and Filipino, beginning shortly after the arrival of American troops.⁵⁷

The general view of Americans toward the Filipinos was naturally consistent with the widespread negrophobia in the United States. Moreover, in common with other American overseas territories, the Philippines were initially administered by the most prejudiced military men in all-white and segregated units, generally commanded by southern officers or former "Indian fighters," apart from the regiments of all-black troops.⁵⁸ Philippines governor William Howard Taft noted in 1900 the increasing displays of racism toward Filipinos on the part of army personnel, particularly white army wives: "ladies of the army certainly seem to have [the impression] that they regard the Filipino ladies and men as 'niggers', and as not fit to be associated with."⁵⁹ This was a rude surprise to the Filipino mestizo, who had until then been accorded a status significantly higher than that of the "pure" Malay and saw that higher status suddenly wiped out.

The historical denigration of the brown-skinned Igorots and black Negritos discussed earlier, also found a place in the American outlook and further contributed to the negrification of Filipinos. These views, coupled with that of the Spanish colonizers, reinforced for Filipinos the undesirability of dark skin. For example, a cartoon by Victor Gillam in *Harper's Weekly* (1899), depicted General Emilio Aguinaldo, the revered leader of the Katipunan revolution which began in 1896, as a black dancing girl confronting a stupefied Uncle Sam dressed as an old white lady.⁶⁰ The wife of another nationalist leader, General "Yayang," Hilaria del Rosario, was derided in equally racist terms by an American: "her face is the round, fat, dusky, uninteresting face of the average native of Luzon's isle."⁶¹ Another American source claimed that del Rosario's "little dark-eyed son stood by her side and gazed wonderingly at the kind-hearted American ladies with such *beautiful white faces* and bright eyes" (italics added).

It is important to note that these views were reported to the incoming Americans as their *first* introduction to the inhabitants in their newly annexed territory. And Rudyard Kipling, the bard of imperialism, excoriated Filipinos as "half devil and half child" in his "White Man's Burden" (1898). Thus, the racial animosity inherent in the American racial tradition toward Native Americans, African Americans, and Asians in America was transferred to the "Little Brown Brothers" and to what they considered as the equally unattractive brown sisters. However, because of their dependence on the collaboration of *ilustrados* (and the keenness of many of the latter to ingratiate themselves with the new colonial masters), American policy-and image-makers in the Philippines soon "exempted" from these disparaging stereotypes the wealthier, better educated, and *mixed-race* class. In other colonial territories the American arrival marked the obliteration of intermediate socioracial groups and their merger into the all-encompassing "negro" caste. In the Philippines, instead, by 1907, the American

period consolidated mestizo social dominance and reinforced the desirability of what many Filipinos have now come to internalize: the mestiza female ideal.

JOSE RIZAL AND THE MESTIZA IDEAL

Even such an august writer as the national hero Jose Rizal subscribed to these Eurocentric role-images.⁶² His writings are replete with idealization of the white mestiza ideal, despite his part-Chinese background. Rizal preferred the Caucasian mestiza over the Chinese mestiza, and his mestiza wife, Josephine Bracken, was the daughter of an Englishman. An examination of the literature of Rizal illustrates the evolution of the image of the Filipina from the precolonial brown beauty of indigenous folklore, to that of Maria Clara, the prototype for the mestiza image by the 1800s.⁶³ In Rizal's writings Maria Clara epitomizes beauty and faithful acceptance of her role as prescribed by culture, religion, and society. She is beautiful, demure, modest, patient, devoutly religious, cultured, submissive, pure, and fair-skinned.

The effect of Rizal's idealization of the mestiza on generations of Filipinas is underscored by Carmen Guerrero-Nakpil. Her characterization of the myth and its effects is worth quoting *in extenso*:

Maria Clara . . . influenced, and for the worse, our feminine standard of beauty. She was a mestiza and therefore, white, "perhaps too white" is Rizal's own phrase, light of hair, "almost blond," with huge eyes which were "almost always cast down" and a perfect nose. Rizal himself called her features "semi-European," and while this circumstance was clearly called for by the novel's plot, yet it was unfortunate for Filipino beauty. For, in portraying his heroine in this guise, Rizal set up, unwittingly, one likes to think, a standard of feminine beauty that was untypical and unreal.

Guerrero-Nakpil continues:

By trying to look like Maria Clara Filipino women have lost the warm naturalness of their Asian personality. Because Maria Clara was fair, they have hidden their golden skin under rice-powder, and, lately, make-up; because Maria Clara's hair was curly, they twisted their hair with curling irons, ribbons, and chemicals and succeeded only on frizzing it; because Maria Clara's eyes were round and long-lashed, their own Oriental almond eyes fell into disrepute, and because Rizal called Maria Clara's European nose "the correct profile," everything else became incorrect and therefore deplorable. Because Maria Clara's mouth was small and dimpled, thousands of Filipinas have gone through life compressing their generous Asian lips into prim and ridiculous rosebuds. We have all seen this kind of mimicry in old family albums—our mothers and grand-mothers, powdered, frizzed, and overdressed, gazing foolishly at a paper moon and, when we come to think of it, looking painfully out of character.⁶⁴

But Maria Clara was not born in Rizal's *Noli me tangere* (*Touch Me Not*). She is the Catholic's Virgin Mary, European and foreign, in the mold of the

religious images brought to the Philippines four centuries earlier. At the same time, reflecting the psychological predicament of colonialism, which diminishes the colonizer even as it oppresses the colonized, Maria Clara is a repressed woman whose weakness and despair over a lost love overwhelm her, enabling powerful and sinister forces to slowly drive her to death.

There is of course a more prosaic and class-based interpretation of the “white bias” implied by the mestiza ideal. In an era when “lower-class” was by definition “outdoor-class” because lower-class occupations consisted of manual labor performed outdoors, it was natural for the upper class to avoid the outward manifestation of manual labor—that is, a suntanned skin. Just as southern European ladies were doing at the turn of the nineteenth century (indeed, from the sixteenth century onward), all precautions were taken by mestizas in the Philippines to avoid sunlight, from parasols to skin protection. As we shall see in the last section, however, the present-day obsession with skin-whitening creams and other cosmetics is related to a less practical reason, namely, the reification of the mestiza phenotype as an end in itself rather than as a means to project higher social status.

THE CONTRASTING MALAY FEMALE IDEAL IN CONTEMPORARY FILIPINO ART

As noted, Filipino artists have asserted periodically the validity of the brown Malay image in religious and secular art. In the twentieth century, religious folk art reemerged to challenge the Eurocentric bias. The Malay image in art grew to a genre in its own right. Among many other artists, Fernando Amorsolo introduced into popular culture the *dalagang bukid* or country maiden. This genre institutionalized the image of the Filipina within a “tropical idyll where youth reigned supreme.”⁶⁵ In 1938, the *Brown Madonna* was introduced in the modern art of Galo B. Ocampo. In this painting, the brown complexion and facial features identify the figures as unmistakably Malay. Linking the phenotype to economic class, the Madonna’s *baro* (blouse), *saya* (skirt), and *tapis* (apron) highlight her rural origins. This representation has been described as one of the first modern efforts to create new Filipino icons with which Filipinos could identify, “an attempt at decolonization of religious imagery.”⁶⁶

During the 1950s, the “proletarian art” of Vicente Manasala appeared. He venerates the brown Malay woman in his *Madonna of the Slums*, a modernist oil painting that now hangs in the National Museum, thereby paying national homage to the Malay woman as the ideal. His depiction of the Malay woman as the Mother of Filipinos continues the Ocampo style. The image is of a brown-skinned urban mother of a strong Malay phenotype holding her brown child in a close embrace. Again connecting race with class, the painting reflects the poverty of postwar Manila and the wretched socioeconomic conditions in which millions of urban Filipinos of both genders existed then and now. His art also captures the anxiety, insecurity, vulnerability, and the enduring dignity with

which millions of contemporary Filipinas deal with poverty.⁶⁷ Another example of this growing tradition is Martino Abellana's *Job Was Also Man* (1953); Job is depicted as a contemporary beggar clad only in shorts against a background of ruined buildings. The face is lined with suffering, the resigned eyes and mouth are open in supplication, and the nude brown torso and limbs show strained sinews.

An interesting recent reversal of the colonial stereotype is *The Brown Brothers' Burden*, a 1972 painting in Benedicto Cabrera's Larawan series.⁶⁸ Showing up the falsehood of Kipling's White Man's Burden rationalization, the artist reveals the true burden to be the white man's interests weighing heavily on the shoulders of the "little brown brothers" (cast in sepia tones). A critic notes: "the artist has heightened the quiet pain in the brown men's faces while he deletes the facial features of the white colonizer."⁶⁹

The works of Filipina artists are also represented in the new genre. Among them are Anita Magsaysay-Ho, whose numerous paintings highlight women in bandannas interacting in work rhythms. Among these are her well-known series on chickens, which she developed during her student years in New York in the 1950s. Norma Belleza, Anna Fer, Imelda Cajipe-Endaya, and Julie Lluich's representations are also in this tradition. In particular, Lluich's work is noteworthy in paying artistic tribute to Malay women as street vendors managing to maintain dignity and a stoic demeanor in the face of crushing poverty and overwhelming oppression. Her vendors sit veiled and hunched over their wares, their large bare brown feet projecting from the hems of their garments. The Malay ideal of the Brown Madonna as the Holy Mother of all Filipinos is also recurrent in religious iconography, and many female religious characters are represented by this physical type.⁷⁰ Finally, it is worth mentioning the *Lady of Edsa*, a 20-foot bronze Madonna erected to commemorate the People's Power Revolution that swept aside the Marcos dictatorship in 1986. It is of interest that her face has an Asian look and that this feature elicited considerable controversy and resentment among many Manila residents.

THE MESTIZA IDEAL IN CONTEMPORARY PHILIPPINES CULTURE

Which of the two Filipina ideals prevails in the contemporary Philippines? Colonization not only shaped the political and economic landscape, but also indirectly influenced a "Filipina mystique," which has implications for identity and hierarchy. Linda Acupanda McGloin writes:

First, in contrast to the Eve-from-Adam's rib version, the pre-colonial narration of simultaneous birth (of the first Filipino man and woman who rose together from the hollow of the split bamboo) lends support to the implication of intended balance or equity . . . Second, the succeeding colonial period carried the colonial thinking which attempted to replace this mythical notion of equality with the reality of a feudal hierarchy. Despite

the attempt to eclipse the pre-colonial notion of gender equality, Philippine history is replete with examples of women who adhere to the notion of equality but, at the same time, accept the reality of hierarchy.⁷¹

This is one of the most enduring reasons for the durability of the mestiza ideal as the core of the “feminine mystique” in contemporary Filipino society. Mestizas are regarded as “special and entitled” because their phenotype validates their foreign genotype, which is in turn the basis of their privileged status. A writer argues that this also involves Filipinas as participants in their own second-degree status, a phenomenon that she describes as “containment by elevation.”⁷² The social status of Filipinas remains high as long as she maintains a public decorum of modesty, patience, devout religion, clean living, culture, and submissiveness. She is expected to stay within the traditional mold embodied by Maria Clara by avoiding public promiscuity and other undesirable behavior unbecoming a “lady,” on pains of a “fall from grace,” in a way that notoriously promiscuous Filipino men do not.⁷³

Containment by elevation can occur through marriage to rich Filipinos or foreigners.⁷⁴ Being a mestiza is an accepted route to power, privilege, and status for poor Filipinas, as it is for comely women of other nationalities. This was illustrated most recently in the saga of mestiza beauty Rose Lacson Hancock Porteous, who inherited about U.S. \$13 million from her late husband, one of Australia’s wealthiest men. Her rags-to-riches journey began when, at the age of 36, the twice-married woman migrated to Australia and accepted a job as a maid to Hancock, then a 77-year-old widower, who died in 1992 at age 84. Her job consisted of cooking, cleaning, and washing clothes. Lacson is very upfront about her “skin-trading” and as she noted “My prize collection is my skin.”⁷⁵ Of course, beautiful and manipulative women have traveled the “wits and tits” route to power from time immemorial and in all societies. (The premier example in the Philippines is former beauty contest queen Imelda Romualdez, whose humble and frustrating beginnings as a poor country cousin of a powerful family were transformed dramatically by her marriage to an up-and-coming politician. She is better known to the world as Imelda Marcos.) Rose Lacson exemplifies the special value of the mestiza image in traveling that route successfully.⁷⁶

Mestizas are regularly featured in the daily press as models of grace, charm, and beauty in contemporary living.⁷⁷ A recent newspaper feature on Senator Tito Sotto and his wife Helen illustrates this. The writer fawns over the near-white couple and their near-white children, and mestizo ancestry provides the subtext to the story, as Helen informs readers of the “French-American origins” of her mother, observes that “because of her French blood . . . she was one meticulous lady,” and makes sure to stress the mestizo heritage of Senator Tito Sotto: “My mother-in-law was a typical Spanish señora—her own mom was pure Spanish.” Helen is depicted as the perfect wife in the tradition of Maria Clara: a dutiful wife, who “excels in home arts, such as cooking, entertaining, decorating, running a busy home, and is the consummate companion.”⁷⁸

A route to upward mobility for Filipinas is enhanced enormously by winning local and international beauty pageants. Indeed, it is expected that after the days of ramp modeling and beauty queen reigning have ended, the women will marry rich men and enter motherhood. These chances are enhanced by being mestiza. A recent feature in the avant-garde magazine *Mega*, reported on eight women who “created an identity for themselves beyond the title” of former model and beauty queen. The transition of all from beauty queen to respectable, affluent matron was made possible, in part, by their mestiza countenance.⁷⁹

The mestiza ideal is transmitted largely through the media. Filipina Doreen G. Fernandez, a contemporary cultural historian, notes that: “Contrary to its name, [the mass media] it is not usually created by the populous, the people, the majority, the mass, but by ‘patrons,’ or if you will, ‘sponsors,’ for the consumption of the masses.”⁸⁰ The mass-media in the Philippines is extremely complicit in elevating the mestiza ideal as the Filipina feminine mystique.

The American movie industry has greatly influenced the Philippine cinema industry and its dissemination of the mestiza ideal. In both American and Philippine movies white standards of feminine and masculine beauty dominate and continue to be internalized by the general public (although certain changes are visible in recent years). Hollywood mythology, with its white gods and goddesses, was transported to the Philippines.⁸¹ Mestiza images are prevalent in cinema in the Philippines, and a review of the phenotypes of popular Filipino actors and actresses, both past and contemporary, reveals the dominance of the mestizo and mestiza ideal in popular cinema. During the thirties and forties these icons included actors such as Mary Walter and Manual Ramirez, Rogelio de La Rosa, Ely Ramos, Norma Blancaflor, and Leopoldo Salcedo; in more recent years, Vilma Santos, Cesar Ramirez, Alicia Vergel, Fernando Po Jr., and Gloria Daz.

At the end of the twentieth century mestiza and mestiza personalities continue to dominate the silver screen and other entertainments.⁸² These include show business celebrities Cristina Gonzalez, Richard Gomez, Lucy Torres Gomez (his wife), pop singers Jinky Llamazares, Pops Fernandez, comedian Johnny Litton, and actress Sunshine Cruz.⁸³ Other contemporary Filipina mestiza superstars include part-Chinese Mikee Cojuangco (movies, television commercials, and print ads), a member of a prominent political family, several of whose members were “cronies” of the late dictator Ferdinand Marcos; Charlene Gonzalez (movies and television personality), and a former Miss Universe contestant, whose sultry Latin beauty testifies to her Spanish ancestry. She is described as “a combination of Marilyn Monroe and Madonna.”

Other contemporary Filipinas in the mestiza mold include socialites Annabelle Rama and Carmina Villaroel, Binibining (Miss) Philippines-Universe contest winner Abbygale Arenas, beauty queen turned actress Daisy Reyes, and Rachel Soriano, 1998 Miss Pilipinas-World. Male mestizo icons include Tonton Gutierrez Leonardo Litton and Rodel Velayo to mention a few.

In 1965, Gemma Cruz-Araneta, a past secretary of tourism in the Philippines

government, became the first Filipina to win an international beauty title, as Miss International Beauty. After her crowning, she urged Filipinos to reevaluate their attitudes toward what constitutes “beauty.” The Philippines regularly sent fair-skinned mestizas to international pageants. Of light complexion herself, Cruz-Araneta nevertheless advised: “If we want to continue succeeding in these contests, we need to send girls whose beauty reflects our heritage.”⁸⁴ She noted that, before her crowning, a Filipina was not considered really *maganda* (beautiful), unless she was *maputi* (white).

In that light, it is interesting to note that the current Miss Philippines and first runner-up in the 1999 “Miss Universe” pageant is Miriam Quiambo, a dusky-skinned (*kayunmanggi*) beauty of distinct Malay features. Consider also the popularity of Wilma Doesnt, a “fourth-generation Afro-American Filipina,” discovered while sweeping the courtyard of her family home in Cavite.⁸⁵ Doesnt was “Supermodel of the World Contest” winner and recalled that her classmates would [derisively] call her *negra*, but “she would not mind.” She did reveal that she was always reduced to tears whenever there was a Santacruzian pageant in her town, because she was always rejected as a participant. The Filipino preference for the mestiza ideal is not always validated by foreign assessments of what constitutes Filipina beauty. For example, the winner of a search launched by the New York-based Ford Model Agency for “Supermodel Philippines 1999,” was Nina Naval, an 18-year-old woman whose Ilocana-Bataguena ancestry is reflected in her Malay features.

COSMETIC PATHOLOGY

The strength of the “white bias” among Filipino middle-and upper-class women is manifested by a variety of signs. Blonde (rather than brunette) Barbie Dolls are the toys of choice for millions of Filipino children; passers-by rush to coo and take photos of themselves with blond, blue-eyed foreign toddlers; most striking, however, is the use of an array of bizarre and often harmful cosmetics. Aside from the large number of young Filipinos of both genders now dyeing their hair blonde (because of the melanin in Asian hair, this is not a simple procedure and requires at least three to four costly and time-consuming attempts), body and face bleaching is prevalent despite the long-term health implications.⁸⁶ Recently, the Philippine Department of Health announced plans to remove from supermarkets some facial “beauty” products, containing the whitening agents hydroquinone and tretinoin, an overdose of which could be hazardous. Health Secretary Alberto Romualdez Jr. cautioned that an “overdose of whitening agents would result in extreme change in color of the skin or may reduce the body’s protection against the sun’s radiation which could eventually lead to cancer.”⁸⁷

These risks do not make much of a dent in middle-class Filipino women’s obsession to get whiter. Consider just a few examples of advertisements commonly running as of mid-2000:

- Pond's Institute advertisement features a mestiza, who proclaims: "Even He noticed my rosy white skin!" and promises that use of the product is "the natural, gradual way to rosy white skin, resulting from the product's Vitamin B3 that whitens skin from within";
- The Facial Care Center, "where beautiful skin happens" is promoted by April Marcial-Stewart, a mestiza hostess for the television program "For Kids Only." A companion ad for the same chain promises to make faces "whiter" and urges women to "lighten up sun-darkened or naturally-born dark skin with Shiroy Active Whitening Treatment," "[o]riginated in Japan and tested in Swiss laboratories, this treatment promotes skin clarity for hyper-pigmentation and stabilizes skin tone over dark, blotchy areas." It concludes "Now you no longer have to put up with the worry of unappealing dark skin";
- Annie's Beauty World and Health Center, a chain of clinics, promises "Eyefold beautification without open surgery" and "body bleaching" for a "simply flawless . . . look you can flaunt anywhere";
- The Rogemson Company, "makers of Babes Sunscreen Facial Cleanser and Epiderm—A Skin Whitening Lotion, Soap and Facial Cream," warns against the dangers of hydroquinone, a chemical used primarily "as a developer in black-and-white photography, lithography and x-ray films." The ad notes piously that "Accelerating skin whitening may do more harm than good. What is important is to use skin whitening products that contain no harsh ingredients like hydroquinone. [Use] products that work with the body's natural functions rather than alter them. [Use] products that not only whiten but help keep skin supple, smooth and healthy."

A CONCLUDING WORD

The "mestiza ideal" created by the Spanish and reinforced during the days of American colonialism, remains strong into the twenty-first century.⁸⁸ The view of "Joman" quoted at the beginning of this chapter—"you wish you were black"—does not appear to have taken root in Filipino popular culture. The general attitude still seems to be "the paler [the skin] the more suited to our embraces."⁸⁹ There is a plausible argument that this pathology affects largely the urban middle and upper classes—and thus a hope that, *if* development becomes more equitable and less Manila-centric, the "white bias" of Filipinos as a group will gradually lessen and their self-pride will grow correspondingly stronger. At the end of the twentieth century, hopeful signs in that direction are few and weak.

NOTES

1. Jose De Olivares, trans., "The Spanish Official History of the Philippine Islands," in *Our Islands And Their People, As Seen With Camera and Pencil*, vol. 2. Introduction by Major-General Joseph Wheeler, U.S. Army (St. Louis: Thompson Publishing Company 1899), p. 549.

2. Jan Nederveen Pieterse, *White on Black: Images of Africa and Blacks in Western Popular Culture* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992), p. 217.

3. Joman, "You Know You're Filipino If . . .," November 1997 <www.joman@ationet.com>.

4. It is interesting to observe the considerably darker phenotypes of the first generation of Filipinos to encounter the Americans as depicted in turn-of-the century photos. Even accounting for the poor quality of the early daguerreotypes taken throughout the many islands from c. 1878 onward, and the greater incidence of suntanned skin, the majority were dark-skinned, including many captioned as "mestizos."

5. Many children appeared to be frightened of me. One child running, bumped into me, gazed up at my dark face, and with some trepidation asked his caretaker: "What is that?!!!" On the other hand, at a restaurant the entire kitchen staff appeared at the kitchen door with bright smiles and waves in my direction. The contrast was heightened by the surroundings of a booming mall sound system playing African American rap music and the spectacle of young Pinoy "wannabees" struggling to keep their low-waisted baggy calf-length pants from falling even lower down their flat and narrow hips.

6. African American female superstars who performed in the Philippines during my residence include Diana Ross, Dionne Warwick, Marilyn McCoo and the Fifth Dimensions, and a reconstituted Supremes. African American men are among the professional basketball players for the Philippine Basketball Association (PBA) and Chicago Bulls superstar Michael Jordan is particularly popular.

7. My earliest assumptions about Filipino Americans and race were formed years ago in the context of the predominantly African American neighborhood of Roxbury in Boston, where I grew up. Filipinos were no strangers, and there was intermarriage between Filipinos and African Americans of both genders.

8. Hazel M. McFerson, "Racial Tradition and Comparative Political Analysis," *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 2, no. 4 (October 1979): 477–97; and *The Racial Dimension of American Overseas Colonial Policy* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1997).

9. For an analysis of the development of this pathology and its impact upon colored people, see Frantz Fanon, *Black Skin, White Masks*, trans. Charles Lam Markmann (New York: Grove, 1967). (*Peau noire, masques blancs* [Paris: Editions de Seuil, 1952].)

10. Racial traditions correspond to either one of two types: rigid and flexible. Both are ideal types in that neither exists in a pure form; rather, racial traditions can contain both flexible *and* rigid characteristics simultaneously, but for different groups. A rigid racial tradition entails: (1) the definition and formation of racial groups solely on the basis of genotype and ancestry; (2) the relative unimportance of phenotypic appearance for status validation across racial groups, although it is important within the subordinate nonwhite group; and (3) in the perception of the dominant socioracial group, the virtual absence of socioracial distinctions within the subordinate group on the basis of nonascriptive criteria such as class and color. This does not mean the absence within the subordinate racial group of a white bias and invidious status distinctions on the basis of color, shade, and other aspects of phenotype. Indeed, these distinctions exist in both rigid and flexible racial traditions, even though in a rigid racial tradition, which emphasizes ancestry, there is the perception of fewer racial groups in the view of the dominant group.

11. Marcelo Tangco, "Racial and Cultural History of the Filipinos," *Readings in Philippine Pre-history*, 2nd series, vol. 1 (Manila: Filipiniana Book Guide, Inc., 1979), p. 62.

12. The presence of the Chinese (who are not a homogenous group) dates from between A.D. 900 and 1200 when immigrants from southern Annam established trading

and commercial posts around Sulu. Concerning Muslims, the Arab scholar Mudum arrived in Sulu in about 1380 and laid the groundwork for the spread of Islam in the Philippines. From that time, other Muslims arrived as both traders and scholars. When the Spanish arrived in the sixteenth century they found a great part of Mindanao and Sulu inhabited by Muslims, whom they called "Moros" by historical analogy to their Moorish antagonists six centuries earlier. See Teodoro A. Agoncillo, *A Short History of The Philippines* (New York: Mentor Books, 1969).

13. Gregorio F. Zaide, *Philippine Political and Cultural History*. vol. 1 (Manila: Philippine Education Company, 1949) p. 19.

14. Zaide writes: *Philippine Political and Cultural History*, p. 11. He "According to Professor H. Otley Beyer, noted American ethnologist, the proportion of racial strains in their veins is as follows: Negrito, 10%; Indonesian, 30%, Malayan, 40%; Chinese, 10%; Indian, 5%; European and American, 3% and Arab, 2%."

15. *Ibid.*, 19.

16. Zaide writes that Padre Rodrigo de Aganduru Moriz (1584–1626), first Recollect [religious order] historian of the Philippines, had a very interesting theory concerning the origin of the Filipinos (*ibid.*). According to Moriz, the Filipinos were the descendants of Cham, one of Noah's sons, who settled in the Philippines after the Great Deluge.

There is an interesting parallel to the creation myth of the Mamanua, a subgroup of the Aetas: "[T]here was only one kind of people in the beginning. Then lightning struck the earth and set it on fire. Those who were singed black became the Mamanua. The Aeta of Capiz, Panay believes that their ancestor was the eldest of three sons who was cursed because he laughed at his sleeping father. The sun's heat turned his skin black and his hair kinky." Cf. CCP Encyclopedia, "Aeta," *Peoples of the Philippines: Aeta to Jama Mapun*, vol. 1 (Manila: Cultural Center of the Philippines, 1994).

Another subgroup, the Aeta of Bulacan tell the not-so-flattering story of a large ape who stole fire from the supreme being named Kadai and set the world on fire. The people who fled downstream became the Malays and those who were singed became the Negrito. Marcelino N. Maceda, *The Culture of Mamanua (Northern Mindanao), As Compared With That Of The Other Negritos of Southeast Asia* (Manila: Catholic Trade School), 1964.

17. Quoted in Maceda, *The Culture of Mamanua*, p. 72.

18. *Ibid.*, vol. I, p. 311.

19. Emphasis added. This is recounted by Francisco R. Demetrio, S. J., *Dictionary of Philippine Folk Beliefs and Customs* (Cagayan De Oro City: Xavier University, 1970), p. 359, based on research conducted in Davao, 1967, a collection that he compiled and edited.

20. CCP Encyclopedia, "Aeta," p. 22.

21. *Britannica Online*, 1999, describes them thusly: "The group's chief physical characteristics are short stature (under five feet tall), yellowish-brown skin, curly to frizzy hair, and rather Australoid facial features, including large teeth and prognathous (projecting) jaw, long head, and broad nose. The . . . women show marked steatopygia (massive fat deposits in the buttocks supported by fibrous tissue)" <www.Britannica.com>.

22. William Allan Reed, *Negritos of Zambales*, vol. 2 pt. 1. Department of the Interior. Ethnological Survey Publications (Manila: Bureau of Public Printing, 1904), p. 21.

23. The Census Office of the Philippine Islands, *Census of the Philippine Islands* (Under the Direction of the Philippine Legislature), vol. 2 (Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1921), 2:917.

24. Demetrio, *Dictionary of Philippine Folk Beliefs and Customs*, p. 367.

25. Quoted in Dean S. Fansler, *Filipino Popular Tales*, Collected and Edited With Comparative Notes (Hatboro, Penn.: Folklore Association Inc., 1965), pp. 287–88.

26. The pageant is described: “The town plaza is a surging bedlam of motley groups in garish costumes and soot-smearred bodies, dancing with incredible abandon . . . The street disgorges into the plaza men and boys of all sizes, painted black from head to foot, waving spears and shields, their heads adorned with many abaca wigs, in the manner of so many Cleopatras, and crying out . . . ‘viva kay Santo Nino’ ” CCP Encyclopedia, “The Ati-Atihan,” *Peoples of the Philippines*, 2:2218.

27. The fiesta at Kalibo, Aklan, is in honor of the Sto. Nino. Fiesta participants are in black face and were originally costumed as the small and black aborigines of the Philippines, the Aetas. There are similar fiestas elsewhere in the country, with different names: Sinulog in Cebu, Dinagyang in Iloilo, Buling-Buling in Pandacan, Manila. In the Visayas, too, the Santo Nino is honored to this day with the annual Ati-Atihan festival. Participants don spectacular costumes and headdress made of local materials and blacken their bodies with soot. Cf. Jaime C. Laya and Lulu Tesoro Casteneda, *Prusisyon: Religious Pageantry in the Philippines* (Metro Manila: Cofradia de la Immaculada Concepcion 1996).

28. Cf. Emma Helen Blair and James Alexander Robertson, eds., “Explorations by Early Navigators . . . to the beginning of the Nineteenth Century,” *The Philippine Islands 1493–1803*, 55 vols. (Cleveland: A. J. Clark, 1903–1909), vol. 40 (*Native Peoples and Customs*), p. 303. All references, including subsequent ones, are to vol. 40.

29. The unnamed chronicler also records the presence of “people who are found only in the environs of Manila, and are called Criollos Morenos (i.e., creole blacks).” These are “oldtime Christians, docile, well inclined and of sufficient understanding. They serve the king in personal duties, and always have their regiments of soldiers, with their master-of-camp, captains, and other leaders; . . . it is difficult to assign their true origin . . . some make them the descendants of those blacks [Negrillos] of whom we shall speak later, who were the primitive lords of these domains.” This, however, he doubted, citing their physical differences from Negrillos “either in their hair or in the members of their bodies, or in the qualities of their minds.” *Ibid.*, p. 300.

30. Reed, *Negritos of Zambales*, pp. 13–14.

31. Mrs. Campbell Dauncey, *An Englishwoman in the Philippines* (London: John Murray, 1906), p. 193.

32. Cf. *Census of the Philippine Islands* (Taken Under the Direction of the Philippine Commission in the Year 1903), vol. 2, *Population* (Washington, D.C.: United States Bureau of the Census, 1905), p. 48. Also included in this classification “Of the wild tribes, the Igorots were, after the Moros [Muslims], the most numerous; then there is a great jump to the Bukidnon; then following the Subanos, the Negritos, the Mandayas, and Manobos” (p. 46). The Igorot consist of various subgroups living in the mountains of northern Luzon, Philippines, all of whom keep, or have kept until recently their traditional religion and way of life. They gained notoriety among Europeans in earlier days for their wars and headhunting. In common with the Moros, they also successfully resisted the Spanish, who never did defeat them militarily.

33. As recently as January 1999, Lucy Torres, the mestiza star of the national situation comedy “Richard Loves Lucy” explains why another character in the sit-com is ugly:

“kasi Igorot ang tatay niya (because his father is an Igorot)” Cf: “Why Igorots Won’t Love Lucy,” *Philippine Daily Inquirer*, January 12, 1999, p. 13.

34. The Spanish were discriminatory toward the indigenous, non-Spanish groups, and they even differentiated among themselves, preferring *peninsulares*, those born in Spain, to *Creoles*, pure-blooded Spanish-Filipinos, Spaniards born in the colony, or those who went to the Philippines in childhood. This group was accorded second-class status, though they enjoyed many advantages over “Indios” as both groups termed Filipinos, reserving to themselves the name “Filipino.”

35. Blair and Robertson, *Native Peoples and Customs*, vol. 40.

36. Some groups were classified as “civilized,” others as “uncivilized,” and “heathen.” The Report even claimed that “in the island of Mindoro, there is one [clan] which has a little tail, as do the monkeys; and many religious [friars] have assured [the report’s author] of it.” Cf. Blair and Robertson, *The Philippine Islands*, vol. 40, p. 307.

37. *Ibid.*, vol. 51, p. 103.

38. *Ibid.*, p. 570.

39. *Ibid.* Unless otherwise noted, this section is based on this source.

40. The Chinese are the ultimate “insiders as outsiders” in the Philippines. Among the many past and present prominent Filipinos of part-Chinese ancestry are nationalist hero and writer Jose Rizal; post-Marcos former president Cory Aquino; the current Cardinal Jaime Sin; and scores of Taipans or Chinese tycoons, such as Lucio Tan, the families of Lopez, Ty, Gokongweis, Huangs, Cojuangco and Go to name a few. Fil-Chinese are also prominent in the medical professions and in government. They are regularly scape-goated and blamed for many of the country’s economic problems and for the haughty manner in which many regard non-Chinese Filipinos. None of this has resulted in anti-Chinese pogroms, which frequently occur in Indonesia and other Asian countries during periodic economic crises. But the Chinese are the targets of economically inspired kidnapping for ransoms. Not all Chinese are released alive even if ransoms are paid.

41. Quoted in Blair and Robertson, *The Philippine Islands*, vol. 52, p. 65. Also see, Dr. Isangani R. Medina, “Chinese Mestizos and the Ethnic Chinese in Cavite During the Philippine Revolution 1896–1902,” and other articles in Teresita Ang See, ed., *The Ethnic Chinese as Filipinos*, part II. *Chinese Studies Journal* 7 (1997): 54–66.

42. Emilio Aguinaldo was the 27-year-old mayor of Cavite, which became a major battleground of the revolution against Spanish colonialism. The Katipunan was a secret revolutionary organization founded by Andres Bonifacio on July 7, 1892; it came to be known as the Kataastaasang Kagalanggalangang Katipunan ng mga Anak ng Bayan (KKK), whose principal aim was to win Philippine independence from Spain through armed revolution.

43. See Teresita Ang See, ed., *The Ethnic Chinese as Filipinos*, Proceedings of the national conference on “The Ethnic Chinese as Filipinos.” Quezon City: Philippine Association for Chinese Studies (PACS), 1997.

44. Among the mixed-race population in the Philippines by the arrival of the Americans were the progeny of Filipino unions with Chinese, Japanese, and “Hindoos,” whom Major-General Joseph Wheeler of the U.S. Army described as “not altogether a barbarous and totally uncultured people”: “They had ships and carried on commerce with China, Japan and India. They had factories where they worked in metals, iron, brass, silver and gold. They manufactured powder, made bricks, excelled in wood carving, and some of

their products of iron were spoken of as superior, and even superb." Quoted in De Olivares, "Spanish Official History of the Philippine Islands," p. 390.

45. Cultural Center of the Philippines, "Philippines Visual Arts," *CCP Encyclopedia of Philippine Art*, vol. 4 (Manila: Cultural Center of the Philippines, 1994).

46. *Ibid.*

47. Leonard Wolff writes that some of the Friars were "distressingly race-conscious. A Dominican newspaper in Manila, referring to a poem about the natives recited at the University of Santo Tomas, remarked: These verses brilliantly set forth the savage instincts and bestial inclinations of those [indios] faithful imitators of apes." Cf. *Little Brown Brother* (New York: Doubleday & Company, 1961), p. 18.

48. This term was used by then candidate Jimmy Carter during his successful bid for the American presidency in 1976.

49. For a discussion of the period see Rayford W. Logan, *The Betrayal of the Negro: From Rutherford B. Hayes to Woodrow Wilson* (1954; reprint New York: Collier Books, 1965).

50. Homer Plessy, the plaintiff in the case was a Louisiana Creole, of "seven-eighths white blood" and his "Negro" ancestry was not visible, yet he was classified as such in law. Cf. Charles A. Lofgren, *The Plessy Case: A Legal Historical Interpretation* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987).

51. Cf. Renato Constantino, *The Filipinos in the Philippines and Other Essays* (Quezon City, Philippines: Malaya Books, 1966).

52. Quoted in De Olivares, "Spanish Official History of the Philippine Islands." He warned Americans that no civilized nation had anything to gain by associating with the "hybrid Malays," or endeavoring to govern them, as among them are "people less advanced in civilization than the wild tribes of Central Africa." He noted that Spain tried the experiment of civilizing them for four centuries and smiled broadly when she sold the "hot tamale to us for twenty millions of dollars."

53. The first American census referred to the mestizos as "half-castes" and "half-breeds," p. 3. The census also discussed at length the color of the population, of whom it was noted that "the people of the Philippine Islands, ninety-nine percent . . . belonged to the brown race," and of whom females were "slightly in excess" (*Census of the Philippine Islands*, pp. 44, 55).

54. *Ibid.*, p. 29.

55. He attributes some of his views on the virtues of the "better class of Filipino women" to Senor Ramon Reyes Lala, a local Filipino dignitary. De Olivares, "Spanish Official History," 2: 589.

56. Quoted from De Olivares, "Spanish Official History," 2: 590. The African American female counterpart, the Mammy, as the archetypal representation of the African American female image is often figured in children's stories, such as the well-known Bobbsey Twins series from 1904, which featured Dinah the cook as the ultimate stereotype of the Contented Slave, the Buxom Mammy, as a superstitious, watermelon-eating, eye-rolling, thieving black. Aunt Jemima dates from 1890 and since 1902 had been calling out to generations of Americans "T'se in town, honey!" See Pieterse, *White on Black*, p. 156; Sterling Brown, *The Negro in American Fiction* (Washington, D.C.: Arno [1969], 1937) and Donald Bogle, *Toms, Coons, Mulattoes, Mammies, and Bucks* (New York: Continuum, 1989).

57. A memorial park commemorating the emergence of the Amerasian community of Filipino and American ancestries beginning in 1899 is at Subic Bay, the former largest

U.S. naval base in the world outside of the United States. A number of African American troops deserted the American army and fought with Filipino insurgents during the Philippine-American War, which began in 1898. Many consorted with Filipinas and had families of black/Filipina ancestries. Their stories have generally been overlooked in accounts of American sexual encounters with Filipinas, as illustrated in the following view, which attempts to whiten the genealogy of many mestizos: "Among the first to leave the Philippines in 1945 were children and grandchildren of Spanish-American War veterans. These were the Filipino descendants of those *white soldiers, sailors and civil servants* who had chosen to live in the Philippines after the Filipino-American War" [emphasis added]. Cf. Fred Cordova, *Filipinos: Forgotten Asian Americans: A Pictorial Essay 1763–1963* (San Francisco: Demonstration Project for Asian Americans, 1983), p. 20. Among the descendants of Filipino and African Americans is Anthony Powell, whose grandfather was in the U.S. Army in the Philippines circa 1900. Powell has written extensively about his Filipina/African American ancestry. Cf. Anthony L. Powell. "Through My Grandfather's Eyes: Ties that Bind. The African American Soldier in the Filipino War for Liberation, 1899–1902," Paper presented at the 1997 National Conference of African American Studies and Hispanic and Latino Studies in Houston, Texas. Also see Willard B. Gatewood Jr., *Black Americans and the White Man's Burden, 1898–1903* (Urbana: University of Chicago Press, 1975). These two sources are remarkably alike in certain sections, including exact wording and examples cited.

58. The history of African American troops in the Filipino-American War has generally been overlooked. For an excellent account of this presence, see Gatewood, *Black Americans and the White Man's Burden*.

59. Cf. Peter W. Stanley, *The Philippines and the United States, 1899–1921* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1974), p. 163.

60. See Pieterse, *White on Black*, p. 216.

61. A comment by Major-General Wheeler, see De Olivares, "Spanish Official History of the Philippine Islands," p. 599.

62. Rizal was born in 1861, and executed by a Spanish firing squad at Luneta in 1896, for the crime of advocating mestizo assimilation into the Spanish colonial hierarchy.

63. Cf. Linda Acupanda McGloin, "Colonization: Its Impact on Self-Image: Philippine Women in Rizal's Novels and Today," *FFP Bulletin* (spring/summer 1992): 1 <www.Boondocketsnet.com/sctexts/Pamrizal.html>.

64. Carmen Guerrero-Nakpil, "Maria Clara," in Petronila Bn. Daroy and Delores S. Feria, eds., *Rizal: Contrary Essays* (Quezon City: Guro Books, 1968), pp. 85–90.

65. *Ibid.*, p. 25.

66. *Ibid.*, p. 229.

67. *CCP Encyclopedia of Philippine Art*, vol. 4:258.

68. An African American soldier in the U.S. contingent to occupy the Philippines in 1898, announced with some humor that "African Americans are here to take up the white man's burden." In the main, though, African Americans were soundly critical of the invasion and occupation, and not a few of them eventually deserted to the Filipino cause. A poem, "The Black Man's Burden" chided white American imperialists to: "Take up the black man's burden! Not his across the seas, But his who grows your cotton, and sets your heart at ease, When to the sodden rice fields Your children dare not go, Nor brave the heat that sings like The foundry's fiery glow. Take up the black man's burden! He helped to share your own, On many a scene by battle-clouds Portentously o'erblown; . . ." John White Chadwick, *Later Poems* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin and Co., 1905).

69. Imelda Cajipe-Endaya, J. Merino, and R. Paras-Perez, with an introduction by Leonidas B. Benesa, *Filipino Engraving, 17th to 19th Century* (Manila: Ylang-Ylang Graphic Group, 1980), quoted in *CCP Encyclopedia of Philippine Art*, vol. 4, p. 25.

70. Maria Christine Zamora explored this line of analysis in "Of Saints and Scars: The Hagiographic Imprint of the Modern Philippine Nation," Fulbright Scholar 1998–99, presentation, Philippine American Educational Foundation, Makati City, December 1998. The Ph.D. candidate's presentation examined the phenotypes of women who were presented as "being-as-image" or "picture-writing" that identifies the hagiographic portraits of saints in the construction of modern Filipino national heroes. Zamora concluded that Filipino nationalism today is a visually centered ideology in which images abound of the mostly Malay women human body, despite the seemingly contradictory pervasiveness of the venerated mestiza ideal. Among the brown-skinned, Malay-featured contemporary religious figures are: Nuestras Senoras De Montserrat, De Buensuccesso, De Los Desamparados, De Guia, De Penafraancia De Bicol.

71. McGloin, "Colonization," p. 2.

72. Cf. Salvadore P. Lopez. "Maria Clara—Paragon or Caricature?" in Petronila Bn. Daroy and Delores S. Feria, eds., *Rizal: Contrary Essays* (Quezon City: Guro Books, 1968), pp. 81–84.

73. This is the most notorious recent example of former president Joseph Estrada.

74. It can also include prominent African Americans. For example, Filipinas married to African Americans include: Cecilia Marshall, widow of the late, Supreme Court justice Thurgood Marshall and Loida Nicholas Lewis, widow of African American entrepreneur, Reginald Lewis, who purchased the international conglomerate Beatrice Foods. Many Fil-American men also marry African American women, although the numbers are unknown. Also, there are some Filipino Americans of both genders who, in common with the Filipino view stated at the beginning of this chapter, celebrate a "black" identity. Cf. Samuel Cacas, "Black Like Me: An Asian American Comes to Terms with His 'Black Identity' " *Interrace* 44 (June 1997): 18–19. He writes "The first people to inhabit the Philippines, my parents' country of origin, were from Africa. . . . The woman I was married to for seven years . . . is African American."

75. Cf. Beth Pango-Frias, "Married Widow Wins \$13-m case," *Philippine Daily Inquirer*, June 11, 1999, p. 1.

76. The story is not very different from that of Marlene Ramallo Cooke, the Bolivian-born young widow of the late Washington-area millionaire Jack Kent Cooke. Upon his death in 1994 at the age of 82, the fortyish widow successfully won a legal battle giving her U.S. \$20 million of the fortune he amassed in part as owner of the Washington Redskins football team.

77. Tanya T. Lara, "At Home with Tito and Helen Sotto," *Philippine Star*, November 21, 1998, pp. L1–5.

78. *Philippine Daily Inquirer*, November 23, 1998, B7. Ciara Sotto, the 19-year old "dusky beauty" daughter of Helen and Tito Sotto has noted that she loves playing golf just like her Dad. But her mother would always remind her to take care of her skin. "I'm not as fair as my Mom or my sisters. I'm really like my Dad. I have my own set of golf clubs that is sitting there, because my Mom doesn't want me to get any darker." Cf. "Ciara Moving out of Parents' Shadow," *The Philippine Star*, July 17, 1999, p. 46.

79. Cf. Jennifer E. Adriano and Pierra Alcuaz Calasanz, "Reign and Shine," *Mega*, August 1998, pp. 62–67.

80. Doreen G. Fernandez, "Mass Culture and Cultural Policy: The Philippine Experience," *Philippine Studies* 37 (1989): 488–502.

81. Cf. Clodualdo A. Del Mundo, *Native Resistance: Philippine Cinema and Colonialism 1898–1941* (Malate, Manila: De La Salle University Press, Inc., 1998).

82. A recent Roper Starch Worldwide thirty-country trend tracker study reported that 35 percent of female respondents in the Philippines said that they think of their appearance "all the time"; 28 percent of male respondents in the Philippines said they think of their appearance "all the time." Worldwide almost two-thirds of Venezuelan women (65 percent) said that they think of their appearance all the time; 47 percent of male respondents said they think of their appearance "all the time." Twenty-seven percent of American female respondents said that they think of their appearance "all the time," and 17 percent of American male respondents said they think of their appearance "all the time." *Washington Post*, November 11, 2000, p. A21.

83. A recent "Funfare" gossip column writer, Ricardo F. Lo, a Chinese mestizo, recently wrote about actress Christina Gonzalez: "Will Christina's baby be as white as *taho*?" [a white pudding-type delicacy]. He continued: "whether boy or girl, the child of Cristina Gonzalez . . . and Leyte Rep. Alfred Romualdez [nephew of Imelda Romualdez Marcos] . . . will surely be as white and as smooth as, yes, *taho* (a drink) . . . She's forever hankering for *taho*. I'm sure her and Alfred's child will be *nakakasilaw na puti* because besides the fact *na pareho silang maputi*, the whiteness of *taho* will enhance the baby's complexion even more." [The baby will also be white because both of his parents are white.] Cf. *The Philippine Star*, March 30, 1999, p. 33.

84. Cf. Genoveva Edroza-Matute, "Philippines—Piling *Maiikling Kuwento*," *World Literature Today* 68, no. 1 (winter 1994): 220.

85. Cf. Leah Salterio Gatdula, "Nobody Does It better than Wilma Doesn't," *Philippine Daily Inquirer*, March 7, 1999, p. F3. In some Spanish countries, the term "*negra*" is a term of endearment. In others, it is derogatory.

86. Some of these products are also popular among women in the contemporary Caribbean, Sub-Saharan Africa, and the United States. African American superstar Michael Jackson represents an extreme case of chemical "skin color alteration."

87. Cf. "DOH Restricts Use of Skin-whiteners," *The Philippine Star*, April 13, 1999, p. 5.

88. As earlier in the United States when mulattoes were resented by darker African Americans, so does the mestiza reality evoke hostility. Midge Manlapig, a young college graduate wrote, "I hate *colegialas*, those convent-bred denizens of high society who tend to overwhelm the brown-skinned majority with their Castilian features and porcelain-like skin. The same girls you will see in the party-hopping photo spreads of all most reputable broadsheets. The same girls who get to skim off the cream of the Top 10 Most Eligible Bachelor's List." "Why I Hate 'Colegiala' Party Girls," *Philippine Daily Inquirer*, October 1, 1998, p. 9. For an excellent fictionalized treatment of a "trendy contemporary mestiza," see the character of Pucha in Jessica Hagedorn's *Dogeaters* (New York: Penguin Books, 1990).

89. Rolando S. Tinio, "Filipino Temperament," in *Philippine Smile* (Makati City, Philippines: Smiles International Ltd., 1998), p. 146.

Race and Culture in Spanish and American Colonial Policies

Marya Svetlana T. Camacho

INTRODUCTION

The Spanish advent in the Philippines has been long treated as defining a new period in Philippine history. More recent historiography, however, in a sweeping attempt not only to approach Philippine history from the Filipino perspective, but also to afford a more integrated view of it, has downsized its significance to the geographical areas and sociocultural strata where its impact was felt. This is not the place to assess revisionist historiography for we are concerned precisely with those spheres that bore and still bear Spanish imprint. This took the form of concepts and usages, structures, and systems that were alien to the natives of the archipelago, and others that were similar to their own, or were more comprehensible and therefore readily fitted into the existing order.

To consider the Spanish imprint is to acknowledge Spanish presence; inevitably the agents of change come into focus. Miguel López de Legazpi came from Mexico with full authority from Philip II to set up a colony in the Philippine archipelago. As head of the Spanish expedition, he made the blood compact with the Visayan chieftain Tupas to establish Spanish sovereignty over the islands. However, the signification of the mixing of bloods, in this case of two races, would be recalled and magnified by nineteenth-century Filipino patriots as a commitment not merely to alliance but also to brotherhood. A similar pact sealed with Manila *datu*s (chieftains) allowed the Spaniards to materialize for the first time the European concept of urban settlement, which in turn provided the locus of the colonial regime. From then on in the towns and villages, due to the scarcity of Spanish settlers, oftentimes the Spanish friar became the sole

representative of the Spanish crown; perhaps more important, he was the main channel whereby Hispanization, mainly via Christianity, took place. Attesting to this are the religious art and traditions dating from the Spanish centuries, which constitute that part of Hispanic cultural heritage that has permeated Philippine society down to the grass-roots level. As a high government official noted in the eighteenth century, the friar was usually the only white man most native Filipinos ever got to know. As a new race came to the islands, the Spaniards themselves represented change. In their persons lay the foundations of the colonial polity. They themselves embodied a new norm based on their self-image.

Gaining new territories for Spain on the far side of the world meant assuming the responsibility to tutor the new subjects of the Spanish king in Christianity and civilization, used here in its traditional meaning of a high level of culture. In practice these two spheres merged. To bestow them on the Filipino natives formed an essential part of the colonial mission, which on the other hand was certainly not expected to be without returns. Partly underlying this complex of aims was a sense of superiority, albeit guided by a paternalistic spirit.

It is in this context that the issue of race and its cultural concomitant are examined here. Colonization originated a new framework in which groups would be divided along ethnic lines: Spaniards, Christian and non-Christian native Filipinos, and Chinese formed a social hierarchy. Both the premise and the result were a distinctive pattern of relationships and values that continues to underpin Philippine society. Historical developments have followed therefrom; in turn history has modified that pattern.

While it is possible and worthwhile to hark back to pre-Hispanic times and study the same, focusing on this aspect of the Spanish colonial period has its own justification. As has been hinted above, it sheds light on the ethnic factor in Philippine culture and history. This chapter focuses on two related topics: the racial aspect of colonial structures and hence on the racial attitudes prevalent in colonial society, and a vital reaction to it, which was Philippine nationalism. The first illuminates the fact that the issue of race figured as a primordial element in the independence movement at the close of the nineteenth century. In other words, the first serves as the milieu in which races and cultures interacted to constitute a national identity.

Admittedly in the given context, politics played an important role as the primary ordering principle of community life. If ethnicity was an intrinsic articulating factor, it could only be intimately connected to political organization and dynamic. As we shall see, political organization (and participation) was partly predicated on ethnicity. In effect, colonial legislation and administrative praxis in this regard were but the practical manifestation of ideas crystallized in attitudes and the consequences of historical experience. The history of the formation of Filipino national consciousness revolved around the question of race, which stood in the way of its rightful realization, as shall be analyzed below.

John N. Schumacher examines this question in his works on nineteenth-century Philippine nationalism.¹ A basic argument that the Filipino propagan-

dists in Spain would refute once and again was the assertion of Filipino incapacity, a mixture of natural indolence and underdevelopment, by some Spanish quarters. The task of rebuttal was not only a matter of national—or racial—pride, but even more crucially at that time, was of political transcendence. Both implicitly and explicitly, *aggiornamento* (updating, bringing up to date, in the sense of adjusting according to the spirit of the [current] times) in the area of civil and political rights hinged on the recognition of ethnic and concomitantly, cultural, equality. Schumacher points to the influence of European romantic nationalism in perking the interest of some Filipinos in their past. A few of them began to delve into history and ethnology in search of Filipino pre-Hispanic culture. It was considered a scientific way of vindicating their people's worth, and ultimately, Filipino identity.

Another seminal work on racial questions in the Philippines is Domingo Abella's essay significantly titled "From Indio to Filipino."² Abella treats the race inseparably from the formation of national identity. With abundant reference to contemporaneous sources he traces the development of racial groups under Spanish rule and illustrates racial attitudes and practices that helped shape the Filipino, as we know him today. The broadness of perspective unique to this essay is due mainly to the background on the racial tradition of Spain and its transference to Latin America and eventually to the Philippines; and to the comparative approach used in the conclusion to round off the exposition. Abella's work may be justifiably considered as a starting point for the topic at hand.

There remains to be clarified the approach we shall adopt. Thus far, the tight relation between race and culture in the Philippines has been established; in turn, both were chief ingredients of identity in the nineteenth-century setting. In other words, the focus is on the Filipino as the term is construed at present, that is, possessed of a national consciousness, preeminently Malay but on the whole an amalgam of several ethnic strains. As such he can be considered mainly from two points of view: his own and that of the foreigner, Spaniard and non-Spaniard. In view of this, the extent and depth of treatment of the subject has been partly conditioned by the available sources as well as existing related literature. While the foreigners have left more written accounts of their views on races in the Philippines, the record of Filipinos' articulation of their own views is harder to come by and dates mostly from the nineteenth century. In both cases, their words allow us a glimpse of their sociocultural background, their mentalities and core beliefs, most interestingly their biases, all of which could be further traced to the age and ambit they belonged to. These sources may be generally grouped into three categories: the Filipino, the Spanish, and the non-Spanish foreigner, usually Westerner. While each carries inherent value—its own perspective—its meaning is completed by juxtaposition with other points of view which, although not in exact correspondence, were expressed in the same time frame. This is the internal side of the question under examination.

The external dimension is the framework in which the multiracial population

and culture of the colonial Philippines developed. It concerns structures and praxis that materialized ideas on race and continuities and transitions that occurred in them. Inevitably the political and economic planes of Spanish Philippines are discussed in so far as they intersected with the ethnic dimension of colonial polity. Most of the time we have to rely on whatever pertinent legislation was enacted and on observations (including criticism) made by Filipinos and non-Filipinos alike, in regard to race and culture. Although some laws might have remained a dead letter, they nonetheless reveal existing circumstances that gave rise to them or the attitude of the government about its own task and toward the peoples governed. As for the perceptions of individuals, sometimes accompanied by commentaries, the authors' conceptions and values can be inferred adequately.

It becomes clear then that this chapter serves as an initial study. The burgeoning interest in the Filipino Chinese may contribute significantly to it; similarly, further research on other Philippine ethnic groups. So much more documentary material remains to be discovered and rediscovered. Beyond this one may venture into other domains like literature, the visual arts, theater, and music; any area that offers media of expression of racial consciousness.

SOCIOPOLITICAL REORDINATION DURING THE SPANISH COLONIAL PERIOD

Essential to the task of conquest was the acceptance of the authority of the Spanish crown. It was within this framework that the payment of tribute (*tributo*) and the rendering of labor for public works (*polos y servicios*) derived their meaning.³ They were both symbols of the recognition and acceptance of vassalage. The theoretical basis of the king's right to exact them was simple: Being the ruler of the land, he could justly expect them to contribute to the cost of government and evangelization, the latter being also a responsibility of the crown. In this way European medieval practice was applied in the Asian colony. According to John L. Phelan,⁴ the relative ease with which native Filipinos⁵ (*indios*) accepted the charge might be attributed to the fact that they had a similar custom. The followers, both free and unfree, of the pre-Hispanic datu also performed services for him and paid tribute.

Exemption was granted to the *principalía*, that is, the local elite comprising current and former *cabezas de barangay*⁶ and their sons; and later, the *gobernadorcillos*.⁷ Other natives who enjoyed this privilege were officers serving in provincial militia and those who extended personal services to churches and religious estates (*reservas*), or served missionaries in other capacities. Similar to the tribute, these services were parallel ways of supporting the crown's task of civil administration, military protection, and evangelization. The other groups that were taxed were the Chinese and as they appeared in significant numbers, the Chinese half-castes (*mestizos de sangley*). Understandably no taxes were imposed on the Philippine ethnic groups that were not subjugated and Chris-

tianized. They were not subjects of Spain, at least not until they accepted the lordship of both the Christian god and the Spanish monarch.

In 1881 Gregorio Sancianco, a Chinese half-caste or mestizo studying in Spain, published a study on the Philippines with a view to improving governance; it was aptly titled *El progreso de Filipinas*. The chapters containing proposed changes in the taxation system are of interest as they draw out racial implications. They actually follow up an earlier proposal discussed more than a decade earlier in the Spanish Cortes or parliament. In the name of progress, Sancianco criticizes the tributary system as outdated given the new political framework. The state is no longer the master of the lives and property of the people; rather, it has the obligation to protect them, and in return for this service it can demand a contribution that is voluntary to some extent. The tribute was imposed by force on conquered territories; in theory, the Philippines was a province of Spain and not a tributary colony; therefore, the Filipinos should be recognized the right of citizenship and pay only a contribution based on property. Well aware of the principle of the *tributo*, he takes the bull by the horns.⁸

why are individuals of a certain race and nature exempt from the payment [of tribute]? Why do only those who do not have peninsular or European blood from the paternal line pay it? Perhaps only those called natives and mestizos obtain state services? Do not the individuals of peninsular and European descent, up to where the paternal line is traced, also avail of them? Should only the children of the peninsulares or Europeans have rights, or should the duties be exclusive to the others born in the Philippines because they are not considered Spaniards like the former?

He surmises that the current distinctions were meant to separate the dominating race and the dominated; if not so, it could be part of a policy of attraction so that more Spaniards might settle in the Philippines and Hispanize it—in which case it has failed as statistics show. Finally, the socioeconomic classification according to ethnic background, to which the tributary system corresponded, could have been a device to prevent the Filipinos from uniting and forming a separatist movement; on the contrary, it has caused resentment and pockets of discontentment against the privileged Spaniards, as proven by recent history.

Sancianco recommends the institution of the *cédula personal* as a contribution to the state on the grounds that it is more equitable for being proportional to the individual's property, and above all, promoted equality for it would abolish class distinctions, that is, distinctions based on race. In this way, the real need of the state for money to perform its functions would be addressed, and justice for the Filipinos obtained. Moreover, the *cédula* would accredit legitimacy of person and life, as differentiated from vagabonds (*vagamundo*) who are, administratively speaking, nonentities. In the classification he proposes, it is noteworthy that he groups nationals and resident foreigners together (excepting ecclesiastics and active military men), thus eliminating the privileged position of Spaniards and Spanish mestizos and melding them with the indios and Chi-

nese mestizos. However, the Chinese are still to be considered as foreigners, mostly transients who take the fruits of their labor back to China; accordingly, they deserve to be taxed at higher rates (triple or more than the first group). The pagan tribes that have come under colonial dominion shall pay a minimal tax indicative of their recognition of vassalage; besides, they possessed less education and fortune.⁹

In an attempt to fan enthusiasm for the aforementioned proposed reform, another Filipino student in Madrid, Graciano López Jaena, aired similar views in 1883. Aside from racial discrimination the tributary system purported to perpetuate, he emphasized its feudal character so outdated in the age of political equality.¹⁰

A few years later reform pushed through. The royal decree of 6 March 1884 abolished the *tributo* and other personal taxes such as the tithes (*diezmo*) and the contribution to the community fund (*caja de comunidad*), replacing them with the *cédula personal* or head tax. The cedula tax was collected by means of a certificate of identity of all residents above 18 years of age, regardless of race and sex. The sixteen-level classification was based on income with some privileges granted to active military officers and their families and agricultural colonists; as before, local government officials were exempted in recognition of their services. The Chinese, being nonresidents, were charged a poll tax instead.¹¹ Thus this administrative milestone accompanied the change in political framework, that is, from medieval kingship to constitutional monarchy, whereby from vassals Filipinos became subjects. With respect to labor, there was a gradual reduction in the number of days of service per year down to fifteen days. Nevertheless, the abuses committed by local authorities (counting many Filipinos) in recruitment, payment of wages, and use of labor remained unabated. Such practices would be today's equivalent of small-scale graft.

After a brief description of these symbols of subjection, the basic divide in Spanish colonial society clearly manifests itself. At this point the concept of caste can be better appreciated. Here the term is used to denote hereditary social status that coincides with a particular economic rank and sometimes with a commensurate political position. In the Philippines, as in colonial Latin America, race was an important determinant of niche; of all things hereditary, race evidently was of prime importance. With the introduction of the Spanish colonial regime, the ethnic-based caste system was born at the Spanish advent.

Naturally the Spaniards, referred to as *castilas* (Castilians) being representatives of their king who had extended his rule over the islands, occupied the highest stratum; the natives, a lower one. Taking into account that there existed a hierarchy in precolonial society, the new governors wisely incorporated it into the new regime, as they did in other colonies. Local governance on the town and barangay levels was delegated to the natives. Former *datus* (chieftains) became cabezas de barangay; as before, their prestige was shored up by administrative office. Thus a relatively smooth political transition was effected. This is an example of successful inculturation. It preserved the traditional order within

a new order. Without upheaval, what had been previously largely independent entities were transformed into dependent local units within a highly centralized government. For this the colonizers capitalized precisely on the loose interbarangay relations. The result was a local oligarchy, first hereditary, then elective. The other side of political participation was its sharp limitation: the indios were not permitted to aspire for office beyond the level of municipal government. As John L. Phelan explains,

Spanish legislation regarded the indigenous population of the empire as legal minors whose rights and obligations merited paternalistic protection from the Crown and its agents. For administrative purposes, the native was treated as a separate commonwealth, *la república de los Indios*, with its own code of laws and its own set of magistrates. The segregation of the Indians from the Spaniard and mestizo communities gave the Indian commonwealth a kind of ethnic-territorial reality.¹²

For Phelan, on the one hand this was a fortunate policy in that it afforded an extensive political experience to a sector of native society. Furthermore, it saved the natives from the demoralizing effects of close contact with dominant foreign groups, as was experienced in Mexico, for instance. But on the other, it was a negative policy for it gave rise to caciquism, which continues up to the present.¹³ The *cacique*, as the term is understood in Spain and its former colonies in America and also in the Philippines, is a local boss who by virtue of his wealth and prestige exercises heavy political influence. But as Philippine society and politics have evolved, it has been applied more extensively to men of considerable wealth and power on different levels, from hacienda owners, to mayors, to the president of the republic himself; oftentimes it is associated with graft. In effect, the *principalía* became the intermediaries between two peoples and cultures, between the Spanish government and the masses. They were none too well considered by some Filipino nationalists, who while recognizing their pre-eminence were wary that reforms, and eventually the revolution, should not redound mainly to the benefit of the caciques.¹⁴ But as nineteenth-century Filipino nationalists would declare, the natives were demoralized in other ways by Spanish colonialism, and one of the root causes was paternalism anchored on racial inequality. This idea will be discussed lengthily below; at this point it is sufficient to consider the analyses of the native character made by Spaniards and other Europeans.

To modern eyes, of course, their interpretation could be attributed to their comparative vision that could not escape a bias for their own ethnic background. As a counterpoint, dissenting voices pointed out positive traits of the natives. Nonetheless, a tone of condescension characterizes all these impressions; again this is ascribable to contemporaneous ideas regarding nonwhites. Ample space will be given to exemplification of these views on the native as they will be the spur to reformist, then nationalist reactions in the last century of Spanish rule.

The idea that the indio was full of contradictions and hence, utterly undefin-

able, gained currency. Fray Gaspar de San Agustín, who wrote in the eighteenth century, contributed to consolidating this impression. He was hard put to gratify a Spanish friend's request to describe the Filipino native (it was difficult enough to generalize about any groups of humans), but his attempt discloses a low regard. The following lines specifically reveal his perception of indio-castila relations.

[The Indians] are extremely proud . . . they only obey the Spaniard because they recognize him as a better; and this they say is due to an internal impulse that obliges them, without them wanting or knowing how; which is God's providence so that they can be governed.

They love to imitate the Spaniard in everything bad, as the variety of attire, making vows, gambling and others that they see, making trouble; and they avoid imitating the goodness in the dealings and conduct of the Spaniards; and the good rearing of their children.¹⁵

One of the first things that the Frenchman Paul de la Gironiere set out to do when he established an agricultural estate in the province of Laguna was to size up the people he was going to manage. "I had sufficiently studied the Indian character to know that I could only rule it by the most perfect justice and a well-understood severity." He apparently arrived at this decision guided by his conclusion that the Indian possessed a combination of virtues and vices and were like children. He cited what were contradictions, that is, from his point of view: The native prefers getting drunk—which he hates—to getting angry; he accepts punishment for his fault but will not bear insult; he is a good father and husband, but is not watchful over his daughters, only his wife. On the whole he considers Spanish colonial governance as best for introducing civilization. Likewise, in his own territory, he insisted on having a church and curate "not only as from religious feeling, but as a means of civilization." There by turns, the children of the natives received instruction at the parish house, a little Spanish, and "customs of a world hitherto unknown to them."¹⁶

At the turn of the eighteenth century Fray Joaquín Martínez de Zuñiga gathers from his experience to correct such perception of "contradictions." They are rather due to passions quickly stirred and calmed. Then he strikes the core of misunderstanding: "Many of their actions seem contradictory to us, because we refer them to our ways and not theirs . . . and if we compare their manner of acting with their manner of reasoning, we will find that much of what appear to us like contradictions are the legitimate consequences of their principles."¹⁷ He goes on to praise the ingenuity and understanding of the native, his facility to learn any art and to imitate well. But his limit lies in the latter, either because of laziness or lack of ingenuity; even those who devote themselves to the sciences do not go beyond average understanding of them.¹⁸ As shall be discussed later, Filipino thinkers of the nineteenth century would recriminate the Spaniards on this point.

After eight years of service in the Philippines Manuel Schiednagel tried to disabuse his fellow countrymen of misconceptions regarding native Filipinos, which are “involuntary and born of a popular opinion on the one hand . . . and on the other of the lack of exact knowledge of their conditions, way of expressing their sentiments, and of understanding of their language.” He goes on to defend them from derogatory remarks, like they never learn to spell Spanish correctly, which he disproves by citing the fact that most clerks and minor officials in the administration who do most of the paper work are Filipinos. Nonetheless, he cannot help comparing the indios to a “thinking and completely civilized race” like his. Yet he is ready to take part of the blame for the vices of the natives as they reflect Spanish failure to promote integral progress in the Philippines.¹⁹

Conceivably, in examining the natives, it was difficult for these men to prescind not only from the given status of the indios but also from their own. Even in the cases cited above, wherein the writer had a closer contact with the native than most other non-Filipinos, there is a certain distance dictated by sociopolitical position and a consequent range of attitudes, from paternalism to outright prejudice.

To be of Spanish descent, whether pure or mixed, earned a person the privilege of tax and labor exemption, of freedom of movement, among others. In the traditional Spanish social hierarchy these prerogatives corresponded to the noble condition, starting from the lower ranks (*hidalguía*) as opposed to the commoner (*pechero*) or the equivalent of a tributary. A requisite to enter the ranks of *hidalguía* was the possession of certified *limpieza de sangre*, untainted by alien blood, either Jewish or Moorish. The concept of purity involved both race and religion insofar as they were identified historically with each other. The Spaniard who ventured to the Philippine Islands, by virtue of his provenance assumed the status akin to that of the *hidalgo* regardless of his previous status in Europe. He had access to the higher administrative and military offices from which indios were barred. He had a right to participate in the lucrative galleon trade when it existed. Thus his caste crystallized: a conglomerate of social, economic, and political privileges deriving from an allegedly superior racial and cultural position that bolstered, and in turn was bolstered, by conquest. In sum, a crucial transfer of Spanish tradition to the Philippine context took place.

The importance of Spanish blood is demonstrated by the practice that Spanish half-castes (*mestizos de español*) were entitled to the same special rights as the pure-blooded Spaniards (*castila* or *kastila*). In a sense, the Philippine mestizo latched onto the superior rank of his white ascendant. Even from the administrative perspective, this was recognized in the way that demographic statistics detailed racial categories. Concretely, the *mestizo de español* was not always designated as a class apart from the Spaniards even if in reality he was not considered the equal of the latter. For this reason it is difficult to determine the number of Spanish mestizos in the Philippines during this period. The scanty occurrence of miscegenation indicates the limited contact between Spaniards

(who, to begin with, were very few) and indios;²⁰ moreover, it is believed widely that the Spanish half-castes were mostly offspring of illicit unions, unfavorable from the standpoint of Spanish social propriety, and regarded with mixed feelings by native Filipinos.²¹ It may be conjectured that the Spaniards, precisely because they were few, preferred to marry their own kind as if in an effort to preserve their ethnic purity amidst an overwhelming nonwhite population. In highlighting the outmoded and unjust nature of the tributary system in the Philippines, Sancianco berated not only the Spaniards but also the Spanish mestizos, who were exempt from paying tribute. These were doubly unworthy for exaggerating their privileged status when in truth many of them were illegitimate offspring.

Feeling that they have privileged blood in their veins, seeing themselves whiter than the natives and educated solely by their mothers, mothers who also think they are privileged, from childhood they begin to look down on the native and look at work with horror, considering it as befitting only the latter, and if they do not have the possibility of making a career that is instructive and of benefit, since they enjoy exemption from tribute, [the rendering of] local services and other burdens laid by the state, including military service, and upon seeing that the peninsulares, of whom they are convinced they are children, have no other occupation but the comfort of working four to five hours in offices, all their aspirations are reduced to obtaining a government position, or employment in companies, trading firms or private enterprises, and they remain in idleness and give themselves over to abusing the class they deem unworthy, getting around government employees and authorities against whom they assert themselves.²²

Nonetheless, the Spanish mestizo sharply felt that he was a notch lower than his pure-blooded brothers. The Russian writer Ivan Goncharov who passed by Manila in 1854 had the following to say on the matter: "The Spanish mestizos are possessed by the urge to pass wherever they can as Spaniards, but it is impossible. Their faces are too swarthy, and their hair, which is too black, reveals at every step that their blood is not Spanish. They themselves understand this and are resigned to it."²³ A parallel attitude may be observed among the present-day Filipino elite, whether of Caucasian descent or not, who try to be as American or European as possible: They shop abroad, maintain residences there, and identify themselves with all things American or European. The great majority of Filipinos today still prefer "mestiza beauty" and "States-side" goods: These are the most common manifestations of the so-called colonial mentality. As the German traveler and scholar F. Jagor seeks to explain a certain awkwardness that he observed in the mestizas' manner of being, he, seems to penetrate to the racial core of the matter: "Its cause lies rather in the equivocal position of half-castes; they are haughtily repelled by their white sisters, while they themselves disown their mother's kin."²⁴

But as Domingo Abella points out, the indios looked on them as castila since they "looked like Spaniards, spoke like Spaniards, and behaved like Spaniards." Similarly, they put other whites in the same category as the Spaniards, which

shows that popular racial classification was based on phenotypes.²⁵ After all, the same gap between the Spaniard from the native Filipino separated the latter from all other Caucasians. Most foreigners who wrote about the indios agree that they were a docile lot and were beholden to the castila. Aside from isolated uprisings signifying protest against the status quo or some new policy, the above observation could very well be true for most part of the Spanish colonial period. Without failing to consider a variety of other factors, the racial attitude of the masses—affirming Spanish superiority—could have partly accounted for their enduring subjection to Spain.

Spanish racial superiority and its concomitant privileges were further emphasized by the careful distinction between those coming from Europe (*peninsulares* or *uropeos*) and those born in the Philippines or America, or creoles (*criollos*, *hijos del país*, or *filipinos*).²⁶ Until today this invisible but strong division periodically manifests itself in the Philippines. The same phenomenon happened in Spanish America where it had more radical consequences. In contrast to the Philippine case, much of the tensions that would be the prelude to the wars of independence were between creoles and Spaniards from the Iberian peninsula. In the Philippines the number of *hijos del país*, as they liked to be called, remained negligible, and their educational level relatively low until the nineteenth century.

However, on both sides of the Pacific creoles keenly felt discrimination against them on the part of the *peninsulares*, much more so in the nineteenth century when the group of Philippine-born Spaniards had developed both in numbers and educational attainment. Goncharov, who has been cited earlier, affirms the distinction of birthplace among the Spaniards who “value the privilege of being born and educated in their own peninsula so highly that even though of Spanish parents, children born in Manila are rated in local society several per cent lower than European Spaniards.”²⁷ John Bowring, the British governor of Hong Kong who visited the Philippines in 1859, had more to say about their conduct: aside from avoiding contact with the indios, “they have the reputation of being more susceptible than are even the old Castilians in matters of etiquette, and among them are many who have received a European education. . . . They complain, on their part, that barriers are raised between them and their countrymen from the Peninsula; in a word, that the spirit of caste exercises its separating and alienating influences in the Philippines, as elsewhere.”²⁸

But according to Jean Mallat, the nineteenth-century French scholar-traveler, the *peninsulares* still recognized creoles as fellow Spaniards, but these did not always reciprocate that generous welcome; “thus it is rare that good terms exist a long time between them [*peninsulares*] and the sons of the country.”²⁹ The *hijos del país* evidently had the natural desire to vindicate their worth. Furthermore, the sensitiveness of the creoles with regard to status can be understood in the light of opportunities available in the colony, especially in the last century of Spanish rule. By that time they had reached a stage of development that capacitated them for a more intense participation especially at the higher levels

of colonial administration; they had also formed roots that had gone deep enough to allow for a real identity as *españoles filipinos*, parallel to the *españoles americanos*. Their resentment at being bypassed for civil government and military positions in favor of Spaniards from Spain, even if they were less qualified, is recorded in history. The mutiny of Andres Novales in 1823 is held up as a classic example of such a situation. Novales, a Mexican army officer, and two others showed their resentment regarding the increasing number of Peninsular officers or *cachuchas* and were thus accused of conspiring. He was assigned to a far post in Mindanao, but before he got there he led a regiment of other malcontents against the colonial government. However, they were quickly routed. It would be interesting to study the place of origin of the men who obtained appointments to public office and military posts in order to further substantiate this particular cause of tension. But certainly by the mid-1800s the *Filipinos* could identify with the grievances in this respect of their Latin American counterparts of the past century. However, unlike in Latin America, the Philippine-born Spaniards would not ignite revolution. It could very well be that they were too few to do so and their interests still strongly attached to Spain. At this point it is largely a matter of conjecture since other developments overtook the consolidation of the creole population. In the social and demographic aspect, the rise of the Chinese mestizo class had vital consequences for this period; the concatenation as well as the convergence of developments in different areas of Philippine life account for the rest. In effect, Philippine nationalism would be largely the work of half-castes and natives.

At this point it is necessary to turn our attention to the Chinese who formed not an insignificant social sector in Hispanic Philippines. They formed a community apart; because of its sheer number and economic import, they required special treatment and legislation.³⁰ For instance, Chinese traders and artisans, either as migrants or transients, paid stipulated residence taxes—rates that were remarkably higher than the native *tributo*. Their status was that of a minority group of foreigners whose negative connotation was compounded by the fact that many were unbaptized (*infeles*) and thereby presented a possible threat to the natives as far as faith and morals were concerned and to the colonial regime in general in terms of loyalty and economic dominance. Understandably, non-Christian Chinese paid more than their fellows who had converted to the Catholic religion. The pejorative term *sangle*y signified their chief activity in the archipelago, for it meant *merchant*. Eventually they would be referred to more respectfully by their nationality as *chinos*.

On the other hand, the two principal objections to Chinese immigration were counterbalanced by the undeniable services they rendered, particularly in services and industrial production. Hence, the ambivalent government policies that swang like a pendulum, from expulsion and restriction to attraction, but exerting relentless pressure in the form of heavy taxation, regulation of movement, and evangelization.

By the second half of the nineteenth century, official policy became more

favorable to them. By 1861 formal organization of the Chinese community, parallel to the municipal government of the natives, developed in the important cities. Quick to take advantage of economic opportunities, the Chinese spread out to become wholesale and retail traders, suppliers and distributors, money-lenders and artisans. In the process they acquired lands, especially as payment of debts. The economic competition that the Chinese posed and the exclusive culture they maintained made the Filipino elite, who were quite Westernized, react with a discriminatory stance against them. Sancianco recommended higher taxes for them. Writer and patriot Jose Rizal treats them satirically in his incendiary novel *El filibusterismo* (*Subversion*). During his exile in Mindanao he waged his little war against Chinese retailers in order to protect native interests. Paradoxically, both these men had Chinese blood. As a reaction to anti-Chinese sentiments, the Chinese withdrew into communalism and made their own claims of superiority, sometimes by strengthening ties with their homeland.³¹

Although the full-blooded Chinese maintained a good-sized population³² in the islands throughout the Spanish centuries, and even up until today, there occurred widespread miscegenation between them and the native Filipinos, producing a significant group of *mestizos de sangley*. Edgar Wickberg underscores the impact of Chinese mestizos on Philippine society: They formed a third stratum between the castilla and the *indio Filipino*. It is safe to assert that the growth of this sector was a crucial factor in breaking the caste system and gradually transforming it into a class system. There was an increasing number of rich Chinese mestizos and indios such that even though ethnic distinctions remained clear, they ceased to have absolute correlation with economic status. In fact, by the mid-nineteenth century Chinese half-castes were taken as models for being among the most affluent and prominent in Philippine society. After having been driven out of the wholesale and retail trade by the Chinese, they turned to landholding and owning (mainly as gains from moneylending to farmers) and the production of export crops. This development marked a definite change from the old parameters of social prestige: It was now chiefly based on property, especially land, and less on descent and the number of dependents.³³

Aside from property, Wickberg identifies another cause of preeminence of the Chinese mestizo: the adoption of Spanish and Western culture partly through informal contact but principally through higher education.³⁴ It is well to note that we are referring to the Christian mestizo here. This "filipinized Hispanic culture" transcended ethnic differences and was shared by mestizos and indios alike. Thus, the twin pillars of Spanish superiority that came along with race, Christian faith and civilization as equated with Hispanization, were acquired by non-Spaniards. Caste was, in effect, giving way to class. Mestizos and indios came to form part of the *ilustrado* class and also to enter the ranks of the national as well as local elite. The role of wealth and education as catalysts of social change in the nineteenth century points to ways for the development of the Philippines at present. It is significant that the mestizos, after having constituted another social class, disappeared as a legal category to be absorbed by either

the natives or the Chinese. Consequently, the term *mestizo* would no longer denote any person of Chinese descent but the Spanish mestizo or Eurasian.³⁵ This development reflected the actual melding of social classes the result of which would be as designated *Filipino*.

The acquisition of Hispanic and Westernized culture took place in institutions of higher learning in Manila, where mainly the affluent could afford to study, and in cosmopolitan cities like Iloilo. But where substantial property made a difference was in putting education in Europe within the reach of Filipinos. The ascendancy of those who received this kind of exposure was expectedly greater. At any rate, whether here or abroad, the educated Filipinos or ilustrados were honed in Christian and Western ideas that would open up to them new perspectives on the status quo in their country. For example, mentioned earlier was Gregorio Sancianco's recommendation to substitute the tribute with the *cédula personal* in order to abolish privileges of people of Spanish descent and consequently establish equality among citizens. Under that overarching reason he includes a prevalent practice that he finds not only superfluous but also irritating because of the stress it puts on racial categories. In documents and official proceedings, it was the standard procedure to indicate people's ethnic background "as if they were not to be known [sufficiently] by indicating [the names of] their parents, place of origin and residence, and other common formulas."³⁶

These ilustrados felt their capabilities were being frustrated by the lack of recognition and of opportunities to carry out vital public and private functions.

If in our days we do not see more Filipinos outstanding in the sciences let this not be attributed to their character nor to their nature nor to the influence of the climate nor much less that of the race, but rather to the discouragement which for some years now has taken possession of the youth, because of the almost complete lack of any incentive. For as a matter of fact, what young man will still make efforts to excel in the science of law or of theology, if he does not see in the future anything but obscurity and indifference? What Filipino will even aspire to be learned, will consecrate efforts to this purpose, seeing that his most noble aspirations wither away under the destructive influence of scorn and neglect, and knowing that honorable and lucrative offices are for him forbidden fruit?³⁷

These are words of Jose Burgos, a Spanish mestizo ordained a secular priest, who militated in defense of the native secular clergy as they were being stripped of parishes in favor of the regular clergy, which was composed by Spaniards. This problem fell under a broader one and, as in a vicious circle, fed it. The Filipino—whether *indio*, *mestizo*, or creole, was the object of discrimination.³⁸ Spokesmen like Burgos began to address this issue forcefully in the middle of the nineteenth century.

Reforms as the means of development in all spheres became their central aspiration. As writer and patriot Jose Rizal stated in 1887, "all we ask for is more attention, better education, better government employees, one or two rep-

representatives [in the parliament] and more security for us and our fortune. Spain could always win the esteem of the Filipinos if only Spain were reasonable!"³⁹ The fundamental appeal was directed to progress based on justice and therefore could not but descend to the bottom line—equality. Whether from the Christian or liberal standpoint, both of which Filipino reformists were familiar, the issue of equality was foundational. And of its many aspects race was fundamental, as they concluded early on. At first the dichotomy between the governing group and the governed, that ran parallel to the racial division, was not so radical as to bar the desire for effective assimilation on the part of the latter. As time passed without bringing about the desired changes, hopes dissipated. Rizal declared to his friend Ferdinand Blumentritt in 1889: "If the Spaniards do not love us as brothers, neither are we eager for their affection; we do not ask for fraternal love like alms. I am convinced that you love us much and that you also desire the good of Spain; but we do not solicit Spain's compassion; we do not want compassion but justice."⁴⁰

The principal difference between reformists and nationalists was the setting they envisioned wherein equality could be made a reality. As history tells us, eventually that of an independent nation would prove to be more convincing.

THE FILIPINO RESPONSE

Ferdinand Blumentritt, the Austrian Philippinologist who had become involved in the Filipino advocacy of civil and political rights, published his analysis of the role that racial attitudes played in the Philippine independence movement at the time when the United States was displaying its own racial attitudes in the process of annexing the Philippines.⁴¹ The Philippine revolution presented an exceptional case compared to the different Latin American countries at the same historical juncture: Whereas in the latter creoles led the revolution, in the Asian colony the natives were the protagonists. The differentiating factor was the Filipinos' "inclination toward civilization and that capacity for assimilation" that made them more acutely aware of the unreasonableness of the white man's sense of superiority over them.⁴² This perception was further sharpened as the Filipinos attained a higher level of education, and conversely, more and more Spaniards of a lower condition came to the Philippines, and their relative class standing remained the same. Some Filipino scholars had done studies to prove that the white man's superiority was all a myth and therefore the consequent treatment of natives was simply unjust. The tension between the changing self-image of the Filipino on the one hand, and the maintenance of traditional Spanish prestige at all costs on the other, increased in the nineteenth century—which would end with the war of independence. Blumentritt pointedly concludes that ethnocentric values are to be blamed for Spain's loss. The Filipinos themselves have made a greater advance with respect to race, as they have dissolved racial distinctions in considering themselves as one people.

Even from his *La Solidaridad*⁴³ days, Blumentritt had proved himself a vocal

defender of Filipino interests. He had learned to love the people (remote as they were) to whom he had devoted years of scholarship. The abovementioned article repeats some of the arguments that Blumentritt had already spiritedly expressed in *La Solidaridad*, mostly as a rejoinder to articles that referred to Filipinos in very pejorative terms, published in some Spanish newspapers. The particular interest of this later work lies first in its deep comprehension of the reaction of the Filipino as he experiences the European sense of superiority over him. Second, it cites Filipino efforts, via literature and ethnography, at refuting that European bias and hence confirming equality among races. Last, it traces the rise of Philippine nationalism to ethnic consciousness born as a response to what Blumentritt defines as Spanish *nativism* (*nativismo*) in other pamphlets.⁴⁴ Coming from a European, these views not only provided heartening sympathy but also a much needed support solidly anchored on a progressive outlook backed up by scholarly activity.

The Filipino propaganda movement in Spain was happy to have such an ally. Its members were keenly aware of the racial dimension of their political aims. The core obstacle was the hovering doubt about the capability of the native Filipino, owing to a level of civilization that was judged as deficient from the Spanish standpoint. The issue was brought up at the Cortes or Spanish parliament when the electoral law providing for universal suffrage was being discussed; it was proposed as an amendment to the said law.⁴⁵ An issue of *La Solidaridad* gave publicity to the speeches delivered on that occasion. Marcelo H. del Pilar published the discussion in pamphlet form with the hope of magnifying its echo.⁴⁶ In the prologue, he presents it as a generous gesture on the part of Manuel Becerra, the minister of Overseas Possessions, and representative Antonio Ramos Calderón, both of whom expressed their support for Filipino parliamentary representation but with the reservation that the opportune time had not yet come. Both objected to an immediate reform positing that the great mass of Filipinos did not yet possess the conditions to make representation work (and it is not their fault either), such as a sufficient knowledge of Spanish and more universities; but both expressed optimism that the Philippines was on its way to progress. Although both simply made promises and spoke in a patronizing tone,⁴⁷ Del Pilar seems to pass over it. However, he actually refutes it by asserting that the Filipino race is not a “raza incivilizable.” As cogent proof he illustrates elements of civilization that the pre-Hispanic natives possessed as witnessed by Spanish chroniclers; then he underscores Becerra’s statement that the deterioration and loss of that civilization was not the Filipinos’ fault; finally he cites one of Blumentritt’s articles that shows the advanced cultural level of native Filipinos.

Del Pilar’s argument owed much not only to Blumentritt but also to fellow propagandist Jose Rizal, whose scholarship on Philippine culture and history was marked with a Filipino perspective, which was a remarkable achievement at that time. Although his fame among his contemporaries rested mainly on two propagandistic novels analyzing Philippine society in the last quarter of the

nineteenth century, he also gained repute among European scholars as a historian-ethnologist. His first attempt at writing history was the annotated version of a seventeenth-century Spanish chronicle about the Philippines, *Sucesos en las Islas Filipinas* by Antonio de Morga. Schumacher considers it a unique historiographical work during its time for being written from the Filipino, and even Asian, viewpoint.⁴⁸ Rizal realized the absolute importance of knowing a people's past—ultimately, of “knowing oneself”—as a foundation of national identity. Hence, he assigned himself the task of recovering and examining sources with a critical eye, and urged fellow Filipinos in Europe to do the same.⁴⁹ Through his annotations he built up the thesis that on account of Spanish colonization, the native culture of the Filipinos deteriorated and was largely forgotten.⁵⁰ This idea would be echoed in other essays such as “Filipinas dentro de cien años,” “La indolencia de los filipinos,” and “Sin nombre,” all published in *La Solidaridad*.⁵¹ The antifriar tone of these works is concentrated on blaming the religious orders for impeding the progress of the Philippines; those who were responsible for bringing the light of civilization took care to make of the indios a demoralized, benighted people. On the whole, however, Spanish colonization is condemned for exploiting an ignorant and submissive people, worse when it has been justified in the name of God and other noble purposes.

This discourse echoes that which Jose Burgos introduced decades earlier. In the *Manifiesto*, he went beyond the canonical dispute between the regular and secular clergy, two groups roughly corresponding to Spaniards and Filipinos, respectively, to refute the detraction regarding the capacity of Filipinos in general, by using evidence from anthropology, biology, and history. The newspaper article he was responding to had made use of Gaspar de San Agustin's negative assessment of the Filipino to assert that the latter was not fit for “lofty offices”—such as the ecclesiastical. In his counterargument, Burgos arrives at a conclusion that drives a devastating blow to the friars: “for we know that the friars are the ones who from times long past hold the unchanged principle and make use of the infamous stratagem of belittling the capacity and aptitude of the Filipino secular clergy in order to make themselves necessary in the country and to perpetuate themselves in the parishes.” In essence he sought to prove the unity of the human species and hence the equality of races. Education marked the difference in level of achievement, as examples of accomplished Filipinos whom he cites prove.⁵² Aside from this, as was mentioned previously, the underachievement of the natives could be ascribed to the lack of opportunity for professional progress.

Indeed Rizal and his contemporaries were heirs to the ideas of Burgos, with whose works they were familiar. Rizal encouraged his fellow propagandists to mention the names of great Filipino thinkers in their publications so as to increase Filipino prestige abroad. “Buy works of Filipinos, mention once in a while names of Filipinos like Peláez, García, Burgos, Graciano, etc.; cite their words. In those books of *Viva, España, Viva*, there are articles by Burgos. If you do not have them there, here I have a lot. It is necessary to bring out the

“top brass”, who are indeed worth much, it’s just that they do not make use of them.”⁵³

As was stated earlier, much of the ire of Filipino reformists—and later separatists—and their allies was fueled by racist publications such as those of Pablo Feced, who used the pseudonym Quiquiap, and his brother José, Vicente Barantes, and Wenceslao Retana, Spaniards who had resided for a time in the Philippines and on that account claimed to have a firsthand knowledge of its people and conditions.⁵⁴ Blumentritt would fume against Quiquiap who was responsible for propagating humiliating descriptions of the Filipino.⁵⁵ As a painter, Juan Luna fulminated against critics who judged him inferior to European artists merely because he was a Filipino.⁵⁶ Among other polemical essays, Rizal deplored the superficial bases of writings prejudicial to Filipinos; not only did those Spaniards settle for what came from hearsay, but their propensity for paradoxical and pompous expressions made them sacrifice veracity.⁵⁷

Inspired by the American Indians who performed at the Wild West exhibit at the Paris Exposition in 1889, Rizal proposed the name *Indios Bravos* (Brave Indians) to designate the Filipino group as an indication of pride in their race, thus reversing the pejorative connotation of the term *indio*. It was part of his personal campaign to raise the moral level of Filipinos in Spain as a living proof that they were a worthy people.⁵⁸

Del Pilar himself formed a low opinion of Spaniards the more he got acquainted with them in their own country; it is better understood in light of his experience with Spanish political parties. In a letter to a friend in the Philippines, this disparaging reference is as candid as the pride he takes in his own tradition. He sees that the hand of Providence has prevented the Filipinos from a total assimilation of Spanish ways:

Owing to the isolation [of our race], their customs could not replace ours despite the spirit of imitation that dominates many; and we ought to bless, yes, bless God eternally for having saved our race from the penetration of the customs of the colonizer. Thus, our virtues, our love for order, our hospitality, that eminently charitable spirit have been preserved, which over there you could not notice since it is so common and so ordinary, but which the [Filipino] native misses here amidst these souls who are as selfish as they are frivolous, without ideals, who do not have any other conviction but their most personal and immediate interests.⁵⁹

In the same spirit, Rizal congratulated Del Pilar on the publication of his pamphlet. With tongue in cheek he suggested that in keeping with the very *indio* tone of his work, Del Pilar ought to look more like one; he looked too Spanish, he should shave his moustache so as to show that he was a true Tagalog; otherwise he could be mistaken for a Spaniard and consequently the merit of his work could be attributed to Spanish blood.⁶⁰

The nativist bent of Rizal is demonstrated by his first novel *Noli me tangere* (*Touch Me Not*). He pokes fun at those who accept Spanish racial superiority

while firmly supporting those who share his native dignity. Without entirely denying the Spanish contribution to Philippine culture, he vigorously airs the damage inflicted by the colonial regime on the latter. Foremost is Doña Victorina, an Indian whose lifelong dream is to be transformed into a castila; thus, she tries in vain to look physically like a castila and also sound like one, she apes Spanish ways, and to complete her Spanish identity desperately searched for a full-blooded Spaniard who would deign to become her husband. Her husband is Don Tiburcio de Espadaña, a low-born Spaniard who comes to the Philippines to try to improve his fortune. Capitan Tiago is a mestizo who, turning his back on his native roots, considers himself a Spaniard; his parties are particularly well attended by peninsulares of high society. In contrast, the protagonist, Crisostomo Ibarra, who is a Spanish mestizo, represents the prototype of a Filipino with mixed heritage, both of which he holds dearly. However, after experiencing injustice at the hands of Spaniards, he bitterly renounces what had proven to be an illusion: "For three centuries we have stretched out our hands to them; we have asked them for love; we wanted to call them brothers. What has been their answer? Insults, sarcasm, a denial, that we are even fellow-men!"⁶¹

The reality of the great gap between Spaniards and native Filipinos is captured in the opening chapter of Rizal's second novel *El Filibusterismo*, depicting the passenger boat *Tabo*, which ironically resembles the "Ship of State," as it is meant to symbolize the Philippine Islands. The upper deck is occupied by a few (mostly Spaniards) public officials, friars, and other prominent citizens who can afford to travel in a leisurely manner. The natives are assigned the steamy, crowded lower deck that naturally offers less amenities, where they have to compete for space with baggage and cargo.

An event that caused the Filipinos in Spain to close ranks was the 1887 *Exposición de Filipinas*⁶² held in Madrid that featured representatives from non-Christian tribes. Out of humane feeling they protested against the indignity of being exhibited and the poor living conditions of the Igorots. But, above all, their indignation stemmed from the concern that the Spaniards should form an image of the Filipinos people as a savage race, with all its negative political consequences.⁶³ Nonetheless they turned the Spanish argument around by throwing the blame on the friars for the scanty progress achieved in the colony after three centuries. This idea would be amplified by Rizal, as has been discussed above. According to Schumacher, as a result of the exhibition the Filipinos in Spain felt more identified with their fellow natives, who were otherwise marginalized by Christian Filipino society. But parallel to the genuine concern to prevent generalizations degrading to Filipinos, we may yet discern what might be an unconscious desire to distinguish themselves as highly civilized compared to other peoples of the Philippine Islands such as those who were displayed.⁶⁴ This ambivalent attitude could be comprehended readily given their status in Philippine society. On the one hand, the Filipinos in Spain were members of the educated elite who could hold their own against Europeans, while on the

other, vis-à-vis the natives, they were advancing the cause of one nation comprising different ethnic groups.

In the Filipino communities in Spain, ethnic background was a key factor to strengthening national solidarity—or to weakening it. Thus Rizal described the group of young Filipinos dedicated to attaining political reforms for their nation: “They are creole young men of Spanish descent, Chinese mestizos, and Malaysians; but we call ourselves only Filipinos.”⁶⁵ It was the idea of a nation yet in the process of becoming. It was still an ideal as reality showed cracks in the projected unity. This could be gathered from the quarrels revolving around the short-lived Filipino newspaper *España en Filipinas*.⁶⁶ Graciano López Jaena, one of those behind this initiative, refused to collaborate on the grounds that it was too moderate and that he mistrusted the aims of the creoles and mestizos on its editorial staff. As Schumacher assesses it, he suspects that López Jaena had other reasons for adopting such an attitude, most of all because there were also *indios* involved in the newspaper. Aguirre, a creole, affirmed his nationalist zeal to Rizal, as he tried to disprove the existence of hostility between *genuínos* (indios) and *aristócratas* (Spanish mestizos and creoles). The group names in themselves indicate the predominant views on race in the Philippines.

All of us, I believe, are convinced that we do not have nor should we carry any other name than that of Filipinos, which is what shows our common Mother: who makes classifications, who establishes differences? . . . As you deplore not enclosing in your veins all bloods that could separate us, to serve as a common bond, I deplore and have always said, that mine could serve as a motive for not being counted among the *genuínos*, when I should and want to be counted among no one else but them, for which reason all or some of those people who can confuse me with the non-*genuínos*, hurt and mortify me. . . . I will tell you more: I take more satisfaction when I see a colored fellow countryman than another unlike him, because he instantly reminds me of our common origin, and the other does not show the seal of our blessed cradle as much.⁶⁷

Aside from giving proof of his impartiality with Filipinos of different ethnic strains, he tells how mortified he gets when in Filipino gatherings he is mistaken as an outsider since he does not have the characteristic features of the native nor the “national color.” Aguirre expresses an overriding concern for unity among Filipinos, a passion that Rizal shared; the worst cause of division would be “the sad apprehension regarding race and epidermic nuances.”⁶⁸

A certain sensitiveness on the part of those of non-Spanish descent could be noted; they were quick to observe the slightest sign of condescension or discrimination shown to them by fellow Filipinos who were full-blooded Spaniards or Spanish mestizos. Antonio Luna, the younger brother of the painter Juan Luna, was quite critical of Eduardo de Lete, a creole, at the time when in 1888 the Filipinos were scouting for a director for the new Filipino newspaper. Among other things regarding Lete, Luna had not forgotten his remark that he did not wish to join the newly established Asociación Hispano-Filipina due to

the presence of “certain elements (*indios*).”⁶⁹ For his part, Marcelo H. del Pilar could not help but suspect that Antonio Regidor, a creole exiled in the aftermath of the Cavite Mutiny of 1872, took back his offer to finance the publication of Rizal’s annotated version of the *Sucesos de las Islas Filipinas (Historical Events in the Philippine Islands)* on account of “racial antagonism.” To support his opinion, he cited another incident revealing said attitude: He had been told that Regidor had relegated the painting of Juan Luna to exhibit that of a Spanish mestizo that was bereft of merit, “to sustain racial superiority.”⁷⁰ Whether founded or not, it reveals the interracial distance that was yet to be bridged if the new unifying concept of *Filipino* was to materialize.

Coupled with this task was the responsibility of consolidating the notion and embodiment of Filipino culture. In *El filibusterismo* Rizal clearly pronounces the justification and possibility of revolution in the character of Ibarra-turned-Simoun who has come back to the Philippines to avenge himself. In rebuking the Filipino students in the person of Basilio for advocating Hispanization, Simoun outlines the way to true independence. Far from being mere political self-determination, it should be rooted deeply in a cherished national identity.

You ask parity of rights, the Spanish way of life, and you do not realise that what you are asking for is death, the destruction of your national identity, the disappearance of your homeland, the ratification of tyranny. What is to become of you? A people without a soul, a nation without freedom; everything in you will be borrowed, even your defects. If they refuse to teach you their language, then cultivate your own, make it more widely known, keep alive our native culture for our people, and instead of aspiring to be a mere province, aspire to be a nation, develop an independent, not a colonial, mentality, so that in neither rights nor custom nor language the Spaniard may ever feel at home here, or ever be looked upon by our people as a fellow citizen, but rather, always, as an invader, a foreigner, and sooner or later you shall be free.⁷¹

As an ilustrado, Rizal was a man who belonged to two worlds. Deeply immersed in Western culture, he was cognizant of its merits. At the same time he esteemed his people’s values and accomplishments. Beyond all political activity, he preferred to pursue the path of education as the means to obtain the best of both worlds, which meant concomitantly avoiding their defects. The very brand of nationalism espoused by Simoun bespeaks German romanticism as applied to the Philippines. The liberal ideals permeated the dreams of the propagandists for their homeland.

The leaders of the revolution of 1896 would be their heirs. For instance, an essay of Andres Bonifacio, head of the revolutionary organization Katipunan bears the stamp of Rizal. The central theme of “*Ang Dapat Mabatid ng mga Tagalog*” is the alliance between Filipinos and Spaniards, broken by the latter, which justifies the struggle for independence. Bonifacio’s rhetoric echoes Rizal’s ideas. “How have they kept the contract, the cause, precisely, of our sacrifices? Our munificence they have rewarded with treachery, they have blinded us and

contaminated us with their infamous procedure. They endeavored to make us abandon our own good customs; they have initiated us in a false belief and have dragged the honor of the people into the mire.” Compare that to Rizal’s commentary on the huge number of human lives lost as a result of piracy by people from the southern Philippines during the Spanish period.

The Spaniards, however, say that the Philippines brings nothing to Mother Spain, that it is the Islands that owe her. Probably; the enormous quantity of gold that she took from the Islands in the first years, the tributes of the tenants of the *encomiendas*, the nine million *duros* paid to military men, employees, diplomatic agents, corporations, etc., the salary not only of the people who go to the Philippines but also of those who return and even of those who had never or will ever be in the Islands nor have anything to do with them—undoubtedly all this is nothing in comparison with so many captives, soldiers who died in the expeditions, depopulated islands, inhabitants sold as slaves by the Spaniards themselves, the death of industry, demoralization of the inhabitants, etc., etc.—wealth brought to these Islands by that holy civilization.⁷²

The interest of Bonifacio’s argument lies in the emphasis it places on equality. He does not mention the framework of vassalage wherein the blood compact was concluded, although he does refer to the goods and services—short of mentioning the hateful *tribute polos*, *servicios*, and *reservas*—rendered by Filipinos indicative of their status as subjects. The point is that the agreement has not been kept.

Bonifacio’s close collaborator Emilio Jacinto also stressed equality among human beings as the touchstone of social harmony. Neither caste nor class but virtue measures personal worth. He makes this idea explicit in three points of the *Kartilya* or primer that he drew for the Katipunan.

4. All persons are equal, regardless of the color of their skin. While one could have more schooling, wealth or beauty than another, all that does not make one more human than anybody else.
13. A man’s worth is not measured by his station in life, neither by the height of his nose nor the fairness of skin, and certainly not by whether he is a priest claiming to be God’s deputy. Even if he is a tribesman from the hills and speaks only his own tongue, a man is an honorable man if he possesses a good character, is true to his word, has fine perceptions and is loyal to his native land.
14. When these teachings shall have been propagated and the glorious sun of freedom begins to shine on these poor islands to enlighten a united race and people, then all the lives lost, all the struggle and sacrifice will not have been in vain.

The spirit of equality presupposes transcending racial distinctions while rooting itself in personal dignity. Jacinto provides only a glimpse, albeit a clear one, of the happy result of this desirable change in the Filipino mindset: national unity in freedom.⁷³

CONCLUSION

Ferdinand Blumentritt concludes his examination of the racial issue in the Philippines thus:

I might continue at greater length on this theme, but I believe that the reader will sufficiently apprehend from what I have said that the European and American whites have not made a good impression on the colored Filipinos, and that the Philippine creoles feel as one with their colored brethren; that there is now no spirit of caste in the matter like that which existed in the old colonial times, but they all call themselves simply Filipinos, and that the rule of the American Anglo-Saxons, who regard even the creoles as a kind of “niggers” would be looked upon by educated Filipinos of all castes as a supreme loss of civic rights.⁷⁴

Very subtly he warns the United States that it might just be repeating Spain’s mistake.

The “Benevolent Assimilation” proclamation of President William McKinley rests basically on the same premise as the Spanish colonization did. Manifest Destiny took the place of service to God and king. Both colonizers saw themselves as agents of civilization and overall well-being. However, in the same way that Spanish ethnocentrism has been criticized broadly, American racism as practiced in the Philippines has also been brought to light. Propaganda to win support for the annexation of the Philippines presented the Filipinos as savages who would greatly benefit from Western civilization—veritably the white man’s burden. Racist attitudes that animated not a few American servicemen are now better known.

Blumentritt was proven partly right by the Philippine-American War (not an insurrection anymore) that followed the war of independence from Spain, and after the formal annexation of the Philippines by the United States, the continuing political and cultural struggle for greater autonomy and eventual independence. On the other hand, he could not have foreseen how in a matter of three decades the mass of Filipinos would take to American ways and icons. He was not quite right in declaring that the spirit of caste had died out totally within the democratic framework set up by American colonialism. The old dividing line between classes—this time, all constituted by Filipinos—would persist and give rise to socioeconomic conflict, fanned by new ideologies, that continues to disturb the country at present.

The Philippines today has certainly attained greater cohesion both politically and socially. The brown Filipino has asserted himself in all areas although he continues to be accused of colonial mentality. The Chinese have been largely absorbed into the mainstream, more so due to their enormous participation in the economic life of the country. Hence, the attitude toward them has been increasingly respectful; however, precisely for the same reason, the hostility of old persists in some quarters. It is noteworthy that the Chinese and the Spanish-

blooded tend to associate with and marry their own kind. Although the racial question has ceased to be a core issue in national life, it is still significant to national life. The challenge now is how to live cultural pluralism, especially with respect to ethnic minorities and Filipino Muslims; and how to extend that to political, social, and economic empowerment.

Enhancement of democratic structures, broadening of educational and economic opportunities, and fostering of social concern represent the gradual but efficacious ways of achieving national solidarity. But admittedly the task at hand must penetrate the people's consciousness in order to be concluded successfully. Promoting national identity has been a slow process as the past century has shown. The question of Filipino identity has been resolved by history. It is now a matter of reflecting on it and making it work for the nation. The ideas, ideals, and struggles of the nineteenth-century Filipino nationalists can be brought to bear on the problems that divide Philippine society today.

NOTES

1. John N. Schumacher, *The Propaganda Movement 1880–1895. The Creation of a Filipino Consciousness. The Making of the Revolution*, rev. ed. (Quezon City, Philippines: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1997); “Propagandists’ Reconstruction of the Philippine Past,” in *The Making of a Nation* (Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1991). Although Schumacher mentions Jose Burgos, Isabelo de los Reyes, and Pedro Paterno, who in some works looked back to the past in varying degrees, he focuses on Jose Rizal’s achievement in this regard.

2. It is published in a collection of papers and monographs with the same title. Domingo Abella, *From Indio to Filipino and Some Historical Works by Domingo Abella*, privately published by Milagros Romualdez-Abella.

3. A full tribute was worth eight reales at first, then ten, to which other taxes were added, such as the *sanctorum* for Church feast-day expenses. Statue labor was stipulated for all male residents including Spanish vagabonds and mestizos. It consisted of forty days of paid labor annually, which was reduced to fifteen days in the nineteenth century. Originally Chinese and Japanese workers were to be hired; only if they were scarce should the Filipinos be tapped under the above conditions.

4. John L. Phelan, *The Hispanization of the Philippines: Spanish Aims and Filipino Responses, 1565–1700* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1959), p. 116. For more information, William Henry Scott’s *Barangay: Sixteenth-Century Philippine Culture and Society* (Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1994) is a good source.

5. Henceforth, the term *Filipino*, especially if it is qualified by “native,” will be used to denote the *indio*, equivalent to the native (of Malay descent). Nevertheless, when the context indicates it, *Filipino* can signify nationality instead of pure ethnicity and thereby include those of Spanish and Chinese descent.

The indigenous Filipinos were first denominated *indios filipinos* to distinguish them from the *indios* of America. Philippine-born Spaniards in turn would be designated *españoles filipinos* as differentiated from the *españoles europeos* or European-born Spaniards.

6. The title of the head of the smallest administrative unit on the municipal level,

literally “head of the barangay.” The *barangay* was the smallest political unit in pre-Hispanic Tagalog society ruled by a *datu* and comprising thirty to one hundred families. The Spanish colonizers incorporated these entities in colonial organization along with the maintenance of the native elite. The term *barangay* spread with its Tagalog political meaning to other parts of the archipelago where it originally meant “boat.” Several barangays constituted the municipality. (Scott, *Barangay*, 4–6.)

7. The town mayor, literally “little governor.”

8. Gregorio Sancianco y Goson, *El progreso de Filipinas: Estudios económicos, administrativos y políticos. Parte económica (The Progress of the Philippines: Economic, Administrative and Political Studies. Economic Part)* (Madrid: Imprenta de la Viuda de J. M. Pérez, 1881), 100–102. (“por qué se had de eliminar de su pago á individuos de cierta raza y naturaleza? Por qué solo han de satisfacer los que no llevan en sus venas la sangre peninsular ó europea por la linea paterna? Por ventura, solo á los llamados naturales y mestizos alcanza el servicio del Estado? No se aprovechan también los individuos de la generación peninsular y europea hasta donde trasciende la línea paterna? Es que solo han de tener derechos los hijos de peninsulares ó europeos y han de ser exclusivos los deberes para los demás nacidos en Filipinas por que éstos no se consideran españoles como aquellos?”)

In this same work Sancianco tries to prove that the Filipino is not indolent, an idea that Jose Rizal would pick up later and elaborate into a propagandistic essay, *La indolencia de los filipinos* (“The indolence of the Filipinos”).

9. Sancianco, *El progreso de Filipinas*, 117–24.

10. Graciano López Jaena, “The Question of Tribute in the Philippines,” *Graciano López Jaena: Speeches, Articles and Letters* (Manila: National Historical Institute, 1994), 67–72.

11. Gregorio F. Zaide, *Documentary Sources of Philippine History*, vol. 7 (Metro Manila: National Bookstore, 1990), 314–18.

12. Phelan, *Hispanization*, 121.

13. *Ibid.*, 126, 135.

14. As Cesar Majul observes, the Philippine Revolution of 1898 did not make the caciques disappear but rather strengthened them, as their collaboration proved vital to its success. They provided the necessary leadership owing to their social prestige and economic resources. Although doubtless they were patriotic, they also sought power. In the First Philippine Republic they played an important role in government since besides the aforementioned advantages they possessed, they formed part of the educated class. (Cesar Majul, *The Political and Constitutional Ideas of the Philippine Revolution* [Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press, 1996], 65–68; *Mabini and the Philippine Revolution* [Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press, 1996], 42–43.)

15. *Carta de Fr. Gaspar de San Agustin a un amigo suyo en España que le pregunta el natural y genio de los indios naturales de estas Yslas Filipinas*, Manila, 8 de junio de 1720, 33–34.

(“Son [indios] sumamente . . . obedecen solo al Español por que reconocen ser mas; y esto dicen que por impulso interior que les obliga, sin querer ni saber como; que es la providencia de Dios para que puedan ser gobernados.

Son muy amigos de imitar al Español en todo lo malo, como es la variedad de trages, echar votos, jugar y lo demas que ven, hacer en los zaramillos, y huyen de imitar lo bueno del trato y política de los Españoles, y la buena crianza de sus hijos.”)

16. Paul P. de la Gironiere, *Twenty Years in the Philippines* (New York: Harper and

Brothers, 1854), 79–87. The author was a surgeon by profession, a native of Nantes, who came to the Philippines where he got a commission to serve as a military surgeon. He married into a creole family.

17. Fr. Joaquín Martínez de Zuñiga, *Estadismo de las Islas Filipinas o mis viajes por este país (Status of the Philippines or My Travels through the Country)* 2 vols., annotated by W. E. Retana (Madrid: Wenceslao, Retana, 1893), 1: 291. The author is an Augustinian who lived in the Philippines from 1786 to 1818. (“Muchas de sus acciones nos parecen contradictorias, porque las referimos a nuestros usos y no a los suyos . . . y si cotejamos su modo de obrar con el modo de discurrir y se halla entre ellos, muchas que nos parecen contradicciones, las hallaremos consecuencias legítimas de sus principios.”)

18. *Ibid.*, 1: 292.

19. Manuel Schiednagel, *Las colonias españolas de Asia* (Madrid: Imprenta de los Sres. Pacheco y Prieto, 1880), 57–59. (“involuntarias y nacadas por un lado de una opinión ya formada . . . y por el otro de falta de conocimiento exacto de sus condiciones, modo de expresar sus sentimientos y de entender su lenguaje.”)

20. Domingo Abello 14–17 gathers some demographic information gleaned from Spanish accounts. Just to give an idea in numbers: At the turn of the eighteenth-century, the privileged class composed by Spaniards and Spanish mestizos was less than 4,000 compared to more than 2.5 million indios. Statistics published in 1883 show that Spaniards and those of Spanish descent constituted only .2925 percent of the total population in areas under Spanish rule.

21. The British merchant, Robert MacMicking, who visited the Philippines in the mid-1900s, observed that since many Spaniards who came over were bachelors, they took mistresses from among Filipino Spaniards, Spanish mestizas, and natives, but especially from the last two groups. In the case of the native girls, their families usually considered the relationship almost as good as a “fortunate marriage”; however, richer indio families frowned on it. He attributed the prevalent attitude to the common occurrence of common-law marriages among natives. (Robert MacMicking, *Recollections of Manila and the Philippines during 1848, 1849 and 1850* [London: Richard Bentley, 1851], 74–75.)

22. Sancianco, *El progreso de Filipinas*, 103–4. (“Sintiéndos con sangre privilegiada en las venas, viéndose más blancos que los indígenas, y educados solo por las madres, madres que también se creen privilegiadas, empiezan desde niños a menospreciar al indígena y a mirar con horror al trabajo, considerándolo solo propio de éste, y si no tienen posibilidades para seguir una carrera que les instruya y aproveche, como gozan de la exención del tributo, de los servicios locales y demás cargos del Estado, incluso el servicio militar, y no viendo en los peninsulares quienes tienen la convicción de ser hijos otra ocupación que la comodidad de servir cuatro o cinco horas en las oficinas, todas sus aspiraciones se reducen á obtener empleo de Estado ó de las sociedades, casas de comercio ó empresas particulares, y permanecen en la holganza y se entregan á todo abuso contra la clase que cree indigna, burlándose de los funcionarios y agentes de la autoridad sobre quienes se imponen.”)

23. Ivan Goncharov, “Voyage of the Frigate *Pallada*,” *Travel Accounts of the Islands (1832–1858)* (Manila: Filipiniana Book Guild, 1974), 163.

24. F. Jagor, *Travels in the Philippines* (London: Chapman and Hall, 1875), 33. The author traveled around the Philippines from 1859 to 1860. His account is supplemented by painstaking research in Spanish archives and libraries in Berlin and London.

25. Abella, *From Indio to Filipino*, 27. On the previous page he cites a passage from a work on the Philippines that articulates the inferior position of the mestizo in relation

to the Spaniard, which was embedded in their consciousness. In turn the mestizos vindicate themselves, asserting their superiority when dealing with indios. (From Fray Francisco, "El Archipiélago Filipino," *la Ciudad de Dios* 24 [Madrid, 1891], 609.)

26. According to Manuel Schiednagel (*Las colonias españolas de Asia*, 12), as of 1880 there were 12,000 creoles in the Philippines, very few compared to the total population of approximately six million.

Agustin de la Cavada Méndez de Vigo, a retired treasurer of the finance department in the Philippines, gives statistics for the same period. However, it is possible that Spanish mestizos are grouped with *hijos del país* under the class *Filipino*.

Filipinos	Male	Female
Luzon	4,087	4,382
Visayas	575	508
Mindanao	105	53
Sub-total	4,767	4,943
Total		9,710

(from *Guía de Filipinas Para 1881* [Manila: Ramírez y Giraudier, 1881], Vol. 1, 373, and Vol. 2, 339.)

27. Goncharov, "Voyage," 163.

28. John Bowring, *A Visit to the Philippine Islands* (Manila: Filipiniana Book Guild, 1963), 68.

29. Jean Mallat, *The Philippines: History, Geography, Customs, Agriculture, Industry, Commerce of the Spanish Colonies in Oceania*, trans. from the French original (Manila: National Historical Institute, 1994), 344–45.

30. The laws governing Manila, which applied to the Chinese, are often related to the economic activities they carried out in the Philippines. Thus, the Spanish government's concern to keep a balance, that is, between maintaining enough Chinese to provide necessary goods and services, especially to the Spaniards, and keeping the Chinese from displacing the native Filipinos from their own economic occupations.

31. Major sources on the Chinese in the Philippines during the Spanish period are Edgar Wickberg's *The Chinese in Philippine Life, 1850–1898* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1965), and the [Philippine] Historical Conservation Society's two volumes on the *Chinese in the Philippines* (Manila: Solidaridad Publishing House, 1969).

32. The Chinese population peaked in the 1870s when it reached 66,000, and possibly 90,000. By 1894 it had declined to 50,000. The majority of the Chinese resided in Manila and its environs.

33. Wickberg, *Chinese in Philippine Life*, 135–40.

34. *Ibid.*, 133.

35. *Ibid.*, 140.

36. Sancianco, *El progreso de Filipinas*, 117. An example is the notarial document. Up to the nineteenth century, the contracting party's ethnic background was usually indicated, especially if he or she is a mestizo. Interestingly, members of the *principalía* are denominated as such, without similar expressions attached.

37. John N. Schumacher, *Father Jose Burgos: Priest and Nationalist* (Quezon City, Philippines: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1972), 77. The text is taken from Bur-

gos's *Manifiesto que a la noble nación española dirigen los leales filipinos en defensa de su honra y fidelidad gravemente vulneradas por el periódico "La Verdad" de Madrid*. The author explains that the Spanish text reproduced in this book is not from the original of 1864 but is taken from the second edition published in Hong Kong in 1888.

38. Jagor, *Travels in the Philippines*, 287–89, also observed that mestizos and creoles resented their exclusion from official appointments.

39. Letter of Rizal to Ferdinand Blumentritt, Berlin, 26 January 1887. *Cartas entre Rizal y el profesor Ferdinand Blumentritt*, vols. 1–3 (Manila: Comisión Nacional del Centenario de José Rizal, 1961). All correspondence between Rizal and Blumentritt that are referred to here come from this collection; henceforth they will be cited according to dates. ("todo lo que pedimos es mayor atención, mejor instrucción, mejores empleados del gobierno, uno ó dos diputados y m'as seguridad para nosotros y nuestras fortunas. España podría siempre ganar el aprecio de los filipinos si España solamente fuera razonable!")

40. Letter to Blumentritt, Paris, 22 November 1889. ("Si los españoles no nos quieren como hermanos, tampoco estamos ansiosos de su afecto; no pedimos el amor fraternal como una limosna. Estoy convencido de que tú nos quieres mucho y que también deseas el bien de España; pero nosotros no solicitamos la *compasión* de España; no queremos *compasión* sino *justicia*."

41. Ferdinand Blumentritt, "Race Questions in the Philippine Islands," *Philippine Historical Review*, 1, no. 2 (1966): 229–39. (Translated from *Deutsche Rundschau*, published in *Appleton's Popular Science Monthly*, August 1899, found in the Abella Collection, Ateneo de Manila University.)

42. Interestingly, Blumentritt attributes to Christianity as unwittingly fostering ethnic bias. Together with the imposition of Spanish as the official language, Christianity provided a ground for equality; thus, color became the basis of stratification. While this may have a grain of truth in it, the matter appears to be more complex, as this chapter is trying to fathom.

43. *La Solidaridad* was the organ of the Propaganda Movement in Spain. It was a fortnightly publication that first came out in February 1889 and finally folded up in November 1895.

44. *Consideraciones acerca la actual situación política de Filipinas* (Barcelona: Imprenta Ibérica de Francisco Fossas, 1889), 13–20; *El Noli me tângere de Rizal juzgado por Profesor F. Blumentritt* (Barcelona: Imprenta Ibérica de Francisco Fossas, 1889), 14–15, 24.

In the first work, he first cites how such nativism on the part of the *peninsulares* alienated them from the American Spaniards, a development that eventually caused the latter to advocate separation. In the case of colonies where colored peoples were numerous, "Aquí el nativismo nacional se robustece y se pavonea a un grado sumo, merced al orgullo de la raza blanca. La leyenda de la superioridad inata de los caucásicos nos es tan agradable como aquella otra leyenda de la superioridad de la aristocracia, sobre la burguesía, cuento que predominó hasta la Revolución francesa. . . . Así aun hoy día hay bastante número de personas que saborean con gusto esta teoría de la superioridad de los blancos, porque no solamente nos adula, sino que es también de una extraordinaria utilidad práctica" (16–17). ("Here national nativism grows in strength and swaggers, thanks to the pride of the white race. The legend of the innate superiority of Caucasians is so pleasing to us as that other legend about the superiority of the aristocracy over the bourgeoisie, a tale that predominated till the French Revolution. . . . So even today there

are quite a number of persons who relish this theory of the superiority of the whites, because they not only flatter us but it is also of extraordinary practical usefulness.”)

45. For a background on this development, see Schumacher’s *The Propaganda Movement 1880–1895*, 198–201.

46. Marcelo H. del Pilar, *Filipinas en las Cortes. Discursos pronunciados en el Congreso de Diputados sobre la representación parlamentaria del Archipiélago filipino* (Madrid: Imprenta de Enrique Jaramillo y Compañía, 1890).

47. As an example, in the course of his intervention, Manuel Becerra stated that he would rather not compare the intelligence of the European and the indio since intelligence is manifested in different ways. “Ya que alguien ha dicho que el indio tiene su inteligencia en los ojos en y en las manos, no es esta una gran condición? No indica especial aptitud? Pues hay que explotarla.” (“Since someone has said that the indio has his intelligence in his eyes and hands, is this not a great condition? Does it not indicate a special aptitude? Well, it has to be exploited.”) *Ibid.*, 43.

48. Schumacher, “Propagandists’ Reconstruction of the Philippine Past,” 113.

49. Rizal sometimes lamented that foreigners should know more about the Philippines than Filipinos did; yet for this he was particularly grateful to German scholars like Blumentritt who studied the Philippines without bias.

Cf. Rizal’s letter to Blumentritt, Berlin, 13 April 1887; and another to the Filipino community in Barcelona, London, early 1889; to Del Pilar, London, 4 February 1889. All correspondence between Rizal and other persons except Blumentritt, which are referred to here, come from *Cartas entre Rizal y sus colegas de la Propaganda* (Manila: Comisión nacional del Centenario de José Rizal, 1961), and shall be cited according to date.

50. Some examples: Annotation (chapter 7, 217, n.2.) to Morga’s statement that the *indios* were dependent on the recently expelled (in 1603) Chinese for supplies because they neglected occupations that they used to do: “The coming of the Spaniards to the Philippines, their rule, and with this the immigration of the Chinese, killed the industry and the agriculture of the country. The terrible competition that the Chinese wage against the members of any other race is well known and for that reason the United States and Australia refuse to receive them. The ‘indolence’, then, of the inhabitants of the Philippines has for its origin the little foresight of the government. Argensola says the same thing, he could not have copied Morga, for their works were published in the same year in countries far from each other and in them are found notable divergencies.”

A similar observation is contained in the annotation to the description of a pre-Hispanic dagger called *bararao*, in chapter 8 (249, n. 4): “This weapon has been lost and not even its name remains. A proof of the backwardness of the present-day Filipinos in their industries is the comparison of the weapons [*sic*] made today with those described by the historians. The hilts of the *talibones* are neither of gold or ivory, nor their scabbards of horn, nor are they curiously worked.” (Antonio de Morga, *Historical Events of the Philippine Islands by Antonio de Morga*, annotated by José Rizal [Manila: National Historical Institute, 1997].)

51. The issues in which they appear are dated 30 September 1889 to 1 February 1890, 15 July to 15 September 1890, and 28 February 1890, respectively.

52. It is interesting to note that many of those he mentions are creoles.

53. Letter to Mariano Ponce, Paris, 18 March 1889; cf. another letter to Ponce written in the same month (no. 118). (“Comprad obras de filipinos, mencionad de vez en cuando nombres de filipinos como Peláez, García, Burgos, Graciano, etc.; citad sus frases. En

aquellos libros de *Viva, España, Viva*, hay artículos de Burgos. Si allí no tenéis, aquí tengo yo una infinidad. Es menestar sacar a luz nuestra plana mayor, que en efecto vale, sólo que no la hacen valer.”)

54. In a letter to Rizal, the painter Juan Luna shows indignation at how Quioquiap was allowed to insult an entire race without being censured. (Letter to Rizal, Madrid, 8 March 1889). Other references: Evaristo Aguirre to Rizal, 17 February 1887; Rizal to Del Pilar, Paris, 5 December 1889; Del Pilar to Rizal, Madrid, 12 February 1890; Rizal to Blumentritt, Berlin, 21 February 1887; Rizal to Blumentritt, London, 12 October 1888 (no. 80); Rizal to Blumentritt, no date.

55. In his defense of the *Noli me tangere*, Blumentritt explains how natural the Spanish reaction was, indignation at the author—“an indio, likewise a *brute*, an *animal*, a *bug*, a *monkey*” (“un indio, así como un *bruto*, un *animal*, un *bicho*, un *mono*”)—who dared to indict his superiors. This is due to an overall sense of superiority shared by most Spaniards: “Raro es el español que no mire en el indio un ser inferior; *hermano menor* le llaman los mejores, y los buenos, un *niño* irresponsable de cuanto hace; pero la mayor parte, sin embargo, de aventureros que sin dinero van a Filipinas para enriquecerse allí, estos siguen las cómodas teorías de *Quioquiap* y *Compañía*, esto es, consideran al indio como una especie de animal o como el ser tan buscado por Darwin, intermedio entre el hombre y el mono, así como una especie de semicudrumano.” (*El noli me tângere de Rizal juzgado por el Profesor F. Blumentritt*, 14–15.) Another reference to this is made in Rizal’s letter to Blumentritt, Paris, 19 November 1889.

56. Letter of Juan Luna to Rizal, Paris, 12 December and 21 December 1890.

57. Letter to Blumentritt, London, 7 August 1888.

58. Schumacher, *The Making of a Nation*, 237.

59. *Epistolario de Marcelo H. del Pilar*, Tomo I (Manila: Imprenta del Gobierno, 1955). Letter to Pedro Icasiano, Datirin, 13 March, 1889 (no. 33). (“Debido a ese aislamiento, sus costumbres no pudieron sustituir a las nuestras, sin embargo del espíritu de imitación que predomina en muchos; y debemos bendecir, sí, bendecir a Dios eternamente, por haber salvado a nuestra raza de la compenetración de las costumbres del colonizador. Así son conservadas nuestras virtudes, nuestro amor al orden, nuestra hospitalidad, ese espíritu eminentemente caritativo, que allí no podréis notar por ser cosa tan común y tan ordinaria, pero que aquí, el natural de allí echa de menos en medio de estas almas tan egoistas como frívolas, sin ideal, que no tienen otra convicción más que sus conveniencias personalísimas y del momento.”)

60. Letter to Del Pilar, London, 3 March 1889. (*Cartas entre Rizal y sus colegas de la Propaganda*, 1, no. 108. (Lo primero que se me ocurre después de su lectura, es que su autor debe afeitarse para hacer ver a todo el mundo y sobre todo a los castilas que él es *tagalog* y *tagalog na lubos* [Tagalog to the core]. Alguno podría tomarle por español por las barbas y atribuir el mérito del libro al *dugong castila* [Spanish blood]. Most probably he is referring to Del Pilar’s essay *La soberanía monacal*.)

61. *Noli me tangere*, trans. Leon Ma. Guerrero (Manila: Guerrero Publishing, 1995), 357 (chapter 62).

62. For a fuller treatment of this event, see Schumacher, *The Propaganda Movement*, 72–77.

63. Cf. Letter of Evaristo Aguirre to Rizal, Madrid, 31 January 1887; letter of Rizal to Blumentritt, Berlin, 22 November 1886.

64. Although it may not apply to the cited case, John Foreman’s observation in this regard sheds light on the abovementioned attitude. Foreman was an Englishman who

spent twenty years in the Philippines as the representative of an English firm. "The christianized Filipinos, enjoying today the benefits of European training, are inclined to repudiate, as compatriots, the descendants of the non-Christian tribes, although their concurrent existence, since the time of their immigrant forefathers, makes them all equally Filipinos." (John Foreman, *The Philippines* [Manila: Filipiniana Book Guild, 1980], 165.)

65. Letter to Blumentritt, Berlin, 13 April 1887.

66. For a fuller exposition, see Schumacher's *The Propaganda Movement*, 63–72. Cf. Letters to Rizal: from López Jaena, Madrid, 16 March 1887 (no. 33); from Eduardo de Lete, Madrid, 20 June 1887 (no. 43); from Aguirre, Madrid, 10 March and 1 April 1887.

67. Letter to Rizal, Madrid, 10 March 1887.

68. Letter to Rizal, Madrid, 1 April 1887.

69. Letter of Antonio Luna to Rizal, Madrid, 19 October 1888.

70. *Epistolario*, no. 66. Letter to Rizal, Barcelona, 18 May 1889.

71. *El filibusterismo*, trans. Leon Ma. Guerrero (Manila: Guerrero Publishing, 1996), 41 and 43 (chapter 7).

72. De Morga, *Historical Events*, 134 n.1.

73. Cesar Majul offers a detailed analysis of the thought of Emilio Jacinto and Apolinario Mabini, key figures of revolutionary ideology in his two books, *The Political and Constitutional Ideas of the Philippine Revolution* and *Mabini and the Philippine Revolution*.

74. Blumentritt, "Race Questions in the Philippine Islands," 238–39.

REFERENCES

- Abella, Domingo. *From Indio to Filipino and Some Historical Works by Domingo Abella*. Privately published by Milagros Romualdez-Abella in Manila.
- Blumentritt, Ferdinand. "Race Questions in the Philippine Islands," *Philippine Historical Review*, I, no. 2 (1966).
- . *Consideraciones acerca de la actual situación política de Filipinas*. Barcelona: Imprenta Ibérica de Francisco Fossas, 1889.
- . *El Noli me tangere de Rizal juzgado por Profesor F. Blumentritt*. Barcelona: Imprenta Ibérica de Francisco Fossas, 1889.
- Bowring, John. *A Visit to the Philippine Islands*. Manila: Filipiniana Book Guild, 1963.
- Buzeta, Manuel. *Diccionario geográfico-estadístico-histórico de las Islas Filipinas*. Madrid: Imprenta de D. José de la Peña, 1851.
- Carta de Fr. Gaspar de San Agustín a un amigo suyo en España que le pregunta el natural y genio de los indios naturales de estas Yslas Filipinas*, Manila, 8 de junio de 1720. (Manuscript copy)
- Cartas entre Rizal y sus colegas de la Propaganda*. Manila: Comisión Nacional del Centenario de José Rizal, 1961.
- De la Cavada Méndez de Vigo, Agustín. *Guía de Filipinas para 1881*. 2 vols. Manila: Ramírez y Giraudier, 1881.
- De la Gironiere, Paul P. *Twenty Years in the Philippines*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1854.
- De Morga, Antonio. *Historical Events in the Philippine Islands*. Annotated by Jose P. Rizal. Manila: National Historical Institute, 1990.

- Del Pilar, Marcelo H. *Filipinas en las Cortes. Discursos pronunciados en el Congreso de Diputados sobre la representación parlamentaria del Archipiélago filipino*. Madrid: Imprenta de Enrique Jaramillo y Compañía, 1890.
- Epistolario de Marcelo H. del Pilar*. Tomo I. Manila: Imprenta del Gobierno, 1955.
- Foreman, John. *The Philippines*. Manila: Filipiniana Book Guild, 1980.
- Goncharov, Ivan. *Travel Accounts of the Islands, 1832–1858*. Manila: Filipiniana Book Guild, 1974.
- Jagor, F. *Travels in the Philippines*. London: Chapman and Hall, 1875.
- MacMicking, Robert. *Recollections of Manila and the Philippines during 1848, 1849 and 1850*. London: Richard Bentley, 1851.
- Mallat, Jean. *The Philippines. History, Geography, Customs, Agriculture, Industry and Commerce of the Spanish Colonies in Acoeania*. Manila: National Historical Institute, 1994.
- Martínez de Zuñiga, Joaquín. *Estadismo de las Islas Filipinas o mis viajes por este país*. Annotated by W. E. Retana. Madrid, 1893.
- Phelan, John L. *The Hispanization of the Philippines. Spanish Aims and Filipino Responses 1565–1700*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1959.
- Rizal, José. *El Filibusterismo*. Translated by Leon Ma. Guerrero. Manila: Guerrero Publishing, 1996.
- . *Noli Me Tangere*. Translated by Leon Ma. Guerrero. Manila: Guerrero Publishing, 1995.
- Sancianco y Goson, Gregorio. *El Progreso de Filipinas. Estudios económicos, administrativos y políticos. Parte económica*. Madrid: Imprenta de la Viuda de J. M. Pérez, 1881.
- Schiednagel, Manuel. *Las colonias españolas de Asia*. Madrid: Imprenta de los Sres de Oacheco y Prieto, 1880.
- Schumacher, John S. *The Propaganda Movement, 1880–1895. The Creation of a Filipino Consciousness*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1997.
- . *Father José Burgos. Priest and Nationalist*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1972.
- Scott, William Henry. *Barangay*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1997.
- Wickberg, Edgar. *The Chinese in Philippine Life, 1850–1898*. New Haven, Conn. and London: Yale University Press, 1965.

“Benevolent Assimilation” and Filipino Responses

Maria Serena I. Diokno

The notion of American rule as a “mixed blessing” was unwittingly authored by the Americans themselves when, on 21 December 1898, President William McKinley declared the policy of “benevolent assimilation” of the Philippines. That statement was a formal, skillfully crafted disclosure of American colonial intentions in the Philippines: to “come not as invaders or conquerors, but as friends, to protect the natives in their homes, in their employments, and in their personal and religious rights.”¹ Along with the promise of American benevolence, however, and in that very same proclamation, came the order extending U.S. military control over the entire country (not just the city and bay of Manila), in “fulfillment of the rights of [American] sovereignty.”

Not unnoticed, the irony achieved its intended effect and gave American rule its distinctive image—colonialism with a heart. How could Filipinos who had long struggled for liberty now oppose American rulers who, unlike their Spanish predecessors, assured Filipinos “that full measure of individual rights and liberties which is the heritage of free peoples”? Some Filipinos, mostly the wealthy, welcomed the imposition of U.S. sovereignty and were, as McKinley had promised, rewarded with American protection. All the others—Filipino revolutionaries and their supporters—were warned they would “be brought within the lawful rule we have assumed, with firmness if need be, but without severity, so far as possible.” As it came to pass, the hand of American friendship became stained with the blood of “irreconcilable” Filipinos (another distinctly American term) in a brutal two-year war, the first war of national liberation in Asia.

A MIX OF FORCE AND KINDNESS

The paradox was evident in the measures the colonial government took to establish itself on Philippine soil. On the one hand were the benevolent measures—aptly called “Filipinization”—which aimed to attract the Filipino elite by giving them seats in various branches of government that the United States continued nonetheless to control. In 1901, for example, the Municipal and Provincial Codes were enacted, which allowed only Filipinos who could read, speak, and write English or Spanish and owned real estate or paid substantial annual taxes, to vote. Since only the elite possessed these qualifications (fewer than 3 percent of the population qualified as voters in the first municipal election in 1903), only they could be elected to office, but they occupied the minor positions of local government and even there were outnumbered by Americans. However, before the first decade of American rule came to a close, the colonial government opened the legislature to Filipinos, eventually retaining the key areas of education and national defense as they handed over the rest of the executive branch to the Filipino elite.

But official steps toward Filipinizing the government were only one part of the American story in the Philippines. More interesting were the parallel measures aimed not at enticing the Filipino elite—as Filipinization did—but at quelling the revolutionary movement, its members, and rural sympathizers. It was not accidental that these divergent approaches came hand in hand. Rather, they exploited the social cleavage in Filipino society by winning over the elite with a soft touch, while applying a heavy hand toward the revolutionaries.

The first step was to drive away the most intransigent leaders: Apolinario Mabini, Artemio Ricarte, and Pablo Ocampo, who were deported in the earliest years of American rule. Next came legislative measures to outlaw any and all expressions of Filipino nationalism. In 1901, the very year the law allowing local elections was passed, the Sedition Law was also enacted, punishing any form of advocacy of independence, *including peaceful means*, with death or long imprisonment.

The contradiction was planted from the outset of American rule. A special class of Filipinos had limited freedom to share in the administration of the country but none was free to express the yearning to be free. (See the “pragmatic materialism” characteristic of American colonialism described in appendix 1, p. 248 for September 1900.) Thus, since each law addressed its own social class—one, the rich and literate who could vote and the other, the landless and uneducated who did not qualify—these measures did not come into conflict with each other. As the electoral arena opened up and more positions in government were given to Filipinos, the United States further tightened its grip on the revolution. Labeled as outlaws by the Brigandage Law, revolutionaries were flushed out of their bases of support by the official “reconcentration” of barrio residents in settlements away from their farms. The display of any symbol of the revolution was banned and the press censored. Furthermore, at the start of American

rule, the Federal Party was the only political party allowed. A counterrevolutionary party, it was co-founded by Americans and members of the Filipino elite, some of whom had themselves been leaders of the revolution they now sought to suppress. Having passed the loyalty test, the Federal Party also became the source of early Filipino appointees to the colonial government.

THE LOGIC OF BENEVOLENT CONQUEST

The simultaneous application of soft and harsh measures was thus fully in keeping with the policy of benevolent assimilation, a turn-of-the-century oxymoron that reflected the passage from one mode of colonial rule to another. The rationalization of this contradiction was that colonial rule and the aspirations of the Filipino people were truly compatible because:

[t]he United States striving earnestly for the welfare and advancement of the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands, there can be no real conflict between American sovereignty and the rights and liberties of the Philippine people. For, just as the United States stands ready to furnish armies, navies, and all the infinite resources of a great and powerful nation to maintain and support its rightful supremacy over the Philippine Islands, so it is even more solicitous to spread peace and happiness among the Philippine people; to guarantee them a rightful freedom; to protect them in their just privileges and immunities; to accustom them to free self-government in an ever-increasing measure; and to encourage them in those democratic aspirations, sentiments, and ideals which are the promise and potency of a fruitful national development.²

Believing the Filipino was not "our Indian of the North"³ but rather, an unruly child who resorted to mischief and trickery,⁴ American military officials accepted that force alone would not achieve long-term results. "In view of these considerations," observed General Bell, provost marshal general in Manila, "avoiding the arousing of race hatred (always long-lived) became quite desirable and important. Our policy heretofore was calculated to prevent the birth of undying resentment and hatred."⁵ Yet, even as the general spoke of the positive effect of this policy "on many" Filipinos, he admitted it had:

failed to arouse sufficient appreciation to materially affect the acts of those still continuing and aiding and abetting the insurrection. Necessity has been plainly seen for some time for measures better calculated to restrain and put an end to the operations of this portion of the population.⁶

[Therefore], without altogether ignoring the dictates of justice and without transgressing the well-known laws of self-restraint imposed by civilization in connection with operations of war, it is desired to create a reign of fear and anxiety among the disaffected which will become unbearable, in the hope that they will be thereby brought to their senses and accept the reasonable assurances which have been given them in order to escape from the effect of such a blight.⁷

On their part, Filipino revolutionaries viewed race as a clear dividing line between the Filipino and the American peoples. An article in *Filipinas Ante Europa*, the newspaper of the Filipino committee in Madrid, argued that the Filipinos were struggling to defend their ideal of independence and conserve their race, whereas the Americans were waging war for profit and to exterminate “all that . . . [was] not anglo-saxon.” The “conceited” imperialists, continued the article, “assassinate[d] the humble Malays out of hatred and for sport,” while the Filipinos “kille[d] the North Americans in defense of their life and their country.”⁸

SPECTRUM OF OPTIONS FOR FILIPINOS

Given the inherent contradictory nature of benevolent conquest, it became inevitable that Filipino reactions to American rule would vary, depending on which side of colonial policy one chose to deal with: the benevolent part (aimed at the well-to-do) or the part of conquest and assimilation (aimed at the revolutionaries). The choice was shaped in large measure by class, which often appeared in colonial documents as twin descriptions of “the wealthy and educated” Filipinos in contrast with “the poor and ignorant” masses. (It was inconceivable at the time for American officials to twist these pairs around.) As the revolution progressed, Filipinos began to explore a range of options in light of the clear intent of the United States to remain in the islands. At one end of the spectrum was independence, the unequivocal, nonnegotiable goal of the revolution and, from its perspective, the only true foundation of peace in the land. At the other extreme was the American colony of the Philippines, where the United States would exercise full civil and military control over the Filipino people while giving them enlightened rule, in contrast to the Spanish regime in the Philippines, which refused to yield to the demands of the early Filipino reformers. In between these two were the options of a protectorate: autonomy under American rule and full annexation to the United States.

The range of choices evolved as a reaction not just to benevolent assimilation but to internal divisions within the revolutionary movement. Addressing the founding Congress of the Philippines in Malolos, Bulacan, in September 1898, President Emilio Aguinaldo appealed to privileged Filipinos to be one with the revolution. There were “patriots in words only,” he said; so too, there were annexationists, such divisions causing grave harm to the nation. Calling upon educated Filipinos, whom Aguinaldo assured of his admiration and respect, he noted: “There are educated Filipinos whose education they do not wish to contribute to the Revolution and instead are still waiting for things to first quiet down; and this is because of their education.” The rich, Aguinaldo added, feared for their wealth and even tried to weaken the unity of the revolution. Though he did not mean to hurt or criticize this group of Filipinos, Aguinaldo warned them not to preempt the government by seeking either autonomy under U.S. rule or annexation. Instead, Aguinaldo asked them to let the people decide and

meanwhile, to “rid ourselves of the pride and favoritism and disunity which the Spaniards taught us.”⁹

CAPITULATION BY ANY OTHER NAME

The revolutionary literature of the period is replete with interesting labels that reflect differing Filipino reactions to American rule: *anexionistas*, *autonomistas*, *americanistas*, “miniscule McKinleys,”¹⁰ *pasteleros*¹¹ (turncoats), *nuevo Maquiavelo*¹² (new Machiavelli), *polichinelas*¹³ (clowns), *intelectuales de guardarropia*¹⁴ (sham intellectuals), pseudonationalists,¹⁵ *independistas*, true nationalists, *intransigentes*, and so on. Independence being the avowed goal of their struggle, Filipino revolutionaries rejected annexation outright.

And if the Siren Yankee,
With a thousand blandishments offers you,
The advantages of annexation,
Pay no heed, ignore it
For it is your undoing.

What political liberties
And equality of rights
Are offered with annexation,
Are just hidden plans
Of future domination.¹⁶

Unacceptable, too, was local autonomy, a sop that might reduce the suffering of the people but would never remove the source of that suffering.¹⁷ Perhaps in response to this criticism, Filipinos partial to the United States (Felipe Buen-camino and Pedro Paterno among them), proposed “independence under a protectorate” as an alternative to the hard-line stance of the *independistas*. To sweeten their proposal, Paterno suggested a number of conditions for the establishment of the protectorate, such as amnesty for all prisoners of war, integration of Filipino soldiers into the new army to be formed, free exercise of individual rights guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution (particularly the formation of political parties), establishment of civil government, and expulsion of the religious orders.¹⁸

But even this compromise was not acceptable to the United States. As Judge Taft (head of the second commission sent by McKinley to the Philippines during the war) a protectorate meant that:

the United States shall guarantee to protect the government of the Philippine Islands from interference or aggression by foreign powers, and should have little or no voice in that government. In other words, that the United States should assume responsibility to the world for a government in which it could exercise no direct influence.¹⁹

Neither did the United States wish to be involved in the “endless tasks of adjusting quarrels between factions in the islands and between the islands and foreign powers.”²⁰ Arguing that sovereignty had passed on to the United States by virtue of the Treaty of Paris, Taft maintained that the American government was bound to establish law and order in the Philippines and refused, on his part, to even discuss this proposal with Paterno and company.

Such refusal was also adamant on the side of the revolutionaries, who not only looked upon the proposal as colonialism in disguise, but a means for Paterno to advance his own private agenda. Among the conditions listed in his proposal, one newspaper singled out Paterno’s call for freedom to set up political parties as his real motive, namely, to put up his own *grupito* (“little party”) that would one day elevate him to his long desired status of *Maguino Principe* (prince).²¹ Mabini, who turned down Paterno’s invitation to take part in the discussion on the proposal, advised Paterno to delay the idea of founding a political party and to demand instead the freedom of press and assembly so as to sound out public opinion.²²

INDEPENDISTAS VERSUS AMERICANISTAS

Called pro-American, proponents of the alternatives to independence invoked them in the name of peace and of course love of country. But who really were the *americanistas*? Isabelo de los Reyes, head of the Filipino committee in Madrid and editor of *Filipinas Ante Europa*, described them as Filipino brothers, some of them his personal friends, who were professionals or owners receiving small rents, and were generally used to certain comforts in life. A number of them had accepted positions in the colonial government. Residing in Manila “under the bayonets of General Otis,”²³ de los Reyes understood their fear, and although he found their actions morally reprehensible, he recognized their need to earn a living. In his article entitled “Olive Branch,” he asked only of them that they conduct themselves with honor in the discharge of their duties as functionaries of the Americans. But at the same time, de los Reyes firmly reiterated that the same measure of understanding be given to those people who were risking their lives and all they had for the cause of independence.²⁴

Some *americanistas* claimed they shared the ideals of the revolution but differed only in the means to obtain these ends. Rather than war, they preferred an evolutionary path to emancipation. The revolutionaries disagreed. It was impossible, they retorted, for this evolution to take place under conditions of severe subjugation. Filipino peace advocates of peace in the form of autonomy also argued that the Americans were not as bad as the Spaniards. Such differences notwithstanding, the revolutionaries maintained that the Americans were determined to control the country.²⁵

In sum, the propeace arguments were the following: The Americans had right-

fully obtained sovereignty through the Treaty of Paris, which the American Congress subsequently sanctioned; and the Filipinos could not win the war. It was the latter reason that riled the revolutionaries the most. Said one: “Glory will never ever be of the cowards and turncoats but of the men of faith.”²⁶ After twenty-two months of warfare, General Hughes, commander of the Visayas, from where letters of peace were sent to American officials, observed that in his area,

The people of good morals and of intelligence . . . are now disposed to quit and wait for a more auspicious time and more favorable conditions to continue their efforts. The moneyed men wish it to cease, because the demands on their resources are growing heavier, more frequent, and are becoming too burdensome to suit their fancy. The fact is that they find their “ideals” are high priced, and they do not have the dinero. . . . The men of position and financial standing are actively working for a cessation of the useless struggle, but my opinion is that the fellows in arms have gotten beyond the control of the home authorities, and they will continue to struggle as out-laws for some time yet.²⁷

On the other hand, accused of being warmongers owing to their intransigence, Mabini explained the revolutionaries were “not enemies of peace nor desired war as such.” But not to fight was to capitulate, to concede to bondage, the aspiration for peace being “solely for the Americans, not for ourselves, who were unfortunately being conquered and enslaved.”²⁸ Genuine peace, the revolutionaries asserted, could not be obtained without war and peace would be its legitimate outcome.²⁹ The *autonomistas* were, in the eyes of the revolutionaries, merely fearful of losing their riches and threatened by the risks of war, despite their public claim to patriotism.³⁰ Indeed as one revolutionary newspaper put it, there was more to fear from the Filipino *americanistas* than from the Americans themselves, for one was a stranger to their home while the other lived among them.³¹

OF LEADERS AND MEN

The cause of the *autonomistas* was considerably weakened by their leadership, whose actions and personal motives were often questioned. Consider, for instance, Paterno and company’s oath of loyalty to the United States. In a feeble attempt to retreat from their position, they reasoned that the oath was not morally binding anyway since it violated the honor of the Filipino people and nation. But soon afterward they clarified that the oath was not one of loyalty to the United States but one of alliance, implying that it was not all that objectionable. From the revolutionary standpoint, this was proof of bad faith.³²

Moreover, because Paterno and his group were willing to accept autonomy under American rule, with no assurance whatsoever of when independence would come (“in the year of never,”³³ as one writer put it), they were looked

upon as traitors. And which honorable Filipino, asked the same writer, “can accept that cruel deception unless they are the hungry *ameri . . . kain*³⁴ [*americanistas*], who not having made any sacrifice for our people, are content with whatever crust is thrown them by their masters?” These “spurious sons of the Philippines” had doubtful lineage as Filipinos thereby explaining why they had no love for their country. (See the discussion of the role of mestizos in chapter 2.)

Apparently, distrust in men like Paterno was not the revolutionaries’ alone. An American observer described him as a man who in the 1890s:

had . . . spent his money lavishly in order to shine in the society of Liberals in Madrid (making ostentation of his intimacy with certain impecunious Spaniards of that connection); who had been ambitious to pose as the poet and historian of a fictitious Arcadia among the primitive Filipinos (a pre-Spanish civilization, based on a few facts plagiarized from others and embellished by his imaginative brain); who had gratified to the full his love for notoriety in acting as “arbitrator” between Spaniards and revolutionists in 1897, only to meet with the cold and cruel disregard of Primo de Rivera when he asked for the title and *perquisites* of a “Spanish grandee of the first class”; and who while Manila was besieged made his final bid for Spanish favor in a scheme for reconciliation of Filipinos and Spaniards so impracticable that even the confiding General Agustin disowned him, he throwing himself then into the revolutionary camp—quite naturally, to repeat, this was a man ready for reconciliation schemes of any sort, or to speak more accurately, for notoriety of any sort.³⁵

Contrast this picture of Paterno with that of Mabini by the same American observer:

Open and consistent irreconcilables like Mabini were so rare among those living in the towns, either in freedom or in confinement, as to make him virtually unique among the revolutionists for ability, at least in statement, in theoretical if not in practical statesmanship. Yet Mabini’s expressions during the period are not only of interest as the outgivings of a Filipino remarkable in many ways, but also, it is quite safe to assume, as setting forth the opinions of a very considerable element of his fellows more ably, as well as more frankly, than they could or would set them forth. Mabini’s documents were never models of clearness, but such lack of candor as they evince was rather the result of the mental roundaboutness and the delight in mere phrasemaking which he had imbibed in the atmosphere in which he has been educated than of deliberate effort to avoid a full and frank expression of his opinion.³⁶

Buencamino, less flamboyant than Paterno and who like him, had briefly been detained by the United States on suspicion of having ties with the revolution, was released from prison to serve as a Tagalog translator in the office of the military governor. (He translated the amnesty proclamation of General MacArthur in June 1900.) Seeing himself as a missionary for peace, Buencamino tried

unsuccessfully to organize Filipinos around a proposal that would end hostilities and reconcile the parties at war.

WARTIME AMNESTY AND “DOUBLE-DEALING” FILIPINOS

In June 1900 General Arthur MacArthur attempted to entice revolutionaries out of hiding by offering them amnesty for past actions except for violations of the laws of war. But the turnout of revolutionaries was disappointing. A little more than 5,000 surrendered and, as MacArthur himself woefully admitted, many of them had no intention of accepting American sovereignty. Attributing their behavior to “the peculiar psychological conditions of the Filipino people,” MacArthur noted that the revolution was putting up local governments alongside the American-established governments, in many cases using the same personnel. Openly in favor of the United States, these people clandestinely supported the revolution. Ironically, American-occupied towns served as the base of revolutionary activities and a place of refuge for revolutionists on the run. The easy transformation of guerrilla fighters into quiet barrio residents perplexed MacArthur, leading him to conclude this was possible because the indigenous population was united. Acknowledging an element of fear, MacArthur believed it was not the only factor. More important, he said, was the “ethnic homogeneity” of the people.³⁷

Other military officers had a harsher view of Filipinos, accusing them of subterfuge. Most pernicious of all, said the *New York Herald*,³⁸ were the revolutionaries living within American lines—those “friends by day and enemies by night” who enjoyed the support of rich and poor Filipinos alike. “When convicted of double-dealing,” someone wrote,

the *Americanistas* were wont to assert that their hearts were with the Americans, and that they only served the *insurrectos* because they feared assassination if they did not do so—fears in many cases well founded, as captured insurgent papers and official records show. It seems perfectly evident, however, that in many other cases the plea was simply a subterfuge, inasmuch as Filipinos, who were in towns strongly garrisoned by American troops, may have cut loose from their associates, had they cared to do so.³⁹

Not unexpectedly, the revolution was insulted by the proclamation of amnesty, especially by the American offer to pay thirty pesos for every gun surrendered in good condition,⁴⁰ which they perceived as a price tag on freedom. A Filipino supporter of the revolution in Spain was tempted to suggest that his comrades at home turn in their antiquated guns and use the money to purchase new ones. Opposing amnesty, he concluded that when a country as proud and powerful as the United States resorted to such means, it was evident the enemy was far from winning the war.⁴¹

THE MODERNIZING ASPECT OF AMERICAN RULE

Despite the proposed compromises, the war reduced Filipino options to an either-or situation, with intermediate choices perceived by each side as favoring the other. Although this either-or framework did not capture the complexity of the situation, the war was a time when choices had to be made. Not to take a stand meant in fact taking a stand. One position, however, stood out among all those presented because it proffered a different view and in so lucid a manner so as to sway even the more committed advocate of independence or submission. Trinidad Pardo de Tavera, a man of learning, Hispanized and well-off, was one of the few to raise the argument of modernization as the justification for accepting the Americans. Without meaning to, he answered MacArthur's criticism that Filipinos were far too occupied with academic discussions of autonomy, annexation, independence, and other "abstractions" and hardly concerned themselves with the more pragmatic questions relating to the prosperity of the people and the establishment of stable civil institutions.⁴²

Pardo de Tavera precisely dealt with the practical need for progress and development, for which he unabashedly believed the Americanization of the Philippines was necessary. The English language, he averred, was necessary so that "through its agency the American spirit may take possession of us and that we may so adopt its principles, its political customs and its peculiar civilization that our redemption may be complete and radical"⁴³—a redemption from the backwardness of the Spanish colonial past.

He then argued that the real question before the Filipino people was not:

whether the sovereign power shall reside in foreign hands, as now, or in our own, as we aspire. I want to prepare the people so that they can not be oppressed by Government, so that they can not be exploited by the authorities, and in order that they may not look upon office as the only thing worth striving for and possessing. That is my ambition, an ambition for a transformation in our society without which any political change would be fictitious and never capable of subserving the true interests of the people . . .

Political independence does not make a people safe from slavery: the law can not protect the individual of inferior capacity from the native or foreign individual of superior capacity . . . It is only a social transformation that can shield us from this danger.⁴⁴

Underlying this argument was Pardo de Tavera's view that Filipinos were not yet capable of self-government. Hence the attraction of autonomy rather than independence. Ferdinand Blumentritt, a German friend of the revolution, differed from Pardo de Taveras, as explained why in a letter to him in May 1899.⁴⁵ First, Blumentritt wrote, "If Filipinos were indeed incapable of self-rule as Pardo de Tavera believed, then the aspiration for autonomy would be just as futile. On this assumption, the only correct option was to become an American colony, albeit with a few liberties the Spaniards had refused to grant. Next, even if Pardo de Tavera were right in thinking that Filipinos would develop their

capacity after ten years of American sovereignty, Blumentritt retorted that self-government would not happen in a decade, not even in a century. Why?" The answer, for Blumentritt, was simple. The United States would never recognize the ability of an inferior race to govern itself. He warned Pardo de Tavera that once planted on Philippine soil, the Americans "will treat the noble sons of the country as they do the coloured gentlemen of the United States. For the Yankees, you are no better than the nigger."⁴⁵

THE HEART OF THE REVOLUTION

By his reasoning, Pardo de Tavera implicitly questioned the fundamental premises of the revolution. What was it *really* all about? A fight for power that would keep the uneducated ignorant and make tyrants out of leaders of an independent Filipino nation? Or a contest of human hubris, a test of endurance between conflicting wills, at the expense of countless young lives?

Pardo de Tavera's approach to these questions was to rather craftily separate political from social transformation, as if these were two disparate processes that could succeed, one without the other. He offered each as a choice, saying that if Filipinos could not have one just yet, then they could well do with the other first. But what was political transformation without social, internal change? By the same token, what good would a change of attitude and thinking do if people were not free to think, speak out, and decide their own future?

This was precisely the point of the Katipunan, the revolutionary brotherhood that first raised the banner of revolt against Spain and whose ideals the wartime revolutionary government continued to profess. Political (external) change and social (internal) transformation were part and parcel of the same process. To join the revolution, one had to be clean of heart and strong of mind, willing to sacrifice one's own life so that independence and freedom could be achieved, for without moral transformation, the revolution would no doubt fail. When Aguinaldo declared Philippine independence on 23 June 1898, he repeatedly referred to the higher order of "goodness and reason" on which the Philippine republic was founded. Guided by these principles, the republic aimed only for what was right. The task of the revolution was to build a nation founded "not on blood and neither on insincere acts, but on deed and the individual right of each one," a nation free and "unsullied by the mud of corruption and greed" or "envy and self-flattery" or "boastfulness and degrading prattle."⁴⁶

To the revolutionary, therefore, a true revolution was total and indivisible. To the *ilustrado* (educated elite) like Pardo de Tavera, a revolution could be split in parts and placed in sequence if all of it could not immediately be attained. Such compartmentalization is not unlike the false division being pushed by some governments in Asia today between political rights, which can wait, while economic rights and development are attended to. In simple terms, the choice laid out before the Filipino people as they entered the last century was to develop (modernize) or to be free. It was argued that they could not have both.

DEVELOPMENT AND INDEPENDENCE

But desire both they did. As Juan Cailles, the military chief of Laguana explained, in fighting for the independence of the country, he also aspired for progress, science and industry for he understood these to be, ALONG WITH INDEPENDENCE, the foundation of the country's development and prosperity.⁴⁷ Aware of the advantages of American rule, another partisan wrote:

I do not deny that with these, we will have all the modern advances, the steamship, electricity . . . flourishing commerce and agriculture; that we will see on our land a manufacturing industry raised to its highest level; that in our cities we will admire perhaps lavish and magnificent buildings . . . the best means of communication . . . huge steam and even electric trains; that our mineral resources will be abundantly exploited; that beautiful ships from all over will ply our ports. But we will be more spectators of all these marvels for we will not be owners of our land, neither of our lives. We will simply be tenants on our land and taxpayers to the filthy rich, who wish to extend their dominion over foreign countries in order to acquire great power and expand their wealth more and more.⁴⁸

The question, then, to borrow Pardo de Tavera's words, was not whether one or the other type of transformation was needed but whether Filipinos were entitled to both as a single, unified option for the future. Adopting Americanization/modernization as the path to independence, Pardo de Tavera and like-minded *ilustrados* in effect chose economic development over independence, though the development agenda was decided not by them but by the Americans. The revolution, on the other hand, demanded both independence and development, the first as both an end in itself and the means to development. Not having them, the revolution preferred, in the words of a partisan, "the glorious death of martyrdom."⁴⁹

In the final analysis, it was this divergence of perspective that differentiated the elite from the revolutionary and drove a wedge between them. It was also this difference in thinking that explains the conflicting Filipino reactions to benevolent assimilation and the mixed blessings it purportedly bestowed. And in many ways it is still this divergence in perspective that differentiates today's moneyed elite from the vast poor majority.

NOTES

1. Cited in James Blount, *The American Occupation of the Philippines, 1898/1912* (Metro Manila: Philippines: Solar Pub., 1986), p. 148.

2. Jacob Schurman et al., "To the people of the Philippine Islands," in *Report of the Philippine Commission to the President*, vol. 1 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1900), p. 4.

3. General Anderson, quoted in "Las Filipinas," *Ang Bayang Kahapishapis* (A Peo-

ple in Misery) (Philippine Insurgent Records [PIR] Newspaper No. 1), 7 September 1899. The PIR was recently renamed Philippine Revolutionary Papers.

4. General Otis, cited in "Mala Fe Manifiesta" ("Show of Bad Faith"), *Filipinas Ante Europa (The Philippines Before Europe)*, vol. 2, no. 21 (25 August 1900): 169 (hereafter cited as *FAE*).

5. Quoted in Philippine Information Society, Boston, *Facts About the Filipinos* (First Series XII), vol. 1, no. 10 (15 September 1901): 40–42.

6. *Ibid.*

7. *Ibid.*, p. 41.

8. "A Los Filipinos en Armas: Conclusion," *FAE*, vol. 2, no. 22 (10 September 1900): 175–76.

9. Talumpati sa Pagbubucas nang Asamblea Nacional, Simbahan ng Barasoain, 15 Setiembre 1898. Limbag sa Kapamahalaan ni M. Zacarias Fajardo, 1898. ["Speech at the Opening of the National Assembly, Barasoain Church, 15 September 1898. Printed under the supervision of M. Zacarias Fajardo, 1898."] PIR Box P-1.

10. "A Los Filipinos en Armas: Conclusion."

11. "Mala Fe Manifiesta," p. 169.

12. "¡No Hay Tal Paz!" (No such peace!) *FAE*, vol. 2, no. 20 (10 August 1900): 159–60.

13. "A Los Filipinos en Armas," *FAE*, vol. 2, no. 21 (25 August 1900): 170–71.

14. "A Los Filipinos en Armas," p. 171.

15. "La Reunion de los Pseudo-Nacionalistas" (The reunion of the pseudo-nationalists), *FAE*, vol. 2, no. 20 (10 August 1900): 164–66.

16. C. de E. M. and A. Za., "A Mindanaw" (To Mindanao), *Ang Bayang Kahapis-hapis*, (31 August 1899): 2. PIR Newspaper No. 1 (original in Spanish, author translation mine).

17. "America en Filipinas" (America in the Philippines), written by Apolinario Mabini on 30 June 1899, and printed in a compilation of his letters/articles, *La Revolucion Filipina (The Philippine Revolution)*, vol. 2 (Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1931), p. 14 (hereafter cited as *LRF*).

18. "La Reunion de los Pseudo-Nacionalistas," p. 164.

19. James Le Roy, *The Americans in the Philippines*, vol. 2 (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1914), pp. 247–70.

20. James Morton Callahan, *American Relations in the Pacific and the Far East 1784–1900* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1901), p. 154.

21. "La Reunion de los Pseudo-Nacionalistas," p. 164.

22. Mabini, Letter to Pedro Paterno, *LRF*, 20 June 1900, p. 248.

23. *Ibid.*, p. 180.

24. Isabelo de los Reyes, "Labor de Paz" (Work of peace), *FAE*, vol. 2, no. 25 (25 October 1900): 204.

25. "La Guerra y La Paz" (War and peace), *La Federacion*, vol. 1, no. 2 (10 September 1899): 2. PIR Newspaper No. 7.

26. "Independencia Verdad" (True independence), *FAE*, vol. 2, no. 29 (25 December 1900): 235–36.

27. Philippine Information Society, *Facts About The Filipinos*, pp. 31–32.

28. Mabini, "La Intransigencia," *LRF*, 6 November 1899, p. 111.

29. "La Guerra y La Paz."

30. Emilio Aguinaldo, cited in Marshall Everett, ed., *Exciting Experiences in Our*

Wars with Spain and the Filipinos: The Life of Admiral Dewey (Chicago: Book Publishers Union, 1899), pp. 482–84.

31. “Sentimiento manifestado en el mundo Filipino” (Sentiment manifested in the world of the Philippines), PIR Box I-37 (Poems), no date.

32. “Mala Fe Manifiesta,” p. 169.

33. “Burla Sangrienta: “¡Ya no nosdan ni la autonomia ofrecida!” (Bloody mockery: Not even the offer of autonomy is given!) *FAE*, vol. 2, no. 8 (10 February 1900): 59.

34. *Kain* in Filipino means to eat, *ameri . . . kain* (hungry for the Americans) being a pun on the word *americano*.

35. Le Roy, *Americans in the Philippines*.

36. *Ibid.*

37. Cited in “Desmintamos a Mac-Kinley” (Refuting McKinley), *FAE*, vol. 3, no. 34 (10 March 1901): 277–78.

38. *New York Herald*, 17 May 1900, reprinted in *Recortes y Traducciones de la Prensa Extranjera* (Excerpts and translations of the foreign press), PRP.

39. Philippine Information Society, *Facts About the Filipinos*, pp. 52–53.

40. Some seventy years later, Ho Chi Minh felt equally insulted by President Johnson’s offer of large-scale economic aid to North Vietnam in exchange for cessation of hostilities in the South. The parallels between the Filipino-American war of 1899–1901 and the Vietnam War of 1965–1973 are remarkable [the editor].

41. “Otro Insulto Al Pueblo Filipino” (Another insult to the Filipino people), *FAE*, vol. 2, no. 18 (10 July 1900): 144–45.

42. MacArthur was cited in the article “El problema actual y el Sr. Buencamino” (The actual problem and Mr. Buencamino), *La Libertad (Liberty)*, vol. II, no. 230, 18 July 1900, p. 1. Article is found in PRP and labeled as PRP Newspaper No. 21.

43. Quoted in Peter W. Stanley, *A Nation in the Making* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1974), p. 72.

44. Quoted in *ibid.*, p. 71.

45. “Opinion de un Sabio Aleman sobre la Cuestion Filipina” (Opinion of a wise German on the Philippine question), *Columnas Volantes*, vol. 1, no. 27 (4 October 1899): 1. PRR. “Columnas Volantes” literally means “Flying Columns,” a reference to underground newspapers and leaflets that were hard to catch/confiscate.

46. “Kalatas (Mensaje) nang Presidente sa Pagbabagong Puri nang Bayang Filipinas (Revolucion Filipina)” (Message of the president on the renewal of virtue of the Filipino people [Philippine Revolution]), read in the province of Cavite, 23 June 1898. Message is found in PRP Box P-19.

47. Letter of Juan Cailles to Sr. Emiliano Riego de Dios, dated 17 July 1900, in “Nuestros heroes” (“Our heroes”), which is found in the PRP collection.

48. “La Guerra y La Paz.”

49. “Nuestro Lema” (Our motto), *FAE*, vol. 1, no. 1 (25 October 1899): 1.

The Role of Education in Americanizing Filipinos

Alexander A. Calata

This chapter examines American colonial education in the Philippines, and describes certain aspects of the educational experience during the early years of American occupation, which include the arrival of the Thomasites, the establishment of the *pensionado* program, and the use of English language instruction in the Philippines.

When the Americans took possession of the Philippines in 1898, they found a limited school system in the islands that was largely in the hands of the church. After almost 350 years of colonial rule, the Spaniards had firmly established an education system whose primary aim was to teach the Filipinos the Christian doctrine, but only to a small percentage of the population.¹ The Spanish education system created a small privileged class of mostly mestizo Filipinos and effectively put a lid on the ambitions of this class (with very few exceptions) to pursue study in foreign countries.² During this period it was not altogether safe for a native to avail himself fully of the educational facilities theoretically afforded him at the institutions within the archipelago, and if he went abroad to pursue his studies he was a marked man after his return.³

The Americans started the task of teaching the Filipinos as soon as they landed in the country. But education fell victim to the early American indecision on what to do with their newfound conquest in the Pacific. While the decision to annex the islands was being made by the U.S. government and Americans were debating the wisdom of America's budding imperialist intention, the task of educating the natives could not wait. So it was that the first American teachers came from the military, and the first school established by the new colonizers was built on the militarily historic island of Corregidor. One of the first images

of the American soldier in the Philippines was one with a “Krag” rifle in one hand and a school book in the other, thereby “bringing civilization to Uncle Sam’s tropical wards.”⁴

The debate in the U.S. mainland sprang from the country’s strong democratic origins. The Americans were uncomfortable with the kind of colonialist image they would project on the world scene. Andrew Carnegie and Mark Twain supported the cause of those opposing America’s nascent colonial inclinations. In writing about his claim, Carnegie would use classroom images to portray the apparent inconsistency between established American democratic principles and the intention to annex the Philippines as its colony in Asia: “With what face shall we hang in the school-houses of the Philippines our own Declaration of Independence, and yet deny independence to them? Are we to practice independence and preach subordination, to teach rebellion in our books, yet to stamp it out with our swords, to sow the seed of revolt and expect the harvest of loyalty”?⁵

American soldiers were not at all prepared for the immediate task of teaching. The problems that confronted them were the ones that challenged the Spanish colonialists—lack of teachers, virtually nonexistent funding, scarce instructional materials, and an education devoted to making the natives obedient to God and the Spanish king. The Spanish colonial government provided that there should be one male and one female primary school teacher for each 5,000 inhabitants or one teacher for every 2,500 inhabitants. In fact, there was only one teacher for every 4,179 individuals when the Americans arrived.⁶

Desperate situations demanded desperate solutions. The early teachers had to improvise even as they used untested instructional materials imported from the United States. In *Life with the Early American Teachers*, Frederic S. Marquardt wrote about his father’s experience as a teacher:

My father began his eighteen years with the Philippine public schools by teaching a group of . . . Filipino teachers about the “red apple”. The accepted pedagogical principle of proceeding from the known to the unknown was ruthlessly discarded, not because it was deemed important that Filipinos should become acquainted with the red apple to which they were utter strangers, but because the teachers were furnished “Baldwin’s Primer” to use as text, and the red apple was the center of interest of page 1.⁷

THE THOMASITES

The lack of teachers gave rise to the massive Pacific Ocean crossing of American teachers to the Philippines. In 1900, the colonial government in the Philippines underscored the urgency of increasing the number of teachers and primary schools. President William McKinley declared that the “fitness of any people to maintain a popular form of government must be closely dependent upon the prevalence of knowledge and enlightenment among the masses.”⁸ Between January 1901 and September 1902, the U.S. government appointed 1,074

teachers, sending them to Manila on board converted cattle cruisers from San Francisco. The first large number of teachers to arrive aboard a ship, the *Thomas*—known as the *Thomasites*—came from all over the United States and represented such institutions of higher education as the University of California, University of Michigan, Indiana University, University of Chicago, University of Kansas, Harvard, Cornell, Stanford, Yale, Georgetown, Purdue, Colby, Dartmouth, and Nebraska.⁹

There would be problems early on. Between May and September 1902, the large numbers of teacher arrivals were reduced to 845 as a result of several factors. Hundreds were separated from service because of death, sickness, and marriage. Of this number, fifteen died; sixty-one got sick or members of the teachers' families fell ill; ten women married; eight were dismissed or discharged from service; seven deserted their posts; and thirty resigned to engage in business or other more lucrative undertakings.¹⁰ It was not the best of times for the teachers.

Their food was often such as they were unaccustomed to, and the change from the conditions which they had left was often such as to cause home-sickness and a certain measure of dissatisfaction with their lot. The long intervals which sometime occurred between the coming of the mails, and the consequent difficulties of hearing from friends and receiving their pay promptly tended to develop in many cases a considerable measure of discontent, and when the pay arrived it was, by reason of the depreciation of the local currency, found to be worth less than at the time when they should have received it.¹¹

During the first five years of their stay in the Philippines, 42 American teachers died. Major causes of death were cholera and dysentery (15), killed by "ladrones" (6), drowning (3), and suicide (2).¹²

Despite the formidable problems, the Americans quickly changed the landscape of Philippine education. Ten years after the *Thomasites* landed in Manila, more than 4,000 schools were constructed in the country with an elementary enrollment of 355,722 and a high school enrollment of 3,404. In 1920, the enrollment had more than doubled and was fast approaching the million mark. The 3,404 high school students had increased to 17,335.¹³

THE PENSIONADO PROGRAM

As early as 1900, the American colonial government recognized the importance of investing in the education and training of Filipinos. "It is in our opinion that there is no other object on which liberal expenditure could be made with such certainty of good returns," the 1900 Schurman Commission *Report* to the president noted. Sending Filipinos to the United States was necessary because "the most valuable lessons of civilization cannot be taught by precept, but only by example." The government concluded that "it would be impossible to provide

in the Philippines a substitute for the object lessons in American civilization which they will receive in spending three or four years in different parts of the United States.”

The passage of Act No. 854 by the Philippine Commission on 26 August 1903, launched the scholarship program for the Filipinos known as the “*pensionado*” program. It was to be the largest U.S. study program for Filipinos before the Fulbright exchanges were established in 1948. “The plan of sending students from one country to another is an old one,” said William Sutherland, the superintendent of students when the *pensionado* program was launched, “but most such enterprises have been small-scale and usually they are backed by private enterprise.”¹⁴

The administrators of the *pensionado* program looked to U.S. schools to share the cost of hosting Filipino students. The universities were asked to waive tuition fees; the colonial government would pay for transportation and maintenance of the students. The obligation of the *pensionados* was to render service to the government on their return from the United States. This arrangement, the administrators said, “furnish ample justification for the expenditure on the part of the insular government.” To this day, cost-sharing through tuition waivers and other forms of financial aid by U.S. universities constitutes a significant part of the funding arrangements for Fulbright students.

The first batch of *pensionados*, totaling one hundred, were selected in 1903 and left for the United States in the same year. Candidates were selected on the basis of individual merit. The selection criteria included natural ability, mental and physical fitness and promise, and moral character. The first-level screening consisted of a written test. Those who got the “highest averages” were certified fit to the civil governor for the next level of competition. Eligible candidates came from the public schools and were between the ages of 16 and 21. Before being nominated officially for an award, a *pensionado* was required to sign an agreement stipulating that he or she would join the Philippine civil service immediately upon return to the Philippines, the period of service to be equal to the time the scholar spent in the United States at government expense.¹⁵

The *pensionado* awards were allocated based “roughly on the school population and the importance in industrial lines of the respective provinces.” In 1903–1904, the distribution of grants was as follows:¹⁶

Abra	1	Camarines	2
Albay	2	Capiz	2
Antique	1	Cavite	3
Bataan	1	Cebu	4
Batangas	3	Ilocos Norte	3
Bohol	1	Ilocos Sur	4
Bulacan	3	Iloilo	5
Cagayan	1	Isabela	1

Laguna	2	Pangasinan	4
La Union	3	Paragua (Palawan)	1
Leyte	2	Rizal	2
Manila	5	Sorsogon	2
Masbate	1	Surigao	1
Nueva Ecija	2	Tarlac	3
Occ. Negros	3	Tayabas	2
Or. Negros	2	Zambales	1
Pampanga	2		

The *pensionado* program continued until the outbreak of World War II. As an immediate response by the colonial government to pressing development needs in the Philippines at that time, most awards were given in fields such as teacher education, maritime studies, weather forecasting, fisheries, and coastal and geodetic engineering.

Regardless of which academic and professional disciplines they pursued, the *pensionados* brought back to the Philippines new ways of viewing and doing things. Virginia Benitez Licuanan, daughter of a prominent *pensionado*, speaks about her own “Americanization” as springing from her parent’s stay in the United States. She recalls that her first word was probably “apple” because “apple pie was very likely” her first solid food. “My father was an apple pie addict since his formative years as one of the first *pensionados* in the small Middle West town of Macomb, Illinois,” says “Ms. Licuanan who considers herself “only a few years ahead of most Filipinos of (her) generation who all started their formal education learning “A” as in “apple.”¹⁷ *Pensionado* Paulo Castillo Jr., who hailed from Samar, went to Massachusetts Institute of Technology to study techniques of weather forecasting. He was enthusiastic about the many possible ways that the weather service could contribute to national progress. Writing from the United States he told his countrymen how American farmers, merchants, and exporters used accurate weather forecasting to promote their business. “By relying on constant weather reports,” Castillo excitedly told his colleagues back in the Philippines, “(American) farmers and businessmen would know when to put on sale certain goods, when to transport certain perishable products, or even when to start selling umbrellas.” Castillo would talk about applying the same approach back in the Philippines.¹⁸

The Americans assessed the performance of the *pensionados*. The scholars were described as “uniformly creditable and in certain instances remarkable.” The program administrators praised their “spirit of seriousness” and “intelligent and persistent effort” which “promises success” for the program.¹⁹ The government recognized that the average Filipino had still to prove his intellectual ability. (“He has never as yet had a fair opportunity to show what he can do.”) Looking back at the achievements of prominent Filipinos during the Spanish

era, the Americans concluded that the rest of the population should be credited “with the ability of no mean order.”²⁰ They acknowledged the “drawbacks” under which Filipinos “labored.” Based on this assessment, the colonial government decided to: (1) set up adequate and secularized free public schools; (2) raise standards for teachers and train them further; (3) introduce the English language “as speedily as practicable” into the primary schools; (4) revise the secondary education curriculum; and (5) establish “good” agricultural and manual-training schools.²¹

The last recommendation faced some challenge. The Americans thought that vocational education would address the needs of the country. But there was the problem of making the program acceptable to the people. “The people have been accustomed under their earlier instruction to regard education as a means of putting themselves in positions where manual labor would not be required. Hitherto a Filipino youth has looked upon the instruction of the schools as a means of preparing him to become a teacher, a civil officer, a clerk, a lawyer, a physician, or a priest. That phase of education through which the young expect to become skillful . . . has lain almost entirely below his horizon.”²²

The attitude of the Filipinos toward manual work “left much to be desired.”²³ If they sent their children to school, it was not to learn to work in the fields. The Americans blamed the Spaniards for the Filipinos’ view of manual labor saying that the former colonizers “impressed upon the Filipinos the lack of appreciation of honest work.”²⁴ This prejudice by Filipinos against manual labor was not deemed unchangeable. The Americans predicted a change in attitude once “they learn more about America and come to understand the marvelous progress which has there been made . . . as a nation of workers.” They were now ready to introduce “machinery and various appliances by which the ratio of human labor to product is diminished.” Four years before the first American Agricultural High School was established in New York, Munoz Agricultural School opened its doors to students in Nueva Ecija.²⁵

THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE

The English language was introduced as the language of instruction as soon as the Americans opened primary schools, and it was found that the great majority of Filipinos were “ignorant of Spanish.” This was particularly true of the children. The colonial government decided that a fuller knowledge of the situation of the Filipinos with respect to language would justify making English the language of the schools. No cultural issue generates a more intense national debate than the use of a foreign language. The early American teachers did not fully realize then how the nation would be embroiled later in a debate on the impact of the continued use of the English language on national identity. At least two serious views have emerged from this debate. The late nationalist historian Renato Constantino considered the English language a wedge that di-

vided social classes. In contrast, a prominent scholar and highly respected educator Bonifacio Sibayan would call it a leveler of classes.

In the histories of the colonial world, the typical relationship between the conqueror and the conquered began with the conquered elite absorbing the language of the conqueror. A consequence of this would be the creation of a widened division among the indigenous population.²⁶ This happened during the Spanish colonial times when the language of the colonial masters was accessible only to a limited sector of the Philippine population. It was also a case of geography; the Spanish-speaking native elites were concentrated mainly in Manila and in other major cultural centers in the country like Cebu, Iloilo, and Zamboanga while the rest of the country did not have effective access to the Spanish language. The Spanish, like the Portuguese, channeled their conquering energies into military power-building and the development of effective colonial rule so that the cultural and educational development goals for their colonies were never given much thought. When the Americans started building more schools and bringing more teachers to Manila and the countryside, they also laid an effective infrastructure for the absorption of the English language by the majority of Filipinos. In the British colonial experience, the English language spread around the world as the language of the educated classes in the British Empire. The mass introduction of the English language in Philippine schools created openings for Filipinos from various socioeconomic origins for further academic and professional opportunities. The *pensionados* were the best examples of these beneficiaries.

The “loss of the Filipino soul” by the widespread use of English was an argument raised during this period. W. Morgan Shuster, secretary of public instruction, tried to allay this fear:

The triumph of English as the common speech of these islands does not by any means imply the suppression of the native character, or the sacrifice of any of its excellencies. . . . Our effort here is not to make Filipinos into Americans but to make better Filipinos. We do not insist that the Filipino qualities of heart and mind shall become those of foreign peoples, but that everything shall be done to cultivate the inherent excellencies of the race in the best possible way. . . . Through all its history [the Filipino race] has proved itself capable of rapid cultural advance. It has been continually acquiring and assimilating new elements of civilization. . . . The lesson to be learned from this, their own history, is not to turn back to their past for ideal or light, but, confident of their own power and virility, press on in the effort to bring up their life and civilization to the highest standard of the Christian world.²⁷

Filipinos received differential benefits, and pleasures, from learning the English language. Consider this letter, written by a 13-year-old Filipina to her American teacher:

My dear teacher:

I take much pleasure in the study of the English language, but it is a thing very difficult for the Filipino . . . young. Do you know, your language has many rules, and

notwithstanding most of these are not conformed by motive of the exceptions; and besides the pronunciation is very curious. Sometimes I think the inventor of the English language is a comedian.²⁸

CONCLUSION

Understanding of the Filipino educational experience under the American colonial government is not by all means complete. What I have presented in this chapter is a view of that experience from one perspective. We should continue studying that important period of history and engage ourselves in a constructive and informed debate about that experience as a people, the better to appreciate the various issues that define our knowledge of our colonial experience.

NOTES

1. Encarnacion Alzona, *A History of Education in the Philippines, 1565–1930* (Manila: University of the Philippines Press, 1932), p. 18.

2. See, for example, David S. Landes, *The Wealth and Poverty of Nations* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1998). The Spanish colonizers did to Filipinos what was done to them by their own government in the middle of the sixteenth century—prohibit them from studying abroad “lest they ingest subversive doctrine . . . In 1559, the Spanish crown forbade attendance at foreign universities except for a few safe centers as Rome, Bologna and Naples.”

3. *Report of the Philippine Commission to the President*, Vol. 1 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1900), pp. 40–41.

4. Rene Romero, “The Flowering of Philippine Education Under the American Regime (1898–1923),” *American Historical Collection Bulletin* 4, no. 2 (April 1976): 15.

5. Andrew Carnegie, “Distant Possessions: The Parting of the Ways,” *The Gospel of Wealth* (New York: The Century Company, 1901).

6. *Report of the Philippine Commission to the President*, p. 31.

7. Frederic S. Marquardt, “Life With the Early American Teachers,” *Before Bataan and After* (Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1943), p. 15.

8. *Report of the Philippine Commission to the President*, p. 17.

9. *Ibid.*

10. *Report of the Philippine Commission to the President*, Vol. 1 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1902), p. 3.

11. *Ibid.*, p. 4.

12. *Ibid.*

13. “From the Transport Thomas to Santo Tomas,” privately printed, Manila, 1949, p. 27.

14. *Report of the Philippine Commission to the President* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1902), p. 3.

15. *Ibid.*

16. *Ibid.*

17. Virginia Benitez Licuanan, “Growing Up the American Way,” *The Philippine Star* 14, no. 145 (December 20, 1999): 1.

18. Letter written by Paulo Castillo Jr. and included in the 1949 volume of the United States Information Service (USIS) Cebu's miscellaneous documents. The volume is housed at the Cebuano Studies Center, University of San Carlos, Cebu City.

19. *Report of the Philippine Commission to the President* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1905), p. 32.

20. *Report of the Philippine Commission to the President* (1900), pp. 40–41.

21. *Report of the Philippine Commission to the President* (1902), pp. 881–82.

22. Clodualdo H. Leocadio, "Philippine Education," *American Historical Collection Bulletin* 3, no. 3 (July 1975): 52.

23. *Ibid.*

24. History tells us that some colonialist nations were better teachers than others. This criterion of tutelage by colonialist countries, according to David S. Landes (*The Wealth and Poverty of Nations*), would have the Spanish and the Portuguese classified as "bad," the Dutch and the French "less bad," and the British "least bad." Britain got the "least bad" classification because of its willingness to invest in social overhead like railways in its colonies.

25. Leocadio, "Philippine Education," p. 52.

26. See, for example, Thomas Sowell's discussion on this subject in his book, *Race and Culture* (New York: Basic Books, 1994), pp. 71–72.

27. *Report of the Philippine Commission to the Secretary of War* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1908), pp. 819–20.

28. Charles B. Spahr, "The Philippine Educational Exhibit," *The Outlook* (September 7, 1901).

Kayumanggi versus Maputi:
100 Years of America's
White Aesthetics in
Philippine Literature
Princess Orig

We are in search of a face, a Filipino face.

—Teodoro Benigno

In his article “Looking for the Filipino,” Edilberto Alegre opined: “But indeed how does one go about in search of the *Pinoy*’ today? The givens of the search are different. We ourselves are looking for our self—this is not just participative research, but introspective quest” (1998:624).

The Filipino’s search for his identity has been a painstaking odyssey. After 425 years of Spanish, American, and Japanese colonial rule, the Filipino has lost himself. He looked Oriental and, yet, he felt Western. He had a polychromatic brown color and, yet, he envied the pallid pigmentation of the Teutonic race. His schizophrenic self loomed in his color aesthetics whenever he valued the white Aryan visage over the brown Malayan physiognomy. In truth, Filipinos have always associated skin color with physical beauty. Since pre-Spanish colonial times, a woman was perceived to be beautiful depending on the color of her complexion. In some occasions, it was the *kayumanggi* (brown-skinned) who was celebrated. At most times, it was the *maputi* (fair-skinned) who was the yardstick of pulchritude. Philippine literature showed that Filipinos imbibed a white aesthetics after the 1899 American conquest. However, it must be understood, that the “cult of the white woman” in the Philippines began even before the Western invasion. The Ilonggo epic *Labaw Donggon* and the Lanao tribal ditty “Song of My Seven Lovers” versified fair-skinned women. In *Labaw Donggon*, the beautiful Anggoy Ginbinitan had thighs that were “As clean and white as . . . split bamboo” (Jocano, 69). In “Song of My Seven Lovers,” the

female persona told of a “fair maiden” (120) who captured the heart of a man she loved. Perhaps the reason why ancient poets valorized white women was that some of the early natives were actually fair-skinned.

Philippine anthropology theorized that Filipinos descended from both dark and fair people. Ancient forebears consisted of the Negritos and Oceanic Negroids who were dark-skinned with frizzly hair, the Australoids who had light to dark brown skin, and the Indonesians who had Caucasoid features of a light complexion, long nose, and straight hair (Dizon, 1979:2–5). Moreover, the historian Gregorio Zaide mentioned that the “last Asian immigrants to colonize the Philippines during the prehistoric times were the brown-skinned, maritime Malays, so named after their word *Malaya*, meaning ‘free’ ” (1957:23). In any case, the fair-skinned women in the mentioned Ilonggo and Lanao poems must have belonged to the fair stock. Otherwise, they could have been the progeny of Arab-Filipino miscegenation in the thirteenth to fifteenth centuries when Moslems traded and introduced Islam in the southern Philippines. The admixture of Arab and Filipino blood produced a fair-complexioned Filipino. Italian merchants who reached the Philippines on their way to China may have also engendered the fair Filipina. Regardless of the origin of the tribes’ color, Antonio Pigafetta, the Venetian chronicler who accompanied Magellan in the sixteenth century, noted that the Cebuano women were indeed “very beautiful and almost as white as our girls” (Quirino, 1977:829). He was referring to the similitude of the Filipinas’ color with the *olivastris*² complexion of the Italians. Moreover, Francisco Ignacio Alzina, who was a Spanish Jesuit missionary in Leyte and Samar, wrote the same observation in the seventeenth century. In his chronicles entitled *Historia de las Islas e Indios de Bisayas . . . 1668*, he revealed:

The women in the interior or those living away from the sea are commonly fairer. Among them, the highborn women whom they call Binocot are markedly fair because they keep themselves shut up in their houses, leaving them but rarely. Some of them have never even stepped on the ground, because they are carried on shoulders whenever it becomes necessary for them to leave the house. In this way they have always preserved their fair color; some of them are just as fair as the Spanish women for these reasons. Their children when small are usually white and blondish and very Spanish-looking although, in growing up, the men lose these characteristics at once. So do the women, if they are not of the principal class. The women of the principal class, because of their retirement or seclusion and not going out under the sun, preserve their light color better. (1979: 17)

According to Alzina, the women of Leyte and Samar³ sometimes had the same skin color as the Spanish women. Still, it can be said that the majority of the Filipino natives had a rich brown color because only a few were of the elite class. The majority belonged to the lower ranks that had to labor under the sun.

The ethnic Filipinos were oblivious of racial disparity. It was only during the Spanish era that they grasped the alleged hierarchy of the races. The Spaniards flaunted white supremacy. As a result, the cult of the white beauty penetrated

Philippine drama. However, Filipinos rebelled against the arrogance of the West as they gradually worked toward the fashioning of their brown identity. Hence, at the close of the Spanish era, there were female writers like Leona Florentino who extolled the *morena* (brown-skinned) beauty in “The Filipina Woman.” In her essay, which was written between 1887 and 1898, she said that “The Filipina . . . [was] generally *morena* and [that] there . . . [were] some with such exceptional beauty that they must be seen rather than described” (1994:285). Filipino women were deemed extremely alluring. It was, therefore, more challenging and difficult for Filipino poets to give poetic justice to brown beauty in their writings. Florentino’s essay showed that the *kayumanggi* was the Filipinos’ pride by the time the Americans came.

Unfortunately, it took only a matter of decades for the Filipinos to revert to a white aesthetics. At the start of the American era, Filipinos were staunch defenders of their Malayan race. Through time, however, the United States won their confidence with benevolent policies. As Philippine American relations developed, Filipinos incarnated American culture and life. They gradually replaced their ethnic identity with modern American values. It was the process of Americanization and de-Filipinization that restored white aesthetics in Philippine letters and thought. America’s color culture penetrated the Filipino psyche from 1899 to the postcolonial years.

REVOLUTIONARY LITERATURE: 1899–1920s

In 1898, the patriot Emilio Aguinaldo allied with Admiral George Dewey to vanquish the Spaniards. Manila and a few northern areas were the only regions that remained under Spanish control. When Aguinaldo sought America’s collaboration to besiege the north, he assumed that Spanish American *détente* engendered a workable alliance between the Philippines and America. He was mistaken. The “allies” he chose turned out to be the enemies he confronted in the succeeding decades. The United States bought the Philippines from Spain for the miserly sum of \$20 million under the Treaty of Paris on December 10, 1898 (Leogardo, Leogardo, and Jacobo, 1995:135–36). Spain had already lost the Philippines to the Filipino rebels who triumphed in provincial battles throughout the country. In this regard, the Treaty of Paris was deemed anomalous. What compounded the anomaly was America’s violent assertion of its sovereignty. On February 5, 1899, the United States declared war against the Philippines. (Leogardo, Leogardo, and Jacobo, 1995:150).

The votary of letters that flourished at the turn of the century retained the use of either Spanish or Tagalog, thereby, illustrating how Filipino nationalists rebuked America’s language as a foreign tongue. There was opposition against the North Atlantic conquerors even in Filipino *belles-lettres*. In 1899, the Filipino poet Cecilio Apostol (1997) wrote a Spanish poem protesting the specious strategy of the United States. In one stanza of “Al ‘Yankee’ ” (To the Yankee), he indicted America’s violation of the Filipinos’ patrimonial right over their coun-

try. He warned Americans of the lingering hatred that would nestle within the Filipino heart if America continued to ravage the land. Interestingly enough, the mentioned stanza perceived the racial issue behind America's annexation of the Philippines. The poem bellowed:

¡Jamás! Cuando la fuerza	Never, when might,
con la traicion y la injusticia pacta,	joins with treason and injustice
para aplastar los fueros,	to crush the laws and rights
los sacrosantos fueros de una raza; (106)	the sacred rights of a race, (107)
—Translated by Nicanor G. Tiongson	

In effect, Filipino writers had no time to associate beauty with color during the early belligerent years of American rule. However, they did speculate on racial issues as the *raison d'être* of imperialism.

Rafael Palma, who was a stalwart member of the Nacionalista party, tackled the racial issue in the *El Nuevo Dia* newspaper on May 5, 1900. In his Spanish essay “El Alma De España” [The Soul of Spain], he discussed the metamorphosis of the Filipino lineage. Specifically, he analyzed the infusion of Spanish blood into the Filipino race:

Quisimos enterrarla, cuando la creimos muerta en los brazos de nuestra revolución, pero no pudimos enterrar con ella lo que ya hemos recibido, lo que se ha asimilado al alma nuestra, lo que se ha inyectado en nuestra sangre. Es en vano raer de la piel esta color blanca que ha dulcificado las fibras morenas de nuestros abuelos, extraer de nuestras ideas el jugo de aquella civilización que ha vigorizado las celdillas de nuestro cerebro, vaciar del alma las virtudes o vicios que hemos heredado. La substancia de una raza se ha transfundido en la substancia de la otra; la masa, los nervios de unos y otros se han asimilado. No hay reactivos posibles; la descomposición no se logrará. (104)

(We wished to bury her [Spain] when we believed her to be dead in the arms of our revolution; but, we could not bury with her what we have already received, what has been infused in our soul, what has been injected in our blood. It is futile to scrape off from our skin the white color that has softened the brown skin of our forefathers, to extract from our ideas the sap of that civilization that has invigorated the gray cells of our brain, to empty our soul of the virtues and the vices that we have inherited. The substance of one race has been transfused into the substance of another race; the vigor of one and the other has been assimilated by both.)

—Translated by Daisy Lopez

In the passage, Palma expounded on the birthing process of the *mestizaje* (persons of mixed races). The Spanish occupation of 333 years inevitably led to the coupling of Spaniards and *indios*.⁴ The interracial union, however, was often illegitimate (Worcester, 1914: 940). Hence, the *mestizaje* were visible relics of illicit affairs and were, therefore, resented by the *indios*. They tarnished

the Malayan race of which the Filipino was proud. Moreover, they carried the blood of the enemy in their genes. The *indio*'s animosity toward them was not unfounded. Historically, the *mestizaje* often collaborated with the colonizers. It was in 1899 when they reneged on their fight for independence and sided with the Americans (Teodoro, 1978:1673). Still, as progeny of colonial ancestry, they were usually better educated and well traveled compared to the *indios*. Hence, the native Filipino's attitude toward them was an admixture of esteem and disdain. The American biologist, Dean C. Worcester, who became the secretary of interior from 1901 to 1913 in the Philippines wrote in *The Philippines Past and Present* that "there . . . [was] more or less [a] thinly veiled hostility between the *mestizo* class and the great dark mass of the people" (939). Palma's essay, therefore, aimed to quell the hostility by defending the *mestizaje*. Palma argued that the infusion of Spanish blood into the Filipino lineage simply gave birth to another ramification of what, in essence, was still Filipino. Ergo, the *mestizaje* were not anathema to the brown race.

During the early American occupation, Filipinos did take pride in their brown heritage. The oppressive racism of the Spaniards led them to assert their identity and glorify their Malay origins. Moreover, the recent Filipino-Spanish 1898 revolution left vestiges of patriotism. In effect, two writers versified the legend of the Filipino race to champion the beauty of the brown color. Amado V. Hernandez was one of them. He wrote "Ang Kulay Ng Pilipino" (The Color of the Filipino).

Ang Kulay Ng Pilipino

Isinasalaysay ng matandang kwento
 ang tao'y kung pano simulang nilikha,
 ang pagkakaiba ng kulay ng tao
 isang kamaliang hindi sinasadya.

Kung ang tao'y lalang ng iisang ama
 at iisang bagay ang ginawang sangkap,
 ay tunay nga namang nakapagtataka,
 ano't sarisari ang kulay ng balat?

Nangyari'y ganito: Diyos ay pumili
 ng lupa't minasang sa sarili'y hawig,
 at nang masiyahan sa hugis at yari
 kanyang isinalang sa hurmang mainit.

Nguni't hindi pa man nadadarang halos
 ay kanyang hinangong nag-aalanganin,

naging bantilawan sa halip masunog:
 ito ang Kastila at Kano—putlain.

The Color of the Filipino

According to an old tale
 the origin of how man was created,
 and those differences in color
 was never an intentional mistake.

If man is created by only one Father
 and there's only one recipe used,
 it's but certain to ask,
 why does man's skin vary in color?

Because it's like this: God chose
 a clay formed from his image,
 satisfied in its shape and constitution
 he cooked it in a hot oven.

Though not that cooked yet,
 he withdrew it from the fire with
 doubt,

it was half-baked and not burnt:
 they're the Spaniards and Ameri-
 cans—so white.

<p>Nang magsalang uli, upang di mahilaw, Hurno'y pinagbaga sa dagdag na gatong at ang niluluto'y laong tinayantang, Kaya't nang hangui'y para namang karbon.</p>	<p>He cooked again, and this time to be sure that it will be fine he added more fire, but when he looked at it, it was as black as carbon.</p>
<p>Yamot na ang Diyos na siya'y natulad sa bagong kinasal na tangang magluto, sa ikatlong salang ay nagpakaingat: nang hangui'y anong inam ng hinango.</p>	<p>Displeased in thinking that he will be likened to newly-weds who don't know how to cook, for the third time, he did it with care: when he withdrew it from the fire, it was well-done and fine.</p>
<p>Kulay din ng lupang sadyang kayumanggi, ang anyo at tindig ay katangi-tangi: Kung lalaki'y walang tatangging babae, Kung babae nama'y makalaglag-pari.</p>	<p>It was the color of clay which is truly kayumanggi, whose figure and posture are excep- tionally special: if man, no woman would refuse, if a woman, even a priest would love.</p>
<p>Ikaw, Pilipino, ay dapat magsaya at ipagmalaki ang balat mo't kulay: ang Itim at Puti'y kamalian pala, iyang Kayumanggi ang lalong mainam.</p>	<p>You, Filipino, you should celebrate be proud of your skin and color: Black and White are mistaken enti- ties, Kayumanggi is obviously the better kind.</p>
<p>Ang totoo'y wala sa kulay ng balat ni hugis ng ilong and uri ng tao: bunga'y sa lamukot naroon ang sarap, tao'y kilatisin sa puso at ulo. (111–12)</p>	<p>The truth is that not in the color of the skin nor in the shape of the nose is man's classification: just like a fruit whose taste is in the flesh, man should be judged according to the state of his heart and mind. —Translated by Leodivico Lacsamana</p>

The last stanzas of Hernandez's poem beckoned Filipinos to value their brown color. According to a legend, the white and the black races were defective products of God's creation. It was the brown race that exemplified the perfect race. The poem believed that Filipinos should, therefore, be proud of their complexion. Still, it ended by discounting skin color as a criterion for assessing a man's worth. It underscored the idea "that not in the color of the skin/nor in the shape of the nose is man's classification; . . . /man should be judged according to the state of his heart and mind." A man's mettle then rested more on his emotional and intellectual strengths rather than on his race.

Another poem, that glorified the *moreno*⁵ in the early 1900s, was Benigno Ramos's poem "Ang Kayumanggi" (The Brown Race).

Ang Kayumanggi

Sang-ayon kay Rizal, nang gawin ang tao,
 Diyos ay kumuha ng putik sa punso;
 may isang kawaling lutuan, umano,
 at dito ang putik ay pinagpaghusto . . .

Ang unang niluto ay inalis agad
 sa takot na baka masunog ang balat;
 nang kanyang hanguin, hilaw na namalas
 at ito ang "Taong Puting" tinatawag . . .

Sumunod na luto'y kanyang tinagalan
 pagka't aayaw nang muli pang mahilaw,

Nguni't nang hanguin ay supok nang tunay
 at ito ang "Negrong" nakikita riyang . . .

Kaya't ang ginawa ay nagluto uli
 ni di niluwatan, ni di minadali:
 nang isalin na po ang kanyang kawali,

"Kayumangging Tao" ang noo'y nayari! . . .

Ang tuwa ng Diyos ay ganyan na lamang
 sa nalutong Taong kulay katamtaman! . . .
 di tulad ng Puti na hilaw na hilaw,
 di Paris ng Negrong dupong ang kaba-
 gay!(134)

The Brown Race

According to Rizal, a legend said,
 the Lord formed man from mud;
 and in a wok, he stirred and baked,
 and patiently waited . . .

Fearing it might be overdone
 he removed it from the wok;
 only to find out it was wan
 from this the "White Race" began . . .

He tried for the second time
 hoping for a better result, he lengthened
 the cooking-time,
 overcooked, it turned out as black as coal
 from this came the "Black Race." . . .

Not contented with the results
 he tried again, very carefully timed:
 from the wok, He lifted the form—a per-
 fect hue,
 from this the "Brown Race" emerged! . . .

How pleased the Lord was
 when the perfect hue was realized! . . .
 neither pale nor burnt, but just right,
 a perfect tan at last!

—Translated by Leon and Aurora Gonzales

The poem reiterated the ideas of Hernandez's "Ang Kulay Ng Pilipino." This time, however, it did not explicitly mention the Americans and the Spaniards as branches of the white race. It simply stated Rizal as the source of the Filipino legend and succinctly narrated the story in five quatrains. Although it differed in style and length from Hernandez's poem, Ramos's "Ang Kayumanggi" essentially echoed Hernandez's homage to the brown lineage. The two mentioned poems showed how Filipinos valued their brown pigmentation.

Meanwhile, Tagalog, which was the main dialect of the north, was used as the playwrights' medium to incite resentment against the United States. The language was surreptitious for it veiled seditious literary themes. Unfortunately, the American government noted the diverse and subtle means by which Filipinos battled against colonial repression. In 1901, it crafted Section 10 of the Sedition Law that banned all initiatives, including literary activities, geared toward in-

dependence. Fortunately, Filipino writers were not cowed by such draconian measures. They used the theater as the fermenting ground for political revolt. Some of them, however, paid the price for their boldness. The playwright Juan Abad wrote *Tanikalang Ginto* that was staged on July 7, 1902. Through its symbolism, the *leitmotif* of his play implicated the United States as a foreign aggressor. Consequently, Abad was jailed and was made to pay a huge sum of \$2,000 after a performance in Batangas on May 10, 1903. Luckily, he was eventually exonerated for his crime. The Supreme Court, which consisted of prudent American justices like Charles A. Willard, overruled the punitive decision of the Court of First Instance. Another writer, Aurelio Tolentino, wrote a tripartite drama that allegorically portrayed the United States as a treacherous colonizer. The play he wrote was *Kahapon, Ngayon at Bukas* (1903). Tolentino was arrested nine times for its production. In 1904, he was sentenced initially to life imprisonment. The term was finally shortened to fifteen years when Governor General William Cameron Forbes⁶ reduced Tolentino's punishment to eight years (Cervantes, 1978, 2289–90). Amelia Lapeña Bonifacio mentioned other restricted dramas in her book *The Seditious Tagalog Playwrights: Early American Occupation* (1972). The banned plays were *Hindi Aco Patay* (1903) by Juan Cruz, *Kalayaang Hindi Natupad* (1903) by an anonymous writer, *Pulong Pinaglahuan* (1904) by Mariano Martinez, *Dahas na Pilak* (1904) by Maximo Reyes, and *Katipunan* (1904) by Gabriel Beato Francisco (24). They were all performed in the provinces with low budgets on makeshift stages, but they were popular among the masses. Their use of stylized movements and symbolism was grasped even by the illiterate. These plays served as reveilles to awaken Filipinos from the nightmare of America's conquest. All of them protested against American rule.

The incarceration of the early Filipino writers served as a caveat to the challenges of the sedition law. This meant that the second decade of American rule in the 1920s spawned a less confrontational literature. Instead of blatantly attacking the new colonial regime, writers were nostalgic for the lost cause of the 1898 revolution. They used European genres of the romance and the novena to express patriotic fervor. In 1913, Jose Chavez wrote "Kay Rizal" (For Rizal) in the tone of a novena's apotheosis of a virtuous man.

Kay Rizal	For Rizal
Ang kinabuhi ni Rizal	The life of Rizal
Amoy lunsay pagtolon-an	Can be studied
Matadlong nga pagsolondan,	As a model
Himpit nga pangninawan,	And as a perfect mirror
Kay totoo iya ginhingan	Of his genuine aspiration
Sang putli nga pamatasan	For virtuous character

(quoted in Cruz-Lucero, 1997–1998:36)

—Translated by Leodivico Lacsamana

The panegyric, which was indited in Ilonggo, lionized Rizal's quintessential character. By doing so, the Malayan race was glorified. Rafael Palma himself gave Rizal the epithet "the pride of the Malay race." Praising Rizal meant praising his Malay origins. Rizal was a Filipino who embodied Asian heroism. He was a sacrosanct figure to whom the Filipinos could relate to in the early years of American occupation. At this point, Rizal's Chinese *mestizo* genealogy was downplayed. He was simply the Filipino *par excellence*.

The romanticization of the Philippine Spanish revolution was a favorite motif during the first five years of American rule. The playwright Severino Reyes wrote the zarzuela⁷ *Walang Sugat* (1904) that crafted a romantic tale amidst the tableau of war. The play, however, was more reminiscent of Spanish occupation in the Philippines. Unlike the early seditious dramas, it was not critical of the American regime.

Similarly, Miguela Montelibano, female Ilonggo writer, imparted patriotic themes in the cadence of romantic poetry. Her poem "Akong Handum" (My Dream) in 1918 wove politics with lyricism as it articulated the persona's poignant desire for liberation. The ingress of the Americans was interpreted as a resurgence of Spain's Western imperialism. In the poem, Montelibano used the persona's voice to echo the national lamentation over the loss of freedom. The poem implicitly suggested that the violation of freedom was dovetailed with the suppression of the Filipino race.

Mainit nga handum ang yari sa dughan
 masingkal sing dabdab ka anggig sa bolkan,
 kag ini nga handum wala sing natungdan
 kondi'ng hinigugma duta'ng nataohan . . .

O! Nga pagkasubu, sini'ng balatyaon
 nga akon ginatigay sa tanan nga tion,
 kon sang kaluasan ako'ng magdumdum
 nga daw subung pala'ng sang dalamguhanon.
 (quoted in Cruz-Lucero, 1997-98:37)

Ardent desire that resides in my heart
 burning hatred as that of a volcano,
 and this only dream
 nothing but the love for one's native-
 land . . .

Oh! What a lonely feeling
 I've been carrying all these years,
 whenever I think about your freedom
 up to now it is nothing but a dream.

—Translated by Leodvico Lacsamana

In the 1920s, other writers who dwelt on the Spanish past were Cecilio Apostol, Fernando Ma. Guerrero, Jesus Balmori, and Manuel Bernabe. Their poems were primarily written in Spanish. Their imagery was indicative of the Philippines' acculturation of Spanish life. Jesus Balmori's protagonist in the poem "Navidad Pueblerina" (Christmas in a Village), incarnated the unsullied nature of Maria Clara.⁸ On the other hand, the poem "Mi Patria" (My Country) by Fernando Ma. Guerrero recalled the dynamic pathos of Rizal's "Mi Ultimo Ad-

ios” (My Last Farewell). The last stanza posited a xenophobic anti-American strain without directly alluding to the Americans:

¡Oh! tierra de mis amores,	Oh land of my loves,
santa madre de mi vida,	holy mother of my life,
que vertiste en mi alma herida	who poured into my wounded soul,
el aroma de tus flores	the aroma of your flowers,
Llora, si tienes dolores,	weep, if you have sorrows,
si sueñas ser grande, espera,	wait, if your dreams be great;
pero te juro que fuera	but I swear it shall be
para mi suerte afrentosa,	ignominious luck for me
ver nacidas en mi fosa	to see blooming on my grave
hierbas de savia extranjera. (284)	plants of a foreign sap. (286b)

—Translated by Nicanor Tiongson

EARLY AMERICAN TUTELAGE: 1920s–1934

When President William McKinley annexed the Philippines in the guise of civilization, there was a furor in the United States. Annexation was discordant to the political ethos of America at the turn of the century. Hence, some Americans cited the incongruity of annexation vis-à-vis the shibboleth of republican democracy. As a result, the anti-imperialist league inveighed. The American novelists Mark Twain and Henry James became voices of conscience advocating the freedom of the Philippines. However, McKinley was an astute politician who informed the body politic of his so-called “civilizing” intentions. He reasoned: “there was nothing left for us to do but to take them all, and to educate the Filipinos” (quoted in Salas, 1984: 21). Shortly afterward, the public school system burgeoned in the Philippines. The first teachers were soldiers who shelved their artillery in exchange for the book. Later, almost 600 Thomasites arrived in the country as public instructors. These white American civilians were dispersed in the different regions in an organized diaspora. Altogether, their prime mission was to educate.

The first obstacle they confronted was language. The dialects of the brown people sounded primitive, and they were not keen to learn it. In an article published in *The Western Journal of Education* on August 1901, Frederick Nash, who was then the secretary to American superintendent Fred W. Atkinson during the American colonial era, referred to Filipinos as a “semi-barbarous people speaking a dozen different languages” (1901: 8). Obviously, Rudyard Kipling’s image of the white race as a bastion of civilization was a psychological illusion that some American academics nurtured. In white eyes, the Americans formed part of the civilized race alongside the European stock. Ultimately, Americanization was equated to “civilization.” America’s policy of education established

white men as purveyors of culture and demigods of modern thought. It was likewise a potent medium to advance the American credo of democracy and civic government. A newspaper article in the *San Francisco Chronicle* dated June 22, 1901 described the Americanization process as a method of assimilating Filipinos:

Assimilating the Filipinos

It is not impossible that this country will yet astonish the world with our success in assimilating the races of annexed countries. In our educational work, which we have begun in the Philippines, we are doing what no other nation has attempted. We are setting up the American schoolhouse in the islands and exporting American teachers to start the schools. We are now sending 1,000 teachers. . . . It is in childhood that the strongest impressions are found, and the plan of educating the Filipino children, en masse, in American schools, by American teachers, exhibits higher statesmanship than we have known to be shown by a nation when dealing with a new people. To American schools, American roads, and American language, we only need to add the American tariff and the American market to make the Filipinos roll blessings upon the American name forever! (quoted in Lardizabal, 1956: 91)

What the news item implied inevitably was that the Americanization policy also led to the Filipinos' de-Filipinization. Later, Captain Albert Todd of the Sixth Artillery proposed the training of native teachers in America. On August 26, 1903, the Philippine Commission passed Act No. 854, which appointed 102 *pensionados*⁹ to the United States (Lardizabal, 1956: 250–51). Upon their return to the Philippines, they became the first Filipino teachers of the American-installed public school system.

Filipino writers chronicled snippets of the *pensionados*' experience as the latter wrestled against colonial issues abroad. At this point, literature was used as a diatribe against Western perceptions of racial hegemony. In the short story "Aloha" (1920–1930s), D. A. Rosario wrote about a Filipino's transient visit to Hawaii. The narrator began his story by recounting his experience in Honolulu when he found himself drinking coffee with an American historian, Dan Merton. While the story focused on the character of Dan Merton, it is the narrator's identity that remained mysterious. Since the narration was told in Tagalog, the narrator initially gave readers the impression of being one of the Filipino migrants who labored in the Hawaii plantations at the start of the twentieth century. Historically, 15 Filipinos were recorded to have arrived in Hawaii in 1906. In 1907, the number increased to 150 (Capili, 1998: 42). Later, the narrator's characterization became more defined as the story progressed. As the narrator gave an intelligent analysis of Dan Merton's academic history together with a critical assessment of social realities, he somehow revealed his true identity. He was more likely a Filipino *pensionado* passing by Hawaii for scholarly pursuits. His opening rhetoric about Rudyard Kipling's "The Ballad of East and West" (1889) was far removed from a peasant's cultural baggage. In Tagalog, he pondered:

Maniwala ka sa kadalubhasaan ni Rudyard Kipling! Hindi ako naniniwala sa kasabihan niyang:

“Ang Silangan ay Silangan,
 Ang Kanluran ay kanluran;
 Magkapatid silang kambal,
 Magkalayo habang buhay.”

Ayaw kong ipahalata sa kausap ko ang malaking pagkamangha sa pagpapasinungaling niya sa sumulat ng “The Ballad of East and West.” (Rosario, 1971: 333)

(Believe in the greatness of Rudyard Kipling! I don’t believe in his saying:

“Oh, East is East and West is West, and never the twain shall meet.”

I don’t want to insinuate to the person I’m talking to my surprise over his disbelief in this saying of the writer of “The Ballad of East and West.”) —Translated by Leodivico Lacsamana

The narrator-character decried the *Weltanschauung* of Western racial supremacy. His foreign education may have fomented his methodical disavowal of Kipling’s views. As an enlightened man, his castigation of Western imperialism was prudent and fair. He expunged the errors of Western racism without generalizing all white men as firebrands of ethnic conflict. Throughout the story, he eulogized Dan Merton, a white scholar, as a pillar of racial equality for his belief in the Asian mind and for his marriage to a Kanaka.

D. A. Rosario’s choice of Hawaii as the short story’s setting was germane. Hawaii, as a country, paralleled the historical subjugation of the Philippine Islands. Hawaii was annexed by the United States only a year before America occupied the Philippines. The fact that Dan Merton approved of racial equality while residing in Hawaii reinforced the nobility of his character. There was always the tendency for the white man to assert racial hegemony in a colony. In E. M. Forster’s *A Passage to India* (1924), for instance, Ronnie Heaslop metamorphosed into an arrogant magistrate after settling down in India. Hence, the fact that Dan Merton believed in racial equality even during his residence in Hawaii proved the mettle of his virtue. Moreover, D. A. Rosario’s depiction of white empathy through Dan Merton was apropos of the period of American tutelage during the 1920s. His dramatization of Western racism vis-à-vis Western empathy mirrored the ambivalent attitudes that Filipinos had toward American apprenticeship. There were Filipinos who perceived America’s benevolent policy as self-serving. There were others who appreciated the political tutelage.

What happened in the 1920s, however, was an exploration of the English tongue. The government *pensionados* who had been schooled abroad became pundits of English rhetoric upon their return. They laid the foundations of Philippine literature in English. By this time, there was a general softening of Filipino antipathy toward the Americans that facilitated the use of the language. American educators who sincerely worked toward the emancipation of the Filipino mind also popularized English. University of the Philippines’s professors Dean S. Fansler and Harriet Fansler became bulwarks of literary education.

Ramos and Valeros recounted in *Philippine Harvest* how the Fanslers instilled in their students a sense of pride over their native culture. The Fanslers reminded their pupils of the need to write about themselves truthfully. They were the ones who initiated the *U.P. Folio* that was first released in 1910. The publication eventually featured the inchoate writings of Vicente Hilario, Godofredo Rivera, Francisco Africa, L. B. Uichangco, Manuel Gallego, and Nicolas Zafra (Serrano and Ames, 1975: 21–23).

Quite a number of literary journals surfaced in the 1920s apart from the *Folio*. The *Philippine Herald* released its maiden issue and printed creative works in 1920. Later, the American Folklore society published *Filipino Popular Tales* in 1921 that featured the writings of Dean Fansler's students (Serrano and Ames, 1975: 23). In 1925, *Philippine Education Magazine* and *The Manila Tribune* were founded. Other magazines that published literary genres in the 1920s were the *Graphic*, the *Woman's Outlook*, the *Women's Home Journal* and, eventually, the *Philippine Collegian*. School publications also became vehicles of literary expression. They were *The Torch* of the Philippine Normal School and *The Coconut* of Manila High School in 1910 (Dula and Croghan, 1971: 1–3). The University of the Philippines's Writer's Club published a collection of short stories in the *Literary Apprentice* (Serrano and Ames, 1975:26). The *Philippines Free Press* did the same in 1905 when it was established by the Americans R. McCullough Dick and F. Theo Rogers. *El Renacimiento Filipino* was another magazine that featured Philippine poetry. In 1907, Justo Juliano wrote his first English poem "Sursum Corda" in the journal. In 1909, Juan F. Salazar also published his poems "My Mother" and "Air Castles" in the same magazine. Other writers who benefited from *El Renacimiento* were Proceso Sebastian and Bernardo P. Garcia. Sebastian's "To My Lady in Laoag" appeared in 1909 while Garcia's "George Washington" was printed in 1910 (Tonogbanua, 1984:4–5).

It is noteworthy that many of the publications were under the stewardship of American editors. Consequently, the budding writers during this era of American tutelage were thematically apolitical in their works. For a while, art was simply for art's sake. Politics was shelved temporarily for the development of literature. Jose Garcia Villa was simply dazzled by the verbal pyrotechnics of the American symbolists. He quickly mastered the modern forms of the Western canon. His style revived the craftsmanship of Walt Whitman. Marcela de Gracia Concepcion's "Lonely" used Western landscape images such as "glacial sun," "frozen rock," and "glacial rivers" to evoke the mood of the poem (83). Paz Marquez-Benitez's "Dead Stars," which was published in the *Philippine Herald* on September 20, 1925, also drowned political issues with a romantic plot. The short story focused on the silent romance between Julia and Alfredo. There was no reference to any havoc wrought by the American regime. The pristine setting created the idyllic harmony of Alfredo's town. The single occasion that hinted the proximity of the Americans was when Julia described her run-of-the-mill barrio. She addressed Alfredo: "Will you come? [She was referring to her hometown.] You will find it dull. There isn't even one American there!" Alfredo

quipped: “Well—Americans are rather essential to my entertainment” (41). Julia’s reaction was to laugh. By this time, it was evident that Filipinos ceased to view Americans as a foreboding threat. They sometimes saw them as mere subjects of amusement.

In the 1920s, the attractive heroines were *kayumanggi*. In Paz Marquez-Benitez’s “Dead Stars,” the hero Alfredo fell deeply in love with Julia, a woman with a rich brown-crimson color. Julia was not a stunning beauty, but her elegance and innate charm enticed Alfredo. Alfredo could not forget Julia even after he married the light-complexioned Esperanza. Eight years after the publication of “Dead Stars,” there was another short story that highlighted the *morena* protagonist. On July 15, 1928, the *Philippines Herald* published Paz Latorena’s “Desire.” In the short story, the heroine was homely. She had a flat nose and wide nostrils. She had a broad forehead that made her look masculine. She had thick lips and big jaws that made her resemble the ethnic pygmies of the north. And yet, men were drawn to her because she had a beautiful body. One of her admirers was a white man, presumably American, who shelved his racist credo whenever he saw her. Other short stories that romanticized the brown Filipina were “Sunset” by Paz Latorena, that was published in the *Graphic* on August 7, 1929 and “The Fence” by Jose Garcia Villa, that was published in the *Philippines Free Press* on December 24, 1927. These short stories described brown heroines as attractive. However, in “Sunset,” it was the woman’s enigma rather than her beauty that enthralled the cobbler. In “The Fence,” the heroine was a flat-nosed girl who captured the heart of the boy Iking. In “Desire” and “Sunset,” the women aroused prurient desires in men due to their appeal. Interestingly enough, they were hardly discussed as beautiful. In that sense, beauty eluded brown heroines as early as the 1920s.

On the other hand, the Filipina poet Angela Manalang Gloria lauded the *mestiza*’s beauty in a poem she wrote in 1927. “To a *Mestiza*” was a simple poem of three lines where the persona expressed her fascination with the *mestiza*’s physical features. The persona evoked: “I found the silent meeting of the East/ and West in the willowy glimmer of a Bicol/ pool—in the beautiful being that is you” (41). The persona was never identified. However, since a woman wrote the poem, the persona easily represented the female consciousness. Moreover, it sharply contrasted Leona Florentino’s eulogy of the *morena* in “The Filipina Woman,” a poem written before the American occupation. Angela Manalang Gloria’s verse revealed how the “white image” in the form of the *mestiza*, appropriated the aesthetic paradigm in the 1920s. The sex of the poem’s versifier was crucial. It showed that Filipino women might have been the first disciples of the white cult during the American regime.

COMMONWEALTH LITERATURE: 1935–1939

The Commonwealth period was a period of hope. The 1934 Tydings McDuffie Law promised the Filipinos their long-awaited independence. On Feb-

ruary 8, 1935, a constitutional convention composed of 202 elected delegates and headed by Claro M. Recto approved the constitution that was drafted by Filemon Sotto, Manuel A. Roxas, Norberto Romualdez, Manuel C. Briones, Conrado Benitez, Miguel Cuaderno, and Vicente Singson Encarnacion. The constitution was approved by President Roosevelt on March 22, 1935, and was ratified by the Filipinos in the plebiscite of May 4, 1935. Later, the public voted for Manuel L. Quezon and Sergio Osmeña as president and vice president of the Commonwealth. On April 30, 1937, Filipino women were granted suffrage rights. Later, the Institute of National Language was erected. It studied the different Filipino dialects and recommended Tagalog as the national language. On December 30, 1937, President Manuel L. Quezon declared Tagalog as the national language in Executive Order No. 134 (Leogardo, Leogardo, and Jacobo, 1995: 166–69).

The Commonwealth government fostered literary activity. Quezon initiated the Commonwealth Literary Awards in 1939 that gave national recognition to writers of English, Tagalog, and Spanish literature. The awards encouraged writers to perfect their craftsmanship. In 1940, the first Commonwealth Literary Awards granted Salvador P. Lopez a full award for “Literature and Society” in the essay competition. Manuel E. Arguilla was awarded for his short story “How My Brother Leon Brought Home a Wife.” Juan C. Laya was given full recognition for his novel *His Native Soil*. Zulueta da Costa versified the poem “Like the Molave,” which was also given the full award. Those who were given honorable mention were the Cebuana poet Estrella D. Alfon for her *Collection of Short Stories*, N.V.M. Gonzalez for his *The Winds of April*, Jose Garcia Villa for his “Poems by Doveglion,” and P. C. Morante for his biography *Filipino Live—An Autobiography*. The general climate of the Commonwealth era germinated literary circles. For instance, the Philippine Book Guild was founded in 1937 to promote Filipino writers. The Philippine Writers’ League was organized in 1939 to promote literature as a tool for the sociopolitical education of the masses. The guild inevitably fashioned the genre of proletariat literature in the Philippines (Dula and Croghan, 1971:134c–d).

Meanwhile, the growing rapprochement between the Philippines and the United States inspired Filipino writers to imitate the stylistic devices and thematic thrusts of their American counterparts. In the mid-1930s, Manuel E. Arguilla, Arturo B. Rotor, Bienvenido Santos, and N.V.M. Gonzalez showed strong traces of American influence in their writings. By this time, Jose Garcia Villa’s experimentation with form also inspired other men and women of letters. Among the writers, there arose a general eagerness to apply foreign literary trends to Philippine literature. English became the language of Philippine *belles-lettres* for it was easier to use the Anglo tongue whenever foreign styles were used. Moreover, expatriate writing flourished due to American scholarships. Writer-scholars wrote in the language of their education. This phenomenon was experienced also by the *ilustrados*¹⁰ of the nineteenth century. Jose Rizal, Emilio

Jacinto, Antonio Luna, Marcelo H. Del Pilar, Pedro Paterno, and Graciano Lopez Jaena wrote in the Spanish language by which they were schooled.

On the cultural level, Philippine American entente hastened the Americanization of the Filipinos. The little brown brothers readily imitated Western culture and life. Two media of Western acculturation were drama and film. These genres revived the cult of the white beauty among Filipinos. Somehow, Filipinos subliminally equated the stage and the movies with the transcendentals. Hence, whatever they saw on stage and on film became the criteria for the true, the good, and the beautiful. The stage and film actors became the new deities of modern life. To the Filipinos, Elizabeth Taylor, Audrey Hepburn, Nilo Asther, and Robert Taylor personified beauty itself.

During the Spanish era, it was the *komedya* that actually positioned the *mestizaje* on stage. In his article "Four Values in Filipino Drama and Film," the literary critic Nicanor G. Tiongson discussed the origins of the "Maganda ang Maputi" [white is beautiful] principle in Philippine literature. He asserted: "Our colonial aesthetics today may be partly rooted to various dramatic forms, (during both the Spanish and American colonial regimes), which popular[iz]ed and perpetuated the value of 'white is beautiful'" (1984: 198). He explained the *komedya* as a drama that narrated either the romantic tales of princes and princesses or the jousts between the Christians and the Muslims in the medieval age. The Filipino actors had to look like the real-life characters that they were representing. Hence, the *mestizaje* oftentimes got the lead roles. Unwittingly, the Filipino audience developed an image of the hero as fair-skinned with long nose, huge eyes, and thin lips (198).

The American vaudeville of the 1930s was then far from original in its rendition of white protagonists. However, its popularity was most effective in restoring the epitome of white beauty. The stage phenomenon that happened in the Spanish era also happened during the American occupation. Soon, Filipinos who imitated American performers were the *mestizaje*. Moreover, school plays organized by the prestigious Ateneo de Manila University chose Caucasian-looking people to appear in Shakespearean stage presentations (Tiongson, 1984: 199). Unfortunately, Filipino film specialists did not correct the malaise. In 1924, Vicente Salumbides employed Hollywood film-making techniques and images in the Filipino production *Miracles of Love*. In the film, the American beauty was launched in Philippine cinema in the person of Elizabeth "Dimples" Cooper (Pilar, 1978: 2474).

It did not take long for Filipino teenagers to acculturate American tastes. Neither did it take long for them to idolize the white beauties of American cinema. Local writers parodied this process of adopting American ways. In 1930, D. A. Rosario wrote the Tagalog short story "Greta Garbo." The story revolved around a certain Monina Vargas who looked like Greta Garbo. True enough, the heroine Monina had prominent eyebrows, red thin lips, and hollow cheeks that likened her features to the actress. The similarity was visible because she was a *mestiza*. In due time, the heroine Monina became an avid fan of the

actress. Greta Garbo became her idol and practically her religion. She eventually fell in love with a certain Octavio Razon who looked like John Gilbert, Greta Garbo's usual leading man. The story ended with her discovery of John Gilbert's wedding to a certain Magdalena Reyes. Hence, Monina was obviously fooled into believing that John Gilbert was sincerely in love with her. The story showed that not even Greta Garbo facsimiles were immune from romantic deception.

Pining Goes Hollywood was a comical skit written by Mercedes S. Ricardo Alfiler in the late 1930s. Again, the play satirized American cinema's influence over the youth. Although the play's title suggested a physical journey to Hollywood, no such journey transpired in the plot. The symbolic journey referred to a young girl's psychological assimilation of the Hollywood culture. Pining was a teenager who disliked being called "Pining" because she preferred being called Josephine or Josie. Her rejection of a local sounding name metaphorically signified her renunciation of Filipino culture in favor of foreign tastes. The play showed how she translated her day-to-day activities into American movies. She kept a picture of Audrey Hepburn. She painted her nails red like the film actresses. She wore a Carol Lombard hairstyle. She saw traces of Jimmie Stewart in Ramon, her male friend. She likened Cely's voice to that of Frances Langford. And she raved over Tyrone Power. In short, she did visit Hollywood vicariously. She lived in Hollywood's dream world.

Another play that was staged in the late 1930s was *Educating Josefina* by Lilia Villa. In the play, the main character was Josefina who, like Pining, also refused to be called a local sounding name like "Pinang." Like other teenagers, Pinang aped the appearance and manners of the Americans she saw on film. She cut her hair short in the fashion popularized by white models. Thus, her father noted: "But bobbed hair, bah! Bobbed hair is all right for American girls and mestizas. I don't believe it becomes Filipino girls. And Pinang is dark. I don't know what's come over her. She used to be very simple, but now her letters are full of silly ideas" (1).

Her father's bewilderment concerning Pinang's physical transformation was soon discovered when he saw her again. He realized that Pinang's curled hair, red lips, and cheeks were similar to those of an actress. In the context of Philippine media history, it was, in fact, in the 1930s when LVN, a local film production outfit, launched the *mestizaje* as heroes and heroines of Philippine cinema. For instance, Carmen Rosales was an American *mestiza* and Lucy May Gritz was a German-Spanish *mestiza*. Similarly, the American film industry only romanticized whites in their romantic plots. Thus, when Pinang's father observed his daughter's similarity with an actress, it meant that Pinang tried to look like the thespians of the white-dominated film industry. Later, his assumption was confirmed. When he looked into his daughter's packages, he saw framed pictures of Robert Taylor and Errol Flynn. Later, Pinang even motioned to replace the decorative pictures of Manuel L. Quezon and Sergio Osmeña, then president and vice president of the Commonwealth regime, with the pictures of Robert Taylor and Errol Flynn. By this time, Pinang imbibed a new concept of heroism

where white actors instead of Filipino nationalists became her idols. This process of substituting Filipino figures with white images influenced her aesthetic standards as well. In fact, what impressed her as far as the beauty of her friend's mother was concerned were the woman's white smooth hands.

In the 1930s, Jose Garcia Villa showed a white woman's failure to sustain a Filipino's love for her. His "Untitled Story" that was published in *Graphic* on September 9, 1931, narrated a Filipino's infatuation with a Filipina called "Vi." Later, the man was sent to study in the United States by his father to separate him from the girl. During his residence in America, he fell in love with an American girl named Georgia. Georgia typified the Aryan race with her golden hair. At first, her blonde tresses fascinated the Filipino hero. For a while, America's myth of the dark man's fascination with the blonde and blue-eyed as depicted in Ralph Ellison's *Invisible Man* (1947) and Richard Wright's *Native Son* (1940) transpired in his life. However, it did not take long for him to fall out of love with Georgia and pine for his Filipino girl once more.

Conrado Pedroche's "The Man Who Played for David," which was published in the *Commonwealth Advocate* on July 1938 featured a Filipino who lived in America for fifteen years. Upon returning to the Philippines, the Filipino called David experienced a crippling loneliness inside him. He overcame his loneliness only after he met Joe, "a tall dusky Negro" (401) whom he met at the plaza. The black man was lonely because he had no friends. David empathized with his loneliness. However, he knew that Joe would also have felt the same isolation in the United States. When Joe related his despondence, David told him: "In America . . . things are no better" (402). David realized that America's racism would neither be a countersolution to Joe's loneliness. The short story implied that even America's racist culture was encroaching upon Philippine culture. Why else did an Afro-American feel lonely in the Philippines? If Joe were readily accepted into Philippine society, he would not have felt alone. Ironically, even David felt lost in his home country. America was far removed from his ideal concept of a home for it was there where he suffered emotionally. And yet, when he returned to the Philippines, he still felt lonely. It was America's ubiquitous presence in the Philippines that made him feel isolated in his place of origin. Back home, everyone was fascinated with America. His Filipino relatives idolized the United States. Thus, in essence, he had not left America. When he met Joe, he felt comfortable relating with a black man who felt dislocated in a place that resembled the United States. He and the black man were two kindred souls in their social discomfiture.

Angel de Jesus's "Exile," released in the *Philippine Magazine* on November 1935, showed the incursion of racist consciousness into the Philippine setting. The dramatis personae feared a European man simply because he did not conduct himself like other white men. The European did not bear the confident and authoritative stance of the white foreigner. Instead, he acquired the ways of the native country bumpkins as he slung his bamboo basket filled with chickens on his shoulders. Filipinos regarded the man as strange because he did not befriend

other white men. Obviously, the racist culture was deeply entrenched into the Filipino psyche in a way that made racial segregation seem more natural than racial integration. Consequently, the Filipinos in the story feared the Westerner even when he addressed them as “my friend” (281). At the end of the story, the narrator briefly explained the white man’s deportment: “Next morning, I woke up early but He [the white man] was already gone. He had folded the blanket carefully and placed the newspapers under it. He had gone with his chickens, his secrets, somewhere up in that wall of green that surrounded us, to a brown wife and child—home” (283). The white man shelved his white identity to have an egalitarian union with a native Filipina. Here, miscegenation led to the erosion of a racist consciousness in the white man. It even resulted in his acculturation of native practices.

WAR LITERATURE UP TO THE EDSA REVOLUTION: 1940–1985

In the late 1930s, the Philippines beamed at the proximity of independence. While cosmic turmoil rocked Europe, the Philippines reveled in jam sessions and basketball hysteria. Foreign films popularized Deanna Durbin, Mickey Rooney, and Betty Grable while the radio warbled “God Bless America.” Local motion pictures imitated Hollywood cinema to attract the public. They used foreign-inspired plots to display Filipino actors appearing as cowboys, detectives, and spies. American films found local counterparts in *Sound of Buwisit* for *Sound of Music* and *James Bandong* for *James Bond* (Pilar, 1978: 2474). Meanwhile, the *mestizaje* survived as gods and goddesses of the local film industry. Delia Razon, Tessie Quintana, Gloria Romero, Lita Gutierrez, Rosa Rosal, Nida Blanca, Eddie Rodriguez, Leopoldo Salcedo, and Mario Montenegro all had fair skin, large eyes, and long noses. Rosa Rosal and Nida Blanca who became popular in the 1950s were, in fact, American *mestizas*.

At the start of the 1940s, the Philippines was still preparing for independence, and the Filipinos were immensely grateful for American tutelage. But then, suddenly, World War II broke out. The Philippines was dragged into the war due to its relations with America. Ironically, it continued to view the United States as its liberator. Japan besieged the country hoping to subvert America’s sovereignty in the Asiatic region. The Machiavellian politics of the Japanese regime was contrapuntal to the democratic system of American mentoring. Hence, in their suppression, Filipinos looked toward America as the hero who would liberate them from the Japanese invasion. With America hailed as a hero, the United States was further extolled by Filipinos.

America’s growing influence was manifested in the 1940s in Salvador Faus-tino’s “Evening of a Poet.” The short story was published on June 19, 1940, in the *Herald Mid-Week Magazine*. It narrated a young poet’s serendipity as he became enamored of a fair-skinned lovely maiden. As he searched for her in the church, the search symbolized metaphorically the Filipino’s assimilation of

a white aesthetics. The poet's soliloquy revealed the burgeoning of his new concept of beauty. He exclaimed: "The qualities of beauty I had before known she has transcended. The beauty I have valued in the gloom of my little room, the beauty I have been inscribing and affirming to—has been discarded, supplanted by the insuperable pang of her loveliness" (504). However, the beauty he celebrated was fair-skinned and angelic. To him, the alabaster skin of the woman encapsulated beauty. Beauty now had to be white because the woman had a fair complexion. The shift of aesthetic criteria was relevant in the context of the man as poet and artist. The man's re-fashioning of his aesthetic standards signaled the shifting aesthetics in concentric circles of social experience. As artist, the hero was both critic and transcriber of beauty. Naturally, his changed notion of beauty would eventually resonate in art, thereby, affecting the public's perception of the beautiful.

In Juan C. Laya's novel *His Native Soil* (1941), a man's changing standards of beauty was portrayed similarly. After securing a business degree from the University of Washington, the protagonist Martin Romero returned to the Philippines with a cultural baggage of Western values. He wanted to supercede his family's heritage, tradition, and patrimony with what he learned in America. Moreover, his foreign exposure made him prefer the *mestiza* rather than the brown Filipina. For him, the dark-skinned Soledad was a virtuous *ingenué* who seemed too petite and asymmetrical. In contrast, Virginia Fe, a fair and tall American *mestiza* who "looked more like the girls he has been accustomed to looking at," animated him. Coming fresh from abroad, he must have thought of the American girls whom he knew. Eventually, Martin realized the racial culture of his Western education. At his father's deathbed, he typified the prodigal son in his remorse. He said: "It was all wrong, Tatang, my going away—all wrong. It's all a mistake. Think of those young boys out there—all desperately lonesome for the normal life. They change and grow away until they are neither Filipinos nor Americans, just racial bastards. You could no longer understand me when I returned. . . . I became what I am . . . because. . . . They hurt me first, Tatang. They hardened my heart" (quoted in Lim, 1989:131). It was his foreign education that inured him to America's racial culture. Later, he admitted that the acculturation was actually a painful process. The de-Filipinization was anathema to him at the start although he eventually gave in to it.

In 1953, Precioso Nicanor wrote *I Married an American*, which dramatized a Filipino's pathetic quest of a utopian America. The novel was narrated in the Victorian *bildungsroman* tradition as it traced Ricardo Salazar's romance with America since childhood. When Ricardo finally arrived in the United States, he met an American woman who became his secretary. The woman called Helen was intelligent and professionally competent. Ricardo began to admire her. In addition, the woman's golden hair, white neck, large blue eyes, and long eyelashes charmed him. It did not take long for him to love her. And yet, even in his passion, not once was he oblivious of their racial disparity. In fact, as her employer, he felt embarrassed to give commands because she was white. When he fell for her, he felt unworthy to express his love. It was only when she got

pregnant with a recreant lover that he mustered the courage to ask her to marry him. After they married, he treated Helen's child as his own. They seemed like a normal family except when they were denigrated by white people. The story ended tragically because Helen eventually reunited with her white lover.

When Nicanor wrote the novel, he intended to forewarn Filipinos who desired to travel to the United States about the harsh realities of American life. The object of his exposé was America's social disavowal of miscegenation. In his foreword, he wrote about how he sought to "disseminate the truth which, because of our racial pride, has thus far been undisclosed." He further explained: "When Filipinos intermarry with whites, as often happens, all too often they are happy only while within their own four walls. The moment they step out from this shelter . . . they must be constantly on the alert—expecting, fearing all manner of snubs and slighting remarks. Resentful of them they will be, but helpless in the face of almost universal prejudice." In this light, one would understand why David of Conrado Pedroche's "The Man Who Played for David" sympathized with Joe the black man. Filipinos were ostracized just like African Americans in the United States. Thus, Nicanor's novel portrayed the plight of the Filipino pariah.

The Filipinos' romance with America further burgeoned in the 1960s. The cold war deepened the Filipino's loyalty to the United States. The media portrayed America as the global protagonist raging a cosmic battle against the USSR. Inevitably, Filipinos again viewed Americans as modern heroes who shielded the world against the onslaught of communism. In 1960, Bienvenido Santos's "Theme: Courage" introduced the character Gloria as a woman who "believed in the power of music and the survival of democracy" (127). The use of American personalities as a reference point was also articulated by the character Ester when she remarked: "I was hoping our new English teacher would be somebody like Robert Taylor, but he looks like a first cousin, Filipino lineage, of Charlie McCarthy" (128). In another short story, "The Day the Dancers Came," which was published in 1967, Santos underscored the complex and dual identity of Filipinos who became naturalized American citizens. In the story, the character Filemon Acayan eagerly awaited the visit of Filipino dancers to the United States only to be ignored by them. His American citizenship severed his affinity with his countrymen. His brief encounter with them was a contretemps that severely bruised him. In "Brother, My Brother" (1960), Bienvenido Santos depicted a Filipino professor's nostalgia for America. He briefly mentioned the intermarriages of Filipino soldiers and American ladies during World War II. Unlike Precioso Nicanor's *I Married an American*, he did not dwell on the pitfalls of interracial unions. It is in "The Little Maid" (1960), however, that Santos projected the encroachment of America's white apotheosis in the mind of a hospital cleaning lady. In the short story, he portrayed a young maid's fascination with a beautiful *mestiza* who had brown hair and fair skin.

In the 1970s, the worship of America continued. N.V.M. Gonzalez's "In the Twilight" (1978) reinforced this in one sentence: "In America . . . the barrio vanished" (153). Like Santos's "The Day the Dancers Came," the story focused

on Filipino Americans. In this case, however, the naturalized Americans were less nostalgic of local culture. In Amador T. Daguio's "Clothes Line" (1973), even the native-born Filipinos preferred foreign films to local ones. In the story, the hero once relished a movie of Greta Garbo and John Gilbert. In the process, he mentally juxtaposed productions of local films vis-à-vis American movies and deduced summarily: "Filipino movies are not as good as American movies" (5). However, in 1973, Sinai C. Hamada's "Kintana and Her Man" unusually built a romantic plot around a Filipina and an African American. The story acknowledged the attractiveness of the blacks and, in effect, flouted America's white aesthetics. It began with a flashback of the arrival of American soldiers in 1898. Upon seeing the foreigners, the Filipino natives were nonplussed. They remarked: "They are not white men. On the contrary, they are black, most of them. . . . True, there are a few white men among them, but the rest are big, dark-skinned, fearful soldiers with heavy guns" (18).

Kintana was a native *femme* who unwittingly attracted the American soldiers. One day, a black soldier attempted to assault her physically. He panicked when Kintana screamed. Later, during the military investigation, racial prejudice was manifested when the white officer readily believed Kintana's accusation of the black man. The black man was duly punished. However, the short story ended with Kintana falling for another black man. The finale's *peripeteia* established the silent understanding between Filipinos and African Americans. It exemplified the physical attraction between Filipinas and black heroes during the first few years of American occupation.

In 1982, Edilberto K. Tiempo's *Goodbye, Barbie* was a tour de force in narrative technique. The novelette showed the changing racial cultures of two young friends—one, a Filipina, and the other, an American. At the start of the story, Cindy Aragon, a young Filipina girl of about six or seven years old became the best friend of Barbie, an American blonde of the same age. When her father's travel grant expired, Cindy had to return to the Philippines with her family. Back in the Philippines, Cindy missed Barbie's camaraderie. It took a while for her to get used to Barbie's absence. Meanwhile, seven years passed. Her father managed to get a teaching post in Waverly, Iowa, where he first met Barbie's family. The whole family was excited because it meant the reunification with old friends. Unfortunately, it was during this second visit to the United States that Cindy discovered the blaring truth about racism. The racism she discovered, however, shielded Filipinos. Waverly's microcosmic town still accepted Filipinos into its social circle. The race it mainly denigrated was that of black Americans. Cindy discovered this when Frank Jackson, a black lieutenant in the Air Force, was not allowed to rent the house of the Ferguson family. Baffled, she asked her father: "why couldn't the Jacksons have the house?" . . . what about us? We're strangers, too. We're not even citizens of this country. We never had a hard time getting a place, including this house, had we?" (31). Mr. Aragon replied by narrating his past experience with a couple who was kind to him but not to the Chinese. Pensively, he concluded: "You know, Cindy,

in this country there seem to be subtle distinctions about color” (32). In other words, Americans who were prejudiced against certain minorities could be tolerant to others. For Cindy, the racial issue sank deeply into her consciousness. Unwittingly, she found herself coveting her mother’s *mestiza* features rather than her father’s Filipino appearance. Although she was attractive, she felt ugly precisely because she was brown. Later, she admitted that it was America’s white elitism that ruined her friendship with Barbie. She narrated:

The first time I met Barb again after seven years, oddly enough was on my thirteenth birthday. . . . There was a certain cautiousness in the way we approached each other. . . . The constraint came mostly from me, I guess, because in her own American way she really didn’t have any reservations about “color” or “belonging.”

What was it that made me hold back? For one thing, I had already had one year of interaction with American preteenagers behind in Michigan and I had, unconsciously, already formulated for myself certain categories of American “types” as they stood in relation to myself. And Barbie fitted into a type that, in Kalamazoo, I didn’t particularly feel comfortable associating with. . . .

What was this type? Tall blonde girls. Talking about boys, bragging a little, mostly rather coy. . . .

It was funny that it should end up being, basically, the question of color that would ultimately separate us. My awareness of my own alien-ness, my long straight black hair, my small thin bones, my brownness. . . . I felt very ugly and very brown. . . .

I suppose if I felt any strangeness, it was the strangeness of my own self because I was not born big and blonde and self-confident. . . . It was because Barbie was Barbie and now a stranger that I had to find friends who were like me, and finding that they were like me I think I also found myself. (40–41, 45)

Essentially, Cindy’s and Barbie’s friendship waned as they grew up and absorbed the white values of American society. America fostered a culture that made distinctions among people. Eventually, the two friends discovered that they were not the same. It was their difference that made them feel awkward with each other. For Barbie, distinctions were simply set by fashion. As a member of the mainstream culture, she was not bothered by racial differences. What mattered to her was that she and her friends were “in,” that is, they had to wear red checkered shirts whenever it was the trend, and they had to sip lime phosphate whenever it was the drink of the season. Cindy, however, was shaken by color distinctions. Thus, she resented her brown complexion. Her singularity led her to seek brunette friends and abandon Barbie. She developed a clique of friends who also belonged to the racial minority of white America. It was only then that she learned to accept her brown race.

POST-EDSA LITERATURE UP TO THE NINETIES: 1986–1999

The 1986 EDSA revolution¹¹ thwarted the *ancien regime*, and President Marcos was finally deposed. When Marcos fled, he brought with him his autarchic

leadership. Philippine democracy was restored and journalistic censorship was mitigated. The peaceful EDSA revolt shifted writers' attention toward political themes. Unfortunately, it also somehow slackened the writer's impulse to write. Francisco Arcellana noted this in his article "Philippine Literature, 1989," which was published in *The Fookien Times 1989. Philippine Yearbook*. He stated that "the Filipino writer . . . [was] dazzled by the richness of the world that his fiction . . . [was] not quite catching" (206). Fortunately, writing circles like PANULAT, UMPIL, PEN International, PLUMA, WICCA, REAPS, and Capas Foundation continued their writers' workshops, conferences, and publications to inspire budding writers.

Meanwhile, the Philippines was approaching a new epoch in its history. Global trends lured the country toward transatlantic multilateral relations. The Philippines found itself an active member of the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC), the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), and the World Trade Organization (WTO). Through these regional blocs, the cries of the French Revolution did not seem anachronistic. Internationalism modernized the utopian principles of *liberté, égalité, and fraternité* in the New World Order. However, as interstate cooperation burgeoned, the incursion of foreign values into Philippine culture accelerated.

People's attitudes toward emergent political and economic trends were somehow reflected in Philippine literature. Writers observed the continued skepticism held by Filipinos on Philippine-American relations. In "The Gecko and the Mermaid" (1988) written by N.V.M. Gonzalez, the main character was a Filipino scholar whose paper was on the "Patterns of Deception in Philippine-American Relations." In Antonio Enriquez's short story "Pablo-Pedro" (1989), a peasant mocked women's attempts to hide their brown complexion through make-up. Globalism, however, did not intend to affect only the Filipinos. Increased contact with brown people inevitably resulted in a blurring of the Americans' distinctions of color. In Edilberto K. Tiempo's "Emily" (1988), an American woman, found the Filipinos' brown complexion attractive. Her exposure to Filipinos in the United States led her to conclude that they were not physically disadvantaged.

In the 1990s, another phenomenon rocked the Philippine setting. Communication technology domesticated the Internet. Middle-class families had access to web sites that transmitted foreign cultures, images, and values. The ingress of Internet technology vis-à-vis the influx of foreign advertisements spawned by globalism expedited the de-Filipinization of Filipinos. The cult of the *maputi* resurrected in some creative works. In "Surfaces" (1994), Timothy R. Montes's romantic heroine was a "white walking flesh" (54) with a "body whitely gleaming in majestic rawness" (59). The hero Roger was captivated by the "whiteness of her thighs [that] only made him more conscious of her subtle powers" (56). The girl named Fe was not even beautiful. Roger was convinced that she was not "worth a bother" (52). But suddenly, he saw how "the woman [Fe] emerged from behind the bend trudging along the sandbar in her bleached, white dress"

(54). In short, she looked white and she wore white. Her power was doubly bewitching to the romantic hero. The writer Leoncio P. Deriada revealed a white aesthetics in his book *The Week of the Whales and Other Stories* (1994). In his collection of short stories, all the fair-skinned personae were beautiful. Whiteness practically became synonymous to beauty. For instance, in "Of Scissors and Saints," the fortune-teller Inday Isang was a "very pretty" Castilian *mestiza*. Her twelve-year-old daughter Citas had her Caucasian features, and she was similarly described as alluring. The story narrated: "Her long wavy hair, also brownish, completed the picture of ethereal beauty and innocence" (64). In "Bus Ride," a young man coincided with the father of his former love during a bus trip. The lad nonchalantly recounted about how the daughter shunned all her suitors for a Dante Mejia who was tall, handsome, and fair. Ironically, although he himself was jilted due to a woman's preference for the fair and the beautiful, he boasted of a fiancée who was likewise tall and fair-skinned.

In "Fredo Avila" (1996), the fictionist Gina Apostol parodied the dream of a *probinsiyano*¹² to compete in "The Price is Right." The dream, in itself, represented the Filipino's yearning for America. When the whole barrio learned of Fredo Avila's fortune to be a contestant in the game show, everyone marveled. The character Tio Sequiel immediately "dreamed . . . of blonde women . . . [and a] white Christmas" (41) as if an earthly paradise was constituted of a white locale. The worship of America was ubiquitous in the story. Even the narrator observed how his aunt scorned all Filipino goods whenever she watched "The Price is Right." America was the alpha and the omega of the barrio folks' myopic lives. When Fredo returned to the Philippines, however, he seemed disillusioned by America. The trip adversely affected him. Fredo abandoned his boxing profession and shifted to marathon running even when he was not bodily equipped for it. And when the narrator dared inquire about his trip, he simply answered: "Danny, did you know there is dust in America?" (51).

In another short story "Bibliolepsy, A Dissertation" (1996), Gina Apostol again revealed the Filipino's penchant for white beauties. The narrator's mother was described as beautiful inasmuch as she was twice a *mestiza*. Paternally, she was a descendant of an American. Maternally, she had Spanish blood. The narrator's sister called Anna was also a ravishing duplicate of the mother. She had "a plaster fairness of skin, moist like a new sculpture, white facility" (57). Moreover, it was her "look of foreignness [that] . . . snared men in different places" (62). Similarly, in "The Axolotl Colony" (1996), Jaime An Lim portrayed the degree by which a Filipina may wreck her family in favor of a white innamorato. In Lim's short story, the character Edith Agbayani filed for a divorce to legitimize her adulterous affair with her American paramour.

The preference for white aesthetics could be traced to the dissolution of the Filipino's racial identity. In the poem "I, In America" (1995), Ruth Mabanglo described how breathing and living in America marginalized one's national heritage. Her poem dramatized each step an immigrant takes to lose himself slowly and painfully in America. The blurring of one's roots was directly felt among

Filipino Americans who traversed to America for employment. New immigrants suffered hunger, cold, and exhaustion as they toiled for survival. They abhorred their condition but they also absorbed the very culture they spurned. Jose Dalisay's "We Global Men" (1995), exposed the Filipino's futile attempts to be respected in the global arena. The hero was a successful Filipino professional who was as competent as his foreign confreres. He obtained his graduate degree from Germany and was well traveled. His professional trips brought him to China, India, Bangkok, Seoul, Scotland, and the United States. He was basically a man of the world. During his trip to Scotland, however, he felt that the Filipino people at large had not really progressed since the colonial era. He deduced this when a foreign colleague admitted that the only Filipinos he knew were the dancers in Osaka. The Filipino protagonist felt offended by the remark. However, the comment did make him realize that for as long as Filipinos denigrated themselves in the sex trade, he would continue to look as primitive as the native Filipinos he saw on a 1910 postcard embellished by a William McKinley stamp. Finally, it was in Marjorie Evasco's "Rim of Fire" (1999), that the poetic habit of juxtaposing white and tropical images resurfaced. The poem's diametrically opposed images of "snow queen" and "tropic sun" betrayed the dual consciousness of the speaker's frame of mind. The first stanza read:

I have dreamed longer than snow queens,
 Under the tropic sun, my green breast
 Breathing the slow under-rhythms of the Pacific. (40)

The poetic voice belonged to a tropical setting and not to a wintry landscape. And yet, the speaker's frame of reference was the imagery of the snow queen. Obviously, the use of white imagery as reference point of any persona resounded in the poem.

CONCLUSION

Emmanuel Pelaez wrote in *Government by the People: My Beliefs and Ideas on our Public Affairs and National Development* in 1963: "The Arabs and the Hindus, the Chinese and the Japanese, the Spaniards and the Americans have each left their mark upon us. But whatever foreign influences we may have absorbed over the centuries, ours is essentially and basically a Malay nation" (quoted in Abueva, 1998: 578). If Filipinos were predominantly brown, their partiality toward the fair-skinned beauty was then strange and ironic. In his article "The Manglapus Nationalism as It affects Philippine Economy," J. P. De Los Reyes similarly appropriated the Malayan heritage when he said: "we are Filipinos, brown and Orientals. And that above being an Oriental, we are Filipinos first and Filipinos last" (quoted in Abueva, 1998: 174). Brownness was most essential to the Filipino identity. In fact, patriots at the turn of the century lauded the *kayumanggi* as the emblem of the quintessential Filipino. When the

Americans annexed the Philippines, Palma revealed the prevalent antipathy toward the *mestizaje*. The Filipinos took pride in their Malayan ancestry more than their Western affiliations. Thus, the 1920s still showed their unequivocal rejection of Western racial superiority. In the latter part of the decade, *kayumanggi* heroines were deemed attractive although they were never described as beautiful.

Meanwhile, America's color culture insidiously encroached upon Philippine society. It precipitated the Filipino's absorption of a white aesthetics in ascertaining physical beauty. In the 1930s, American movies romanticized white heroes and heroines. Philippine cinema also limited its choice of thespians to the *mestizaje*. The result was a subtle indoctrination of the "white is beautiful" principle. America's racial prejudice infiltrated society in such a way that those nonracist whites began to seem peculiar. Thus, Angel de Jesus's "Exile" showed how Filipinos were sometimes suspicious of a European who uncharacteristically blended with them. Occasionally, however, there were Filipinos like Conrado Pedroche's protagonist in "The Man Who Played for David" who empathized with Afro-Americans and spurned America's racial prejudice.

In the 1940s, the acculturation of white aesthetics was more deeply ingrained in the Filipino's consciousness. The proximity of Philippine independence and the sudden invasion of the Japanese made Filipinos turn to America as a political liberator. In time, America's image of beneficent hegemony led Filipinos to regard Americans as the paragon of the good and the beautiful. Thus, Salvador Faustino's "Evening of a Poet" showed an artist's espousal of an aesthetic ideal that hailed the fair-skinned and angelic as the epitome of beauty. The artist's surrender to a white aesthetics ushered the many dimensions of America's color culture in Philippine sociological experience. In the 1950s, Precioso Nicanor wrote about a man's travails in marrying a blonde and blue-eyed American in the novel *I Married an American*. In the 1960s, Bienvenido Santos's "Theme: Courage" showed a woman's description of her Filipino teacher in reference to American actors. However, in the 1970s, Sinai Hamada's "Kintana and Her Man" showed that there was an early affinity between Filipinos and African Americans during the transitional phase of 1898. In the 1980s, Edilberto K. Tiempo craftily narrated a young girl's disgust over her brown physiognomy in white America.

The 1990s witnessed the dawning of a global era. The Philippines became an active member of APEC and WTO orchestrated under the leadership of the United States. The policy of trade liberalization increased the influx of Western products and advertisements. Internet technology likewise intensified the country's exposure to Western media. White images pervaded international politics, economics, and culture alongside the spirit of globalism. Hence, Philippine literature chronicled the return of the white aesthetics, this time, in a more pernicious fashion. Fictionists depicted protagonists who now ceased to be wary about the prevalent apotheosis of the white beauty. In "Surfaces," Timothy R. Montes's romantic heroine was repeatedly mentioned as *maputi* (fair-skinned).

In *The Week of the Whales and Other Stories*, Leoncio P. Deriada described all his fair-complexioned characters as beautiful. The white aesthetics was legitimized fully in Philippine literature.

It was the Philippines' rapprochement with America that made Filipinos imbibed a white aesthetics. Historically, Filipinos showed an early admiration for the fair-complexioned belle. Their ancestry consisted of both the dark and the fair stock. Their aesthetic concept also sprung from their bilateral entente with foreigners. In pre-Spanish times, for instance, the natives had amicable relations with Arabs, Portuguese, and Italians. Hence, their appreciation for fair images was a product of their harmonious politico-economic relationship with light-skinned foreigners. The Spanish colonizers, however, introduced the idea of a racial hierarchy that denigrated Asians and raised Westerners to the level of gods. In time, Filipinos resented the discrimination. Thus, although the Spanish era had a surfeit of the *mestizaje* on stage, Filipinos ascribed their identity to the brown Malayan heritage. It was during and after the American occupation that they reverted to the white aesthetics. The Americans proved to be more democratic and humane than the Spanish colonizers. The U.S. policy of benevolent assimilation endeared the Filipinos to them. In due time, Filipinos aped American values, customs, and language in myriad forms. Philippine popular culture was Americanized. The white aesthetics that valorized the fair-skinned beauty further prevailed both in Philippine literature and society.

NOTES

1. Pinoy is a colloquial term that refers to the Filipino.
2. Italian word for olive-skinned or tanned.
3. Like present-day Philippine geography, Leyte and Samar were located in the Visayas region of the Philippines.
4. The word *indio* was a pejorative term used by the Spaniards to refer to native-born Filipinos. However, the Spaniards also made distinctions among themselves. They referred to Spaniards who were born in the Philippines as *insulares*. In contrast, they referred to Spaniards who were born in Spain as *peninsulares*. The latter formed part of the most privileged social class in the Philippines.
5. Tagalog term for brown-skinned person.
6. William Cameron Forbes was a member of the governing Philippine Commission in 1904. He became the governor-general from 1909 to 1913. O. D. Corpuz briefly mentioned him in his book *The Roots of the Filipino Nation*, vol. 2.
7. The zarzuela was a kind of musical drama that was popularized by the Spaniards in the Philippines. During the American period, Filipino writers embellished the zarzuela with patriotic themes to express their resistance against the United States.
8. Maria Clara was a demure heroine in Jose Rizal's *Noli Me Tangere*. The nationalist Rizal was executed by the Spaniards in 1896. His death catapulted the Filipino-Spanish revolution in 1898. Rizal was later proclaimed the national hero of the Philippines.
9. *Pensionados* were male and female government appointees who studied in the

United States from 1903 to 1927 through scholarships offered by the Philippine government.

10. The enlightened Filipino intellectuals during the Spanish regime.

11. EDSA stands for Epifanio De Los Santos Avenue. In 1986, millions of Filipinos converged in EDSA to protest the election results that declared Ferdinand Marcos as the presidential winner. The *en masse* protest succeeded to dethrone the Marcoses from their seat of power. Since then, the EDSA Revolution of 1986 was revered throughout the world for its peaceful manner of staging a bloodless revolution.

12. Tagalog term for a Filipino country bumpkin.

REFERENCES

- Abao, Frances. "Contextualizing Language: The Importance of Language Policy Studies in the Philippines." *Diliman Review* 47, no. 1 (1999): 33–37.
- Abueva, Jose V., ed. *The Making of the Filipino Nation and Republic*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press, 1998.
- Alegre, Edilberto. "Looking for the Filipino." In *The Making of the Filipino Nation and Republic*. Ed. Jose V. Abueva. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press, 1998. 624–26.
- Alfiler, Mercedes. "Pining Goes Hollywood." In *Short Plays of the Philippines*. Ed. Jean Edades. Manila: Benipayo Press, 1958. 61–70.
- Alzina, Francisco Ignacio. "Historia De Las Islas E Indios De Bisayas . . . 1668." In *Readings in Leyte-Samar History*. Ed. Ma. Luz C. Vilches. Tacloban: Divine Word University of Tacloban, 1979. 9–28.
- Apostol, Cecilio. "Al 'Yankee.'" Trans. Nicanor Tiongson. In *Philippine Literature: A History and Anthology*. Ed. Bienvenido Lumbera and Cynthia Nograles. Pasig City: Anvil Publishing, 1997. 106–7.
- Apostol, Gina. "Bibliolepsis, A Dissertation." In *Fiction by New Writers 1995: Catfish Arriving in Little Schools*. Ed. Ricardo De Ungria. Pasig City: Anvil Publishing, Inc., 1996. 54–79.
- . "Fredo Avila." In *Fiction by New Writers 1995: Catfish Arriving in Little Schools*. Ed. Ricardo De Ungria. Pasig City: Anvil Publishing, Inc., 1996. 36–53.
- Arcellana, Francisco. "Philippine Literature, 1989." In *The Fookien Times 1989. Philippine Yearbook*. Ed. Betty Go Belmonte. Manila: The Fookien Times Yearbook Publishing Company, Inc., 1989. 206, 360.
- Balmori, Jesus. "Navidad Puelberina." In *Early Philippine Literature: From Ancient Times to 1940*. Ed. Asuncion David-Maramba. Manila: National Book Store, Inc., 1971. 286b–286c.
- Benigno, Teodoro. "In Search of a Filipino Face." In *The Making of the Filipino Nation and Republic*. Ed. Jose V. Abueva. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press, 1998. 612.
- Bernad, Miguel. "The American Conquest in Retrospect." *Kinaadman: A Journal of the Southern Philippines* 9 (1987): 72–81.
- Camagay, Ma. Luisa. "Women Pensionados: Purveyors of Modernization Amongst Filipino Women." *Diliman Review* 45 (1997): 2–3.
- Capili, Jose Wendell. "Expatriate Themes in Philippine Poetry in English." *Diliman Review* 46, nos. 3–4 (1998): 41–47.

- Cervantes, Behn. "The Seditious Theater." *Filipino Heritage*. Vol. 9. Ed. Alfredo R. Roces. N.p.: Lahing Pilipino Publishing Inc., 1978. 2289–90.
- Concepcion, Marcela de Gracia. "Lonely." In *A Survey of Philippine Literature in English*. Part I. Ed. Rodolfo Dula and Richard Croghan. Manila: Jesuit Educational Association, 1971. 83.
- Corpuz, O. D. *The Roots of the Filipino Nation*. 2 vols. Quezon City: Aklahi Foundation, Inc., 1989.
- Cruz, Andres Cristobal, ed. *The Ravens: A Selection of Philippine Writing*. Manila: Philippine Education Co., Inc., 1980.
- Cruz-Lucero, Rosario. "Ang Rebolusyon 1896: Sa Imahinasyong Pampanitikang Ilonggo. 1898–1920." *Diliman Review* 45, no. 4, 46, no. 1 (1997–1998): 34–38.
- Daguio, Amador T. "Clothes Line." In *Storymasters II*. Ed. Alberto Florentino. Mandaluyong: Cacho Hermanos Inc., 1973. 1–6.
- Dalisay, Jose. "We Global Men." In *Penmanship and Other Stories*. Mandaluyong: Cacho Publishing House, 1995. 47–58.
- David-Maramba, Asuncion, ed. *Early Philippine Literature: From Ancient Times to 1940*. Manila: National Book Store, Inc., 1971.
- De Jesus, Angel. "Exile." In *Philippine Short Stories: 1925–1940*. Ed. Leopoldo Yabes. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press, 1997. 275–83.
- De Los Reyes, J. P. "We Are Filipinos, First and Last." In *The Making of the Filipino Nation and Republic*. Ed. Jose V. Abueva. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press, 1998. 174.
- De Manuel, Dolores. "Brown River, White Ocean: An Anthology of Twentieth-Century Philippine Literature in English." *Pilipinas: A Journal of Philippine Studies* 24 (1995): 88–91.
- Deriada, Leoncio P. "Bus Ride." In *The Week of the Whales and Other Stories*. Quezon City: New Day Publishers, 1994. 31–37.
- . "Of Scissors and Saints." In *The Week of the Whales and Other Stories*. Quezon City: New Day Publishers, 1994. 63–72.
- Dizon, Roland. "The Peopling of the Pacific." In *Readings in Philippine Prehistory*. 2nd series. Vol. 1. Manila: Filipiniana Book Guild, Inc., 1979.
- Dula, Rodolfo, and Richard Croghan, eds. *A Survey of Philippine Literature in English*. Part I. Manila: Jesuit Educational Association, 1971.
- Enriquez, Antonio. "Pablo-Pedro." In *The Night I Cry and Other Stories*. Quezon City: New Day Publishers, 1989. 24–35.
- Evasco, Marjorie. "Rim of Fire." In *Ochre Tones: Poems in English & Cebuano*. Marikina: Salimbayan Books, 1999. 40–41.
- Factora, Agapito. "A Critical Examination of the American School System in the Philippine Islands." Ph.D. diss., University of Southern California, 1940.
- Faustino, Salvador. "Evening of a Poet." In *Philippine Short Stories: 1925–1940*. Ed. Leopoldo Yabes. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press, 1997. 492–505.
- Florentino, Leona. "The Filipina Woman." In *El Folklore Filipino*. Ed. Isabelo De Los Reyes. Trans. Salud C. Dizon and Maria Elinora P. Imson. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press, 1994. 285.
- Gloria, Angela Manalang. "To a Mestiza." In *The Complete Poems of Angela Manalang Gloria*. Ed. Edna Zapanta Manlapaz. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1993. 41.

- Gonzalez, N.V.M. "In the Twilight." In *The Bread of Salt and Other Stories*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press, 1998. 152–55.
- . "The Gecko and the Mermaid." In *The Bread of Salt and Other Stories*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press, 1998. 156–64.
- Guerrero, Fernando Ma. "Mi Patria." Trans. Nicanor Tiongson. In *Philippine Early Philippine Literature: From Ancient Times to 1940*. Ed. Asuncion David-Maramba. Manila: National Book Store, Inc., 1971. 284, 286a–b.
- Hamada, Sinai. "Kintana and Her Man." In *Storymasters II*. Ed. Alberto Florentino. Mandaluyong: Cacho Hermanos Inc., 1973. 18–23.
- Hernandez, Amado. "Ang Kulay Ng Pilipino." In *Parnasong Tagalog ni A. G. Abadilla*. Ed. Efren Abueg. Maynila: MCS Enterprises, Inc., 1973. 111–12.
- Jocano, Landa F. "Labaw Donggon." In *Early Philippine Literature: From Ancient Times to 1940*. Ed. Asuncion David-Maramba. Manila: National Book Store, Inc., 1971. 69.
- Kipling, Rudyard. "The Ballad of East and West." In *Kipling: A Selection of His Stories and Poems*, Vol. 2. Ed. John Beecroft. New York: Doubleday & Company, 1892. 425.
- Lardizabal, Santamaria. "Pioneer American Teachers and Philippine Education." Ph.D. diss., Stanford University, 1956.
- Latorena, Paz. "Desire." In *Philippine Short Stories: 1925–1940*. Ed. Leopoldo Yabes. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press, 1997. 73–79.
- . "Sunset." In *Philippine Short Stories: 1925–1940*. Ed. Leopoldo Yabes. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press, 1997. 91–100.
- Leogardo, Felicitas, Vicente Leogardo, and M. R. Jacobo. *A History of the Philippines*. Quezon City: Philippine Book Company, 1995.
- Lim, Jaime An. "Literature and Politics: The Colonial Experience in the Philippine Novel." Ph.D. diss., Indiana University, 1989.
- . "The Axolotl Colony." In *Fiction by New Writers 1995: Catfish Arriving in Little Schools*. Ed. Ricardo De Ungria. Pasig City: Anvil Publishing, Inc., 1996. 83–99.
- Lumbera, Cynthia Nograles, and Teresita Gimenez-Maceda. *Rediscovery: Essays in Philippine Life and Culture*. Quezon City: National Bookstore, 1977.
- Mabanglo, Ruth. "I, In America." In *Pilipinas: A Journal of Philippine Studies* 24 (1995): 81.
- Marquez-Benitez, Paz. "Dead Stars." In *A Survey of Philippine Literature in English*. Part I. Ed. Rodolfo Dula and Richard Croghan. Manila: Jesuit Educational Association, 1971. 34–52.
- Mercado, Monina, ed. *Doña Sisang Filipino Movies*. Philippines: Vera-Reyes, Inc., 1977.
- Molina, Antonio. *The Philippines: Through the Centuries*. Vol. 1. Manila: U.S.T. Cooperative, 1960.
- Montes, Timothy R. "Surfaces." In *The Black Men and Other Stories*. Pasig City: Anvil Publishing Inc., 1994. 9–21.
- Nash, Frederick. "The Philippine Educational Problem." *Western Journal of Education* 16 (1901): 3–8.
- Nicanor, Precioso. *I Married an American*. Los Angeles: American Book Institute, 1953.
- Ordoñez, Elmer. "An Embarrassment of Riches." *Sunday Times Magazine*, July 16, 1989: 10–12.

- Palma, Rafael. "El Alma De España." In *Latidos Del Alma Filipina*. Ed. Edgardo Tiamson Mendoza. Manila: Bookmark, 1984. 103–4.
- Pedroche, Conrado. "The Man Who Played for David." In *Philippine Short Stories: 1925–1940*. Ed. Leopoldo Yabes. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press, 1997. 398–403.
- Pelaez, Emmanuel. "Our Essential Identity." In *The Making of the Filipino Nation and Republic*. Ed. Jose V. Abueva. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press, 1998. 578.
- Pilar, Santiago A. "The Old Movie Melons and Lemons." In *Filipino Heritage*. Vol. 9. Ed. Alfredo R. Roces. N.p.: Lahing Pilipino Publishing Inc., 1978. 2470–77.
- Quirino, Carlos. "The Chronicles of Pigafetta." In *Filipino Heritage*. Vol. 3. Ed. Alfredo R. Roces. N.p.: Lahing Pilipino Publishing Inc., 1977. 828–32.
- Ramos, Benigno. "Ang Kayumanggi." In *Parnasong Tagalog ni A. G. Abadilla*. Ed. Efren Abueg. Maynila: MCS Enterprises, Inc., 1973. 134.
- Rosario, D. A. "Aloha." In *Early Philippine Literature: From Ancient Times to 1940*. Ed. Asuncion David-Maramba. Manila: National Book Store, Inc., 1971. 333–41.
- . "Greta Garbo." In *Philippine Literature: A History and Anthology*. Ed. Bienvenido Lumbera and Cynthia Nograles. Pasig City: Anvil Publishing, 1997. 137–41.
- Salas, Dindo. "Retelling Philippine History." *People's Progress* 1, no. 3 (1984): 4–5, 21–22.
- Santos, Bienvenido. "Brother, My Brother." In *Brother, My Brother*. Intro. Leonard Casper. Makati City: Bookmark, 1960. 267–81.
- . "The Little Maid." In *Brother, My Brother*. Intro. Leonard Casper. Makati City: Bookmark, 1960. 239–52.
- . "Theme: Courage." In *Brother, My Brother*. Intro. Leonard Casper. Makati City: Bookmark, 1960. 125–36.
- . "The Day the Dancers Came." In *Philippine Literature. A History and Anthology*. Ed. Bienvenido Lumbera and Cynthia Nograles. Pasig City: Anvil Publishing, 1997. 282–93.
- Scott, William Henry. *Barangay*. Quezon City: Ateneo De Manila University Press, 1997.
- Serrano, Josephine, and Trinidad Ames. *A Survey of Filipino Literature in English (From Apprenticeship to Contemporary)*. Manila: U.S.T. Printing Office, 1975.
- "Song of My Seven Lovers." Trans. Frank Laubach. In *Early Philippine Literature: From Ancient Times to 1940*. Ed. Asuncion David-Maramba. Manila: National Book Store, Inc., 1971. 120.
- Teodoro, Luis. "How it is to be . . . Not Quite Brown." In *Filipino Heritage*. Vol. 6. Ed. Alfredo R. Roces. N.p.: Lahing Pilipino Publishing Inc., 1978. 1672–73.
- Tiempo, Edilberto K. "Emily." In *Rainbow for Rima*. Quezon City: New Day Publishers, 1988. 111–36.
- . "Goodbye, Barbie." In *A Novelette and Five Short Stories*. Quezon City: New Day Publishers, 1982. 5–45.
- Tiongson, Nicanor G. "Four Values in Filipino Drama and Film." In *Revaluation: Essays on Philippine Literature, Cinema and Popular Culture*. Ed. Bienvenido Lumbera. Manila: Index Press, 1984. 198–211.
- Tonogbanua, Francisco. *Philippine Literature in English*. Manila: Delna Enterprises, 1984.

- Villa, Jose Garcia. "The Fence." In *Philippine Short Stories: 1925–1940*. Ed. Leopoldo Yabes. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press, 1997. 43–49.
- . "Untitled Story." In *Philippine Short Stories: 1925–1940*. Ed. Leopoldo Yabes. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press, 1997. 172–80.
- Villa, Lilia. "Educating Josefina." In *Short Plays of the Philippines*. Ed. Jean Edades. Manila: Benipayo Press, 1958. 1–8.
- Worcester, Dean. *The Philippines Past and Present*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1914.
- Zaide, Gregorio. *Philippine Political and Cultural History*. Vol. 1. Manila: Philippine Education Company, 1957.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author of this chapter wishes to thank Abigail de Leon for her valuable research assistance.

PART II

SOCIETY AND POLITICS

The American Influence on Philippine Political and Constitutional Tradition

Wilfrido V. Villacorta

The question has always been asked: Has American mentorship of the Philippines in the ways of democracy been a blessing? On balance, the U.S. democratic contribution has been largely positive, although there were indeed some weak points. The Americans could have addressed further the agrarian problem, which had been the primary grievance of most Filipinos. They could also have strengthened the civil service as much as the British had in their colonies. In both cases, the American authorities found difficulty in insulating the political economy and the civil service from the dominant influence of the traditional landed elite. The latter, which was the carryover from the Spanish period, easily found their way into the leadership of the political system and the bureaucracy.

Democracy, nonetheless, has taken root in the Philippines. This is not only to the credit of the Americans for the soil for transplanting democracy was fertilized by the blood and aspirations of Filipino reformists and revolutions. Such libertarian aspirations were sustained by the Filipino leaders of the Commonwealth period, who made sure that their American mentors lived up to what they taught: constitutionalism, civil rights, and freedom. We can see that these ideals not only live to this day, but also continue to be upheld as the nation's reason for existence.

WAS THE PHILIPPINES RIPE FOR DEMOCRACY?

In studies on the transplantability of democracy to other cultures, there are two schools of thought. One claims that Western democracy can be exported easily to non-Western societies because the human attraction for freedoms and

rights is natural and universal. The other school asserts that every society has its unique circumstances and characteristics that are different from other societies, and must, therefore, find its own political system that suits the temperament of its people.

The experience of the Philippines shows that these two lines of thinking are not mutually exclusive. While the findings of some scholars indicate that Filipino indigenous political culture tends toward authoritarianism, centuries of Spanish colonial rule generated a backlash against centralized political authority. This had its manifestation in the various rebellions that culminated in the Revolution of 1896–1898. But the latter was not a mere eruption of accelerating rebellious sentiments. The Revolution was nourished by liberal democratic ideas that were imbibed by Filipino reformists and interpreted and propagated by them among their countrymen.

This exposure to liberal theory coupled with popular expectations raised by the lofty goals of the Independence Proclamation in Cavite and the Congress convened in Malolos were catalysts that made for the easy acceptance of American political ideals and institutions. It may be argued that only the *ilustrado* or intellectual class was reached by democratic ideas. But such was inevitable in a nineteenth-century, colonized society where political consciousness was usually fashioned by the elite.

THE ROOTS OF ELITIST DEMOCRACY

In understanding democracy in the Philippines, it is necessary to know the background of the traditional elite. Spanish colonization, which began in 1575, put in place a landed class. The landlords acquired their estates through land grants, purchases, and, in many cases, land grabbing. Most of these landlords had Spanish blood, and many of them descended from elements of the pre-colonial native aristocracy that were co-opted by the Spanish colonial authorities.

Three and a half centuries of Spanish rule deeply entrenched the power of the landed class (*caciques* or *hacenderos*). With the emergence of *nouveau riche* merchant classes in the early nineteenth century, an increasing number of old landed families intermarried with affluent Chinese and Filipinos. The offsprings of these intermarriages—Spanish and Chinese *mestizos*—had access to university education in Manila as well as Madrid and gave rise to the *ilustrados* or intellectuals who became more conscious of their Filipinoness.

Many of them participated in the reform movement led by Dr. Jose Rizal and the Philippine revolution in its later stages. They also comprised the majority of delegates to the constitutional convention and the legislature of the first Philippine Republic that was based in Malolos, Bulacan (see Agoncillo, 1960).

When the United States established its rule in the country, a significant number of the *ilustrados* and *hacenderos* crossed over to the camp of the new colonizers. The American authorities, for their part, were conscious of the strategic importance of capturing the loyalty of the landed elite and the constant

supply of their agricultural products for the U.S. market. Expectedly, they were careful not to threaten the interests of the *hacenderos*. In the absence of land reform, the same feudal system that prevailed during the Spanish period remained (see Salamanca, 1984).

Moreover, the cooperation of the local elites was essential in the pacification campaign. The rewards for such cooperation took the form of appointments to top positions in government and—when the Philippine Assembly and Congress were formed—support for their electoral bids for local and national positions. What developed, therefore, was a situation in which the good intentions of democratic education had to concede to the imperatives of colonialism and the realities of a feudal economy. To this day, elections have been virtually intraelite competition.

According to David Timberman, “the American colonial period was characterized by a devolution of power to the Filipino elite and a lively give and take between American colonial officials and Philippine leaders” (Timberman, 1991: 9). Benedict Anderson noted that a feature of the period was “the huge proliferation of provincial and elective offices—in the absence of an autocratic territorial bureaucracy. From very early on mestizo *caciques* understood that these offices, in the right hands, could be considered as their local political fiefdoms. Not unexpectedly, the right hands were those of family and friends” (Anderson, 1998: 203).

The Americans concentrated on the political aspect of democracy, which was training the Filipinos in self-government. Until the 1930s when the “New Deal” was conceived in the United States, the American experience in democratic development never considered wealth-equalizing measures like agrarian reform as a prerequisite to democracy. The focus was more the individual and his empowerment through education and political participation.

The character and behavior of the national and local elite, which had been shaped by patronage extended by the Spanish, American and later, Japanese colonial rulers, led to a paternalistic approach to democracy in the Philippines. Lucien Pye describes the Philippine elite as “not a stable hierarchy of patrons, each with his own set of clients, but rather a dynamic society of people, all of whom are competing to gain more privileges, to appear to be more above the law than others, and to be more deserving of honor and respect” (Pye, 1985: 124; see also Cullinane in McCoy, 1994:163–241).

The democratic political culture that emerged in the Philippines can be attributed to the country’s history and social structure. Samuel Huntington (1993) observed that American democracy cannot be replicated easily. It is rooted in an egalitarian society built by migrants who escaped from the inequities of European monarchic rules: “American democracy has been shaped by English heritage, empty spaces and free land, the absence of an aristocracy, massive immigration, vertical and horizontal social mobility, minimum government and pervasive middle-class liberal ethos” (Huntington, 1993:3).

PUBLIC EDUCATION AND DEMOCRATIC TRAINING

Nevertheless, the introduction by the Americans of the public school system and the granting of scholarships for talented Filipinos to study in the United States increased the potential for social mobility and effective training in electoral democracy. Called *pensionados*, they later occupied crucial positions in the executive and legislative branches of government.

David Wurfel described the impact of education during the American period: “The school population expanded 500 percent in a generation, and educational expenditures came to consume one-half of government budgets at all levels. Indeed, educational opportunity in the Philippines was greater than in any other colony in Asia. As a consequence of this pedagogical explosion, literacy doubled to 50 percent in the 1930s and English, the language of instruction, was spoken by 27 percent of the population, a larger percentage than spoke any one of the native dialects” (Wurfel, 1988: 9).

Wurfel also paid tribute to the extent of political participation during the four decades of American rule: “The American period, despite its brevity and because of its recency, has left a political legacy in contemporary Philippines perhaps as great as that of the Spanish era. The expansion of political participation was perhaps the greatest change. In 1907, the first elected legislature in Southeast Asia was chosen by an electorate limited by property qualifications. Thirty years later, all literate adults, with literacy tests that was rather generous to the voter, had the right to vote” (Wurfel, 1988: 10).

The American mentors on democracy stressed the central role of elections. Lucien Pye makes the following assessment:

Almost from the beginning of American rule, the Filipinos were taught that politics meant elections, not careers in the civil service. With this rule came the free-for-all spirit of grandiose promises, back-room deals, and patronage. With independence, the Philippines did not inherit bureaucratic structures comparable to those in Burma, Indonesia, or even Thailand. Instead, government during the Commonwealth period was the city-hall politics of mayors and congressmen dealing with constituents, and of presidents distributing favors to deserving provinces (Pye, 1985: 121).

We must remember that the United States had its own political problems at this time. Benedict Anderson (1998) points out that the America of 1900–1930 was the America of Woodrow Wilson’s lamented “congressional government.” The metropole had no powerful centralized professional bureaucracy; office was still heavily a matter of political patronage; corrupt urban machines and venal court-house rural cliques were still pervasive; and the authority of presidents, except in times of war, was still restricted” (Anderson, 1998: 202).

While the trappings of electoral democracy that were put in place created a semblance of political equality, the myth did not succeed in abating the prevalent social inequality. Wurfel emphasized that while an urban middle class, both

salaried and propertied, had appeared to be “the primary beneficiaries of American educational, commercial and agrarian policies, those who already had superior wealth, education, [are the] men whose political power grew rapidly under American tutelage” (Wurfel, 1988: 12).

ENDURING AMERICAN CONTRIBUTIONS

Despite these shortcomings, I believe that the lasting American influence on the Philippine political system can be found in three institutions: (1) commitment to civil rights, (2) the presidential form of government, and (3) constitutional supremacy.

Civil rights, which are anchored on the dignity and equality of all individual persons, have remained as a foundation of Philippine democracy. Freedom of expression is the most cherished of civil rights. Despite the repression during the Marcos regime, demonstrations, rallies, the underground press, and open rebellion continued. To this day, any leader who has dictatorial aspirations would have to contend with the Filipino’s jealous protection of freedoms and civil rights.

The Filipino has also gotten used to choosing directly the chief executive. For almost sixty years, the country has been operating under a presidential form of government. It would be difficult for the electorate to appreciate the parliamentary system in which the right to select the head of government is left in the hands of a select group of legislators. For the Filipino, this is tantamount to violating the birthright for no other way of electing a leader is known. The presidential system is deeply ingrained in Filipino political culture, dating back to the days of the *barangay* when the freemen chose their *datu*.¹ So too would it be unthinkable for Americans to adopt a parliamentary system because they were fearful of a strong executive.

The U.S. Constitution provides that no person may hold office simultaneously in more than one of the three branches of government. The framers of the U.S. Constitution did not look kindly at the British parliamentary model in which the prime minister is the head of both the executive and legislative branches. James Madison took the lead in calling for a government that was sufficiently strong to maintain law and order but divided enough to prevent the rise of tyranny: “No political truth is certainly of greater intrinsic value, or is stamped with the authority of more enlightened patrons of liberty, than that of the accumulation of all powers, legislative, executive and judiciary, in the same hands whether of one, a few, or many, and whether hereditary, self-appointed, or elective, may justly be pronounced the very definition of tyranny” (*Federalist Papers*, 1961).

The fact that the citizens are the ones determining who occupies the position of the presidency makes the chief executive directly accountable to them. The Filipinos went farther than the Americans. They do not want a president who stays too long in office. The 1935 constitution originally barred reelection for the president, but President Quezon engineered the adoption of an amendment

that would allow him to run for reelection. However, from Roxas to Macapagal, no president was reelected. Marcos was the only reelected chief executive in the postwar years and see what happened. The 1987 constitution reconstituted the people's sentiment against presidential reelection.

The third enduring legacy of the American tutorship in democracy is constitutionalism. While it may be said that we keep changing our constitutions, there has always been a tradition of regarding as sacrosanct the fundamental law currently in place. Officials take their oath to uphold the constitution and always invoke it in their deliberations. The Supreme Court as the final interpreter of the charter remains as the most revered pillar of government.

This reverence for the constitution is behind popular resistance to amend the present Philippine constitution. The survey of the Social Weather Station from March 1999 shows that 86 percent of the respondents were against charter revision. A massive rally led by former President Corazon Aquino and Cardinal Jaime Sin in Makati City was attended by some 150,000 persons from various sectors. It was the first of a series of mass actions that would mobilize opposition to attempts to extend term limits of elected officials, curb the Supreme Court's judicial review, and give foreigners the right to own properties that are reserved for Filipinos.

THE CENTRALITY OF DEMOCRATIC PRINCIPLES IN THE PHILIPPINE CONSTITUTION

The first Philippine constitution was framed in Malolos in 1899. It was influenced primarily by the Mexican constitution. On the other hand, the 1935 constitution that was written during the American period was similar to the U.S. Constitution in form and substance.

The 1973 constitution attempted to depart from the American political model and introduced the parliamentary system. However, Ferdinand Marcos managed to introduce amendments that detracted from the original intentions of the framers and legitimized his dictatorial regime.

The present Philippine constitution, which was drafted by a constitutional commission in 1986 and ratified in a plebiscite by an overwhelming majority vote in 1987, contains more contemporary concepts in democracy and development that were inspired by the country's liberation from thirteen years of authoritarianism. They include rights of the marginalized and indigenous communities, social justice, gender rights, right of self-determination, right to life, rights of children and the family, rights of the accused, humanitarian rights of prisoners, abolition of the death penalty (except for heinous crimes), right to information on public policy, accountability of public officials, education for all, nationalism and patriotism in the curriculum, freedom from nuclear weapons, and protection of the environment.

The following provisions of Article II (Declaration of Principles and State Policies) of the 1987 constitution highlight its commitment to democracy:

Section 1. The Philippines is a democratic and republican State. Sovereignty resides in the people and all government authority emanates from them.

Section 3. Civilian authority is, at all times, supreme over the military.

Section 4. The prime duty of the Government is to serve and protect the people.

Section 5. The maintenance of peace and order, the protection of life, liberty and property, and the promotion of the general welfare are essential to the enjoyment by all the people of the blessings of democracy.

Basic civil rights are mandated in Article III (Bill of Rights). In addition, there are some innovative provisions that have been incorporated that in other democratic countries are not found in their constitutions but in their laws:

Section 7. The right of the people to information on matters of public concern shall be recognized. Access to official records, and to documents, and papers pertaining to official acts, transactions, or decisions, as well as to government research data used as the basis for policy development, shall be afforded the citizen, subject to such limitations as may be provided by law.

Section 12. (1) Any person under investigation for the commission of an offense shall have the right to remain silent and to have competent and independent counsel preferably of his own choice. If the person cannot afford the services of counsel, he must be provided with one. These rights cannot be waived except in writing and in the presence of counsel.

(2) No torture, force, violence, threat, intimidation, or any other means which vitiate the free will shall be used against him. Secret detention places, solitary, incommunicado, or other similar forms of detention are prohibited.

Section 14. (2) In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall be presumed innocent until the contrary is proved, and shall enjoy the right to be heard by himself and counsel, to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation against him, to have a speedy, impartial, and public trial, to meet the witnesses face to face, and to have compulsory process to secure the attendance of witnesses and the production of evidence in his behalf. However, after arraignment, trial may proceed notwithstanding the absence of the accused provided that he has been duly notified and his failure to appear is unjustifiable.

Section 19. (1) Excessive fines shall not be imposed, nor cruel, degrading or inhuman punishment inflicted. Neither shall the death penalty be imposed, unless, for compelling reasons involving heinous crimes, the Congress hereafter provides for it. Any death penalty already imposed shall be reduced to reclusion perpetua.

(2) The employment of physical, psychological, or degrading punishment against any prisoner or detainee or the use of substandard or inadequate penal facilities under subhuman conditions shall be dealt with by law.

Article VI (The Legislative Department) contains the functions of the two houses of the Congress, which are similar to those of the U.S. Congress. How-

ever, the article also stipulates for party-list representatives who constitute 20 percent of the House of Representatives. Moreover, senators are elected not by district but nationally.

Article VII (The Executive Department) vests executive power in the president. Unlike the U.S. system, both the president and the vice president are elected by direct vote for a term of six years. The president is limited to one term only. It is possible for the vice president to come from a party different from that of the president. As a reaction to the martial-law experience, extensive limiting powers have been given to the Congress and the Supreme Court in reducing the effects of the presidential prerogative to suspend the writ of habeas corpus and to declare martial law during emergency situations.

The Philippine constitution is perhaps the only fundamental law with separate articles on local government and autonomous regions, social justice and human rights, education, science, and culture. It provides for an ombudsman to prosecute graft cases and has several sections limiting the powers of the armed forces.

PASSING THE TEST

Philippine democracy may seem to fall short of some standards of advanced democracies where political rights and freedoms are buttressed by their advanced stage of economic development. In these developed economies, citizens do not generally sell their votes and elect their officials based on their stand on issues rather than on their personal appeal.

It is too much simplification, however, to say that the Philippines is a caricature of American democracy. I believe that the Filipino people and even our leaders ought to be congratulated for their modest successes in the areas of popular participation and democratic governance. Ours is the most viable democracy in Southeast Asia. And this accounts in large measure for our being better off than our Asian neighbors who are similarly afflicted by financial crisis. Our vociferous press, our vigilant civil society, our interdependent, yet independent-minded branches of government ensure the health and dynamism of our democracy.

We need only to observe the predicament of our neighbors in Asia and even our distant cousins in Latin America to appreciate the benefits of our presidential democracy. And these blessings we owe not only to the American legacy, but more especially, to the libertarian heritage of our Founding Fathers and freedom fighters.

NOTE

1. *Barangay* was the term for the precolonial political communities, which were headed by the *datu* or chieftains. During the martial law period, then-president Ferdinand Marcos replaced the term *barrio*, which referred to villages, with *barangay*. It was part of his efforts to "indigenize" Philippine politics.

REFERENCES

- Agoncillo, Teodoro. 1960. *Malolos: The Crisis of the Republic*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press.
- Aguilar, Filomeno. 1992. "Of Cocks and Bets: Gambling, Class Structuring, and State Formation in the Philippines." Paper presented at the Conference of the Program for Southeast Asian Studies, Arizona State University. March 21–22.
- Anderson, Benedict. 1998. *The Spectre of Comparisons: Nationalism, Southeast Asia and the World*. London and New York: Verso.
- Blount, James H. 1913. *The American Occupation of the Philippines*. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.
- Doronila, Amando. 1992. *The State, Economic Transformation, and Political Change in the Philippines*. Singapore: Oxford University Press.
- Evans, Harold. 1998. *The American Century*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Foner, Eric. 1998. *The Story of American Freedom*. New York: W. W. Norton and Co.
- Friend, Theodore. 1965. *Between Two Empires*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Gebhardt, Jurgen. 1993. *Americanism: Revolutionary Order and Societal Self-Interpretation in the American Republic*. Trans. Ruth Hein. Baton Rouge and London: Louisiana State University Press.
- Golay, Frank H. 1997. *Face of Empire*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Gutierrez, Eric et al. 1992. *All in the Family: A Study of Elites and Power Relations in the Philippines*. Quezon City: Ateneo Center for Social Policy and Public Affairs.
- Huntington, Samuel. 1993. "American Democracy in Relation to Asia." In *Democracy and Capitalism: Asian and American Perspectives*. Edited by Robert Bartley, Chan Heng Cheem, Samuel Huntington, and Shijuro Ogata. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.
- Johnson, Paul. 1997. *A History of the American People*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers.
- Kaplan, Robert. 1998. *An Empire Wilderness: Travels into America's Future*. New York: Random House.
- Kimura, Masataka. 1997. *Elections and Politics Philippine Style: A Case in Lipa*. Manila: De La Salle University Press.
- Lande, Carl. 1996. *Post-Marcos Politics: A Geographical and Statistical Analysis of the 1992 Presidential Election*. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.
- Madison, James. 1961 reprint. "Federalist No. 47." *The Federalist Papers*. New York: Mentor Books.
- McCoy, Alfred, ed. 1994. *An Anarchy of Families: State and Family in the Philippines*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- National Democratic Institute for International Affairs and National Citizens Movement for Free Elections. 1996. *Making Every Vote Count: Domestic Election Monitoring in Asia*. Washington, D.C.: National Democratic Institute for International Affairs.
- Owen, Norman et al. N.d. *Compadre Colonialism: Philippine-American Relations: 1898–1946*. Manila: Solidaridad Publishing House.
- Pye, Lucien. 1985. *Asian Power and Politics: The Cultural Dimensions of Authority*. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Rivera, Temario. 1994. "The State, Civil Society, and Foreign Actors: The Politics of

- Philippine Industrialization." *Contemporary Southeast Asia* 16, no. 2 (September): 157–77.
- Salamanca, Bonifacio S. 1984. *The Filipino Reaction to American Rule*. Quezon City: New Day.
- Timberman, David. 1991. *A Changeless Land: Continuity and Change in Philippine Politics*. Manila: Bookmark; Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.
- United States Information Service. 1998. *The American Contribution to Philippine Education*. Makati: USIS, Manila Office.
- Villacorta, Wilfrido V. 1994. "The Curse of the Weak State: Leadership Imperatives for the Ramos Government." *Contemporary Southeast Asia* 16, no. 1 (June): 67–92.
- Wurfel, David. 1988. *Filipino Politics: Development and Decay*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.

Shaping the Filipino Nation: The Role of Civil Society

Jose Rene C. Gayo

In the popular vernacular, “civil society organizations” are often equated with “nongovernment organizations” (NGOs). This chapter examines the role of “social development organizations,” a more precise term than either to explain the functioning of democracy in the Philippines. The roots of democracy can be traced back to the early years of Philippine history but had their growth in the consciousness of Philippine NGOs or civil society, particularly in the Philippines context. The focus of this chapter is on the influence of social development organizations in shaping the Filipino nation, specifically on the functioning of a democratic republic. Social development organizations can now be counted as one of the mainstream civil society organizations and a crucial element in civil life during American colonial rule.

DEFINITION AND CLARIFICATION OF KEY CONCEPTS

First, one needs to clarify key concepts. I have observed, in various forums and from what has been written in the literature, that there is still no common language concerning some key ideas relevant to our discussion (maybe because some of these concepts are relatively new or there is a general lack of understanding).

What is *civil society*? As Baron describes it:

The concept of civil society has a long history in Western political thought. In medieval Europe, it referred to efforts by an emerging bourgeoisie to resist the absolute authority of monarchy and to create a space in which private enterprise could flourish. In the

eighteenth century, the concept of civil society as a community of free and equal citizens standing in opposition to the monarchy and enjoying “natural” rights and freedoms, found expression in the French Declaration on the Rights of Man and the Citizen (1789) and in the “self-evident rights” enshrined in the American Declaration of Independence from British colonial rule. More recently, during the 1980s, the term came into vogue again, this time with particular reference to the efforts of the East Europeans to free themselves from the Soviet government and communist rule. In each of these historical usage, civil society was viewed as a counterweight to a dominant state, an effort to create political space in which citizens could exercise their rights to free association and expression, usually in opposition to the State.

In common usage among western political scientists and donor agencies, the term civil society therefore refers primarily to the wide variety of voluntary associations and citizen groups which now exist in many countries around the world and constitute the primary vehicles for individual citizens to articulate their views and participate in policy processes. The common assumption is that freedom of association and the existence of a vibrant nonprofit sector contribute to, and are defining characteristics of, democratic political systems. (Baron, 1997)

It is too limiting to define civil society as voluntary associations. In the classic definition given by St. Thomas Aquinas in his *Summa Theologia* and *Commentaries*, civil society is “a group or association to which man belongs to, which assists him in regard to complete sufficiency so that he may not merely live but also live well, for the purpose of purely temporal common good” (Gilby, 1952).

A healthy society requires three vital sectors: a public sector of effective governments; a private sector of effective businesses; and a social sector of effective community organizations (Drucker Foundation, 1998) with all working in partnership for the common good.

The concept of government and business as distinct and separate types of organizations are understood easily. The “social development organizations” (SDOs) are characterized by voluntary and free association and provide common bonding of free individuals to form themselves into a group for mutual interests. SDOs can be classified as two types: member-serving organizations that exist to serve their members and public-serving organizations that serve the public (Salamon, 1996). The former includes business and professional organizations, social and fraternal organizations, mutual and cooperative organizations, and so forth. Public-serving organizations include funding intermediaries,¹ churches, service providers,² and social welfare organizations.³

Social development organizations have played and will continue to play a key role in shaping the Filipino nation specifically in its adherence to democratic principles of governance. SDOs have also played a role in social and political change in the Philippines particularly in terms of social justice and poverty alleviation, and this role is likely to grow. The development of SDOs is the particular contribution of American colonial rule, when the seeds of various civil society organizations that form the fabric of a democratic republic were sown in our soil.

HISTORY OF SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATIONS IN THE PHILIPPINES

Pre-Hispanic Times

Based on the accounts by both Chinese and Spanish historians on the pre-Hispanic way of life of native Filipinos, there had already been activities manifesting the nature of civic-mindedness, self-governance at the community level, and social development initiatives.

Chinese historians cited instances in which the natives of the Philippine Islands had practiced—what we could consider today—as co-operatives. The Philippines then were populated by many autonomous communities (termed as *barangays*), each led by a *datu* or chief. In many instances, as noted by both Chinese and later by Spanish historians, the *datu*s were more administrative heads than kings. Offerings or tributes to *datu*s mainly came from foreign traders or visitors. Offerings from the citizens of the community were also given to these visitors and traders in the presence of the *datu*. The existence of such offerings (presumably as tokens or gifts) is probably what led conquistadors to the perception that the *datu* was comparable to the position of a European king (Zaide, 1990).

Spanish historians such as Francisco Colin and Miguel de Loarca also gave similar accounts, but were less than appreciative of the level of development the native population had attained in terms of self-rule prior to colonization of the Philippines (De la Torre, 1986).

The American historian H. Otley Beyer (1967) cited the case of the Kalingas and Ifugaos, both of whom demonstrated the ability to form cooperating extended households, or kinships, in order to achieve large-scale projects, such as the construction of rice terraces. The effort is designed to provide subsistence for the mutual benefit of all involved. The concept of family-based collaborative or collective groups was the same overarching principle in the *barangays*. These groups banded together for the mutual protection and economic survival of the member families, and interrelationships between the groups were usually cemented through intermarriages. However, these interrelationships were sporadic, and Spanish historians provide accounts of constant vendettas between warring communities (Mendoza, 1986).

Trading between these communities and with the inhabitants of China, Indo-China, Moluccas, and Borneo were very frequent during pre-Hispanic times. Goods consisted mainly of agriculture produce and precious materials such as gold, pearl, and tortoise-shell. As mentioned in the Chinese accounts, particularly by Chau Ju-Kua, a typical display of the sociocivic spirit among Philippine communities could be observed during the trading transaction. During trading, members of the community acted in unison when collecting the goods for barter and bringing them to the traders' ships, and all members were involved during the transaction, with the *datu* acting as chief negotiator (Zaide, 1990).

Spanish Occupation

Pigmentation dictated the position one held in society, politics, and business during Spanish times. The highest positions were held by the Spanish purebloods: the *insulares* (born in Spain) and the *peninsulares* or *criollos* (born in the Philippines). The *criollos* were generally looked down upon by the *insulares*. Because of the Spanish practice of sending society's undesirables to the islands, the *criollos* were regarded by *insulares* in toto as "descendants of scoundrels, rebels, murderers, wanton women and what not." *Mestizos* resulting from intermarriages between pure Spaniards and local *indios* and Chinese were treated as even less desirable, even when *mestizos* associated themselves more with the *insulares* and *criollos*. Like the pure-blood Spaniards, *mestizos* were usually merchants or property owners, but had less status in social circles (Cordero-Fernando and Ricio, 1990).

Native Filipinos, or *indios*, were the lowest in the pecking order, looked down upon by the *peninsulares*, *insulares*, and the *mestizos*. They were comprised of the new rich (who benefited from the economic growth of the mid-1800s), the educated or *ilustrados* (who were neither well off nor poor), and the masses. The term *indio* had acquired the connotation of being inferior in many ways, and they were treated by higher classes as such. As a result, little interaction in economic and social activities transpired between those who held and controlled the economic and political power and those who toiled the land. The masses primarily suffered from the distancing of the classes, being deprived of basic social benefits, such as access to education, housing, and health (Cordero-Fernando and Ricio, 1990).

The Spaniards grouped communities together in *pueblos* or towns. The resulting overcrowding in towns produced unsanitary living conditions. Furthermore, some of the tribes, kinships, and *barangays* used to be hostile to one another, and the concentration of these groups in one area generated personal maladjustments and economic dislocations, not dissimilar to the situation experienced by Native Americans during the pre-Civil War period. Most notable in Spanish colonial history are the well-documented accounts of the punitive measures implemented by the Spanish rulers. Problems of destitution and indigency have been attributed to such practices, as exemplified in the works of Dr. Jose Rizal: the *La Solidaridad* and *El Filibusterismo* (Mendoza, 1986).

Some of the *encomenderos*⁴ and landowners were motivated into providing aid to some of the grieving masses in an effort to do good for the salvation of their souls. This demonstrates the influence of Catholic beliefs in creating religious charity work, a motivation that has been the driving factor for the establishment of schools, hospitals, and asylums during Spanish times. Examples of such religious charity work include the first hospital established in the Philippines, founded in 1565 by Don Miguel Lopez de Legaspi in Cebu (later transferred to Manila and called the Hospitalito de Sta. Ana). Among the schools

founded were the Parochial School of Cebu (1565, the first in the archipelago), the Colegio de San Ignacio (1589), the Artillery School (1754), and the Ateneo de Manila (1859, from the original Charity School called Obras Pias). Asylums and orphanages, including the Real Casa Misericordia (1594), and the Archicofradia de Nuestro Padre Jesus Nazareno de Recoletos (1565) were also established, primarily to attend to the needs of the sick and permanently disabled who were impoverished. These efforts were far from sufficient. They showed, however, that ordinary citizens moved by compassion and charity, when led by an organized group (in these cases, by religious authorities) were to be a force in social development (Mendoza, 1986).

It was basically the *ilustrados* who provided the masses with most of the needed services, primarily in the rural areas, through sociocivic activities. It has been well documented that several of the *ilustrados* whom we came to know as national heroes (such as Jose Rizal), initiated sociocivic work in order to alleviate the sufferings of the masses. In his years of exile in Dapitan, Rizal started the first cooperative in the country. He also spent time providing health care and education for the underprivileged. The most recognized work of the *ilustrados* was in the cause of political reform, spearheaded by the Masons (led by Miguel Morayta), through its quasi-political organization the Asociación Hispano-Filipina and its press, *La Solidaridad*. *La Solidaridad* was originally conceived by Marcelo H. del Pilar as the mechanism in lobbying for greater political representation in Spanish governance in the Philippines (which eventually took an antifriar leaning as the publication grew). This propaganda movement of del Pilar, and its eventual failure, was what inspired Jose Rizal to begin his writing about nationalism. His work was the inspiration for Andres Bonifacio's "proletariat movement" and the birth of the Katipunan (Fores-Ganzon, 1996).

Revolutionary Days

The accumulation of grievances and resentments against the Spanish government, coupled with various social forces, led to the birth of nationalism, the rise of leaders, and the founding of the Katipunan. The ideals of the Katipunan aroused the masses into supporting the cause of the movement. In essence, the Katipunan became the first sociocivic group with a revolutionary social framework ("Collective Behavior," 1983).

The outbreak of revolution also led efforts by *women ilustrados* to tend the sick and wounded Filipino soldiers who needed care. Religious groups like the *Hermanos* responded, several women eventually emerging as leaders of such groups especially after the death of Rizal at Bagumbayan on December 30, 1897. Also organized during the same time was the National Association of the Red Cross, which was established in 1899 to provide food and medical supplies to the revolutionaries of Luzon ("Collective Behavior," 1983). The cause of the Philippine Revolution continued up to the early years of American colonization

of the Philippines. Gen. Jose Malvar was the last Filipino revolutionary to surrender to the Americans in 1902, thus ending the revolution (National Historical Institute, 1990).

Pre-American Occupation: Situation in the United States

In 1831 and 1832, a young French nobleman, Alexis de Tocqueville, came to the United States to appraise the meaning and actual functioning of democracy in order to understand how it might serve to supplant the aristocratic regimes in the countries in Europe. His observations from that trip are recorded in his book *Democracy in America* first published in 1835. Among his insightful observations on the American way of life he wrote the following:

Americans of all ages, all conditions, and all dispositions, constantly form associations. They have not only commercial and manufacturing companies, in which all take part, but associations of a thousand other kinds—religious, moral, serious, futile, general or restricted, enormous or diminutive. The Americans make associations to give entertainments, to found seminaries, to build inns, to construct churches, to diffuse books, to send missionaries to the antipodes; they found in this manner hospitals, prisons, and schools. If it be proposed to inculcate some truth, or to foster some feeling by the encouragement of a great example, they form a society.

Tocqueville captured succinctly that the habit of forming associations, that is, social development organizations, in ordinary life is the very essence of democracy. Such was the American way of life that would soon be brought to Philippine soil.

Prior to the Spanish-American War of 1898, great changes in relief work were developing in the United States. The first Charity Organization Society (COS), patterned after the COS of England, was established in 1877 in Buffalo, New York, to address the inadequacy and disorganization of relief work at that time. The American COS was intended to avoid wastage of funds and competition and duplication of work among the member organizations. Relief agencies and organizations involved with the COS soon discovered a multitude of causes of poverty and sought to advocate measures intended to address them. Such measures included the clearance of slums, improvement of housing, public health measures, and loan societies among others. There was also recognition of the need for a greater understanding of the social and economic problems of the time in the context of its affects on human behavior. This resulted in the formulation of the first special training on social work, founded by Mary Richmond in 1897 in the form of a Training School for Applied Philanthropy in New York. It is of particular interest to note that some of the graduates of this training school eventually became the administrators of social welfare development projects in the Philippines during the American occupation (Mendoza, 1986).

Another important development in charity work that was eventually adopted in the Philippines was the settlement house movement. The U.S. settlement house movement was in response to the pressures of industrialization, forcing more and more people to squeeze into crowded cities and creating unsanitary living conditions, as well as the increasing inflow of immigrants. These settlement houses not only provided opportunities for cultural and intellectual growth, but also offered counseling, assistance, day nursery, kindergarten, and social clubs. Many of its former residents eventually worked hard for legislation intended to institutionalize on a national level the many services required to better social welfare (Mendoza, 1986).

American Occupation

The American occupation introduced into the Philippines the concept of social welfare as a civic duty, not just by private groups but by the government as well. Much of the evolution of social development organizations in the Philippines had an unmistakable American flavor.

Mindful of the role played by social development organizations, the American government created the Public Welfare Board (Legislative Act #2510) in 1915 to coordinate the welfare activities of various existing charitable organizations. Among the charitable activities performed afterward included the establishment of the first orphanage in Makati in 1917 (Mendoza, 1986). Soon new forms of civic organizations that were introduced and gained root in the Philippines were youth organizations (such as the Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts), emergency health care groups (Red Cross), Catholic charities, labor groups, and student groups, among others. These social development organizations provided a practical education in civic-mindedness to hundreds and thousands of Filipinos in the next generations.

Successive legislations, particularly during the Commonwealth period, introduced breakthrough developments in social welfare to Philippine society, all of which were originally established in the United States. Among these included the recognition by the government of its responsibility for the welfare of society on a nationwide scale. The coverage originally began to meet the needs of dependent children and the permanently disabled (inspired by President Theodore Roosevelt's efforts to organize a more coordinated effort for delivering welfare work to dependent children in the 1910s). Most of the developments in this area were in the creation of organizing and supervising bodies for coordinating the efforts of private charity organizations. Examples of these are the Young Men's Christian Association (YMCA) and the Young Women's Christian Association (YWCA).

A Child Welfare League and a National Youth Administration were established in the same period, following the models of the same coordinating bodies that found success in the United States. Both institutions were originally established to serve the needs of dependent children and unemployed and out-of-

school youth, all of whom suffered greatly during the Great Depression of the 1930s. Here we are seeing the early models of government and social organizations working together for the common good. This provided more impetus for the government to provide mechanisms so that social development organizations could share in the burden carried by government to extend social welfare services to its citizens. At the same time as the growth of government involvement in social welfare work increased, American society was experiencing increased recognition of its responsibility in promoting the welfare of all people. Following the model of the first Community Chest Fund in Cleveland in 1913 (designed to address the limitations of public fund generation), the Community Chest Fund in the Philippines was also established to address the substantial fund requirements of rehabilitating many of the rural areas affected by the years of revolution during the Spanish colonial period. Many of the rural development projects were also developed to address the need for bringing up to American standards the way of life in such rural communities. A concrete example is the 4-H Club.

Greater recognition of the limitations of the capabilities of government institutions engaged in social work, including the just established Social Service System, brought to fore the founding of charity and sociocivic organizations from private groups. Among these organizations, which founded branches in the Philippines, included the Kiwanis Club, the Elks Club, the Rotary Club, the Salvation Army, Catholic Charities, the National Red Cross, and the Jaycees. Many of these same organizations eventually would play a key role in the rehabilitation of Philippine society and the Philippine way of life after World War II and the Japanese occupation.

Independence and the Marcos Era

The establishment of a democratic government system was the greatest contribution of the American occupation. The system provided the structure for greater private participation in the life of government and civic life as a whole.

The first postwar presidential election was held in April 1946. Two dominant political parties contested the elections: The Nationalista Party and the Liberal Party. In succeeding years up to the time of Martial Law (from 1972 to 1980), these parties controlled local politics. During these years, sociopolitical groups took center stage in the development of quasi-political movements in the Philippines. Foremost was the Hukbalahap, a resistance group during the Japanese occupation. After the war, it turned toward socialistic leanings. In the 1960s, communist-inspired groups came to fore: Kabataang Makabayan (KM) (National Youth), a militant student group; Hukbong Mapagpalaya ng Bayan (HMB) (National Liberation Army), later renamed New People's Army (NPA); and the Partido Komunista ng Pilipinas (PKP) (Communist Party of the Philippines).

During these years, the mainstream civic groups such as those started during American rule, continued to expand their reach to other cities and towns in the

Philippines, to help provide the basic social services to groups not reached by government welfare agencies.

During Martial Law years, the government was hostile toward privately initiated groups. The feeling was mutual. The SDOs were generally suspicious toward the government. Government was considered the enemy because it worked against the interests of the people whom it was supposed to serve. The regime, on the other hand, viewed SDOs that worked among the poor with extreme suspicion, rationalizing its need for control as “anticommunism.” The dictatorial regime had an adversarial attitude on any organized participation in public life or the formation of civil associations. Such an environment, however, created the impetus for the formation of many reform movements, particularly those sectors that felt they were left out in the economic development promised by Marcos’s New Society. Such movements put forward the welfare causes and concerns of youth, women, underprivileged children, farmers, and laborers. Most notable among these were the League of Filipino Students (LFS), Kilusang Mag-sasaka (KM), and Kilusang Mayo UNO (KMU) (Villanueva, 1968).

Unfortunately, many of these groups and movements were communist-inspired and had a clear political agenda. But a number of the groups and movements that sprouted during the Martial Law years had legitimate concerns for truly democratic reform. Originally established to promote the cause of their respective sectors for improved delivery of welfare services, these movements eventually became quasi-political in nature—a role that was to find great recognition during the EDSA People Power revolution of 1986.

The EDSA Revolution

EDSA (Epifanio de los Santos Avenue) is the principal thoroughfare of modern Metro Manila. It is on a stretch of EDSA that people congregated in non-violent ways and in vast numbers to express their final rejection of the Marcos dictatorship. Many consider the EDSA revolution to be the revolution of the middle class. Contemporary historians have noted that, although the earlier catalyst was the assassination of Senator Benigno S. Aquino Jr. in 1983, the seeds of revolution were already in place in the form of various social reform movements that grew during the Marcos years. The quasi-political nature of these movements was demonstrated by the role they played in promoting and soliciting support from the middle class in affecting drastic social change in the form of a change in government. Among these were Catholic reform movements, labor groups, youth organizations, sociocivic organizations, professional associations, business groups, and cause-oriented groups. In supporting a mutiny of sorts within the Philippine military that culminated in the EDSA revolution in 1986, these reform movements demonstrated their credibility as agents of social change, putting them at the same level of importance as other social development enterprises in making democracy work. People Power succeeded finally in the overthrow of dictatorial rule.

After EDSA

Up to that point, political expediency and opposition to Marcos provided the common bond for groups of originally various interests to rally for a common cause. The goal being achieved, People Power had to metamorphose. The Aquino government committed itself to setting the framework for promoting economic development through people power. In President Corazon Aquino's words: "Ours is a government that came to power borne on the shoulders of our people; we must, therefore, govern on the basis of that same people power."

High priority was given to people's participation in national development. This was manifested in the new constitution drafted and ratified immediately after the revolution. The constitution empowered the president to organize regional development councils with the participation of NGOs. With faith in her people, President Aquino made it a policy to involve social development organizations in the planning and the decisions made by government, from the *barangay* level way up to the national level. For the next six years, SDOs would bloom throughout the country.

One of the active NGO leaders and advocates had this insight:

Immediately after EDSA, there was a flowering of NGO movement. First, because President Aquino gave us democratic space. Second, her ascendancy to the presidency on the wave of people power inspired us to use the same methods of organizing concerned citizens, no longer to topple a dictatorship but to banish hunger and illiteracy, malnutrition, and other social ills. Many of the NGO leaders today were in the protest movement against the dictatorship. It was a natural evolution that we moved from the socio-political to the socio-economic as the needs of our country and our people changed" (Presidential Management Staff, 1992).

Since EDSA, new and activated SDOs served as the government's alternative delivery mechanisms, facilitators for project funding and assistance, credit conduits, and project implementors. Social development organizations like farmers' associations, cooperatives, labor unions, associations of agrarian reform beneficiaries, organizations of upland farmers, fisherfolk, urban poor, women, youth, and students were formed to address specific sectoral issues. The great contribution of President Aquino's administration to SDO development is that it made government-SDO partnerships a way of governance. She made it a way of life.

The vision of a Philippines 2000 during the Ramos administration also relied on a development framework centered on people empowerment. "By people empowerment, we mean improving the capacity of ordinary Filipinos to be more productive, more efficient and quality-oriented, thus enabling them to take better control of their lives, and the future of both their families and communities" (Ramos, 1990). Among the programs launched to achieve this vision were the Social Reform Agenda and the creation of the Philippine Council for Sustainable Development in 1992. The council in many ways broke new ground in providing

a mechanism that transcended the limitation of traditional bureaucratic institutions, because government and SDOs sit as co-equals in the council, which represents the highest level of decision-making in government. The Social Reform Agenda, on the other hand, has put poverty alleviation at the center of government's concern. The war on poverty meant mobilizing a strong army of citizens, not only the government but also the entire citizenry as well, to rally to the cause of self-help and self-reliance. It was meant to harness the energies of the poor themselves by enhancing the capability of SDOs specifically, people's organizations (such as cooperatives, livelihood associations, and self-help groupings).

The current administration of President Estrada carries a pro-poor agenda. His election promise "Erap Para sa Mahirap" (Erap for the Poor) provided a strong appeal to the choice of the masses. As of the time of writing, it was too early to judge in what way Estrada would be able to tap social development organizations in his program of government.

SUMMING UP

Social development organizations (SDOs) have a very important role to play in civil society and their active collaboration is the very essence of democracy, as observed by de Tocqueville in the United States in the early part of the nineteenth century. Historically, SDOs had their formal beginnings in Philippine civil life during the Spanish colonial rule in the form of charity works initiated mostly by Catholic religious groups and with the support of ordinary citizens from all social classes, based on the need to extend social services to the needy and the destitute.

During the American colonial period, SDOs took the form of voluntary groups initiated by citizens mostly from the upper and middle classes (which were still relatively small compared to today). These SDOs, however, were transplants of their U.S. counterparts. Charitable works inspired by Protestant and Catholic Church groups were the first to come. Later, social and fraternal organizations followed, and soon after came business and professional organizations, service providers, and federated funding organizations.

Independence marked the beginning of self-rule and a growing nationalism to establish a Filipino identity away from the image of the "little brown brothers" of the Americans. Sociopolitical groups and political parties with clear political agendas stole the limelight of SDO development in the Philippines. Mutual and cooperative organizations, business and professional organizations, funding intermediaries, and the other types of SDOs began to take root on Philippine soil. They grew even during the Martial Law years but had to operate with great caution under the suspicious eye of the government.

With the excesses of the dictatorial government under Marcos, other types of social welfare organizations came to the fore, to promote civil rights, advocacy, ethnic, and other interests seeking to change the way things were run in gov-

ernment. At the center-stage, however, were communist-inspired groups that sought to topple the government.

The EDSA revolution provided the impetus for placing SDOs as key participants in civil society and assuring their survival to make democracy work in the country. Social welfare organizations blossomed during the Aquino administration. They metamorphosed from quasi-political pressure groups to agents of social development.

Social development organizations have now established themselves as the critical Third Sector in society; an equal partner with government and business in pursuing the common good. The role of SDOs, especially in the field of social justice and poverty alleviation, is likely to grow and have greater importance for the following reasons:

- Government is downsizing with the realization that it cannot do things all by itself and with the reality of resource limitations. Also, business enterprises and social development organizations can do a number of things more efficiently than government. SDOs are likely to expand their services to include the management of educational institutions, health care, culture and arts centers, environmental protection, and so forth. They are likely to perform better than business enterprises in the provision of these social services because they do not work for profit.
- A new class of entrepreneurs are joining the ranks of SDOs. These “social entrepreneurs” realize that SDOs cannot forever live on the charity of people and grants from foreign aid. If SDOs have to survive for the long run they have to have mechanisms to generate their own funds to support their social service functions.
- The active participation of SDOs in these activities noted above will spur more community-based and group-based initiatives. The experience of a “greater control of their lives” through volunteerism, self-help groups, and associations guarantees that SDOs are likely to grow in importance.

I am confident of the positive role that SDOs play in shaping the Filipino nation and making firm the foundations laid down by American colonial rule for democracy to take deeper roots in Philippine society. SDOs are the guarantee for the future in shaping “a common civic culture that is strong enough to balance parochialism with universalism and deep enough to sustain individual freedom and a robust sense of obligation to the common good” (Sleeper, 1997).

NOTES

This chapter was completed with the assistance of Mr. Cesar S. Tolentino, executive assistant to Dr. Gayo, and Dr. Manuel Bonifacio, professor-emeritus, College of Social Science and Philosophy, University of the Philippines-Diliman. It was presented to a conference on The Impact of American Colonial Policy, Administration, and Attitudes on Society and Politics in the Philippines, which was held at the University of Asia and the Pacific, February 5, 1999.

1. Private foundations, corporate foundations, community foundations, and international funding organizations.
2. Private universities, schools, hospitals, clinics, orchestras, art galleries, museums, day care centers, child welfare, youth services, handicapped services, housing and shelters, legal aid services, pollution control, environmental protection, animal and wildlife protection, etc.
3. Advocacy, civil rights, ethnic, and other organizations that seek to influence legislation and public policies in support of particular interests.
4. There is no direct English translation for *encomenderos*. It refers to a system given by the Spanish crown to its loyal subjects granting them a certain territory to collect taxes from its inhabitants (note this does not mean land ownership). It was first used in Mexico (and in other Latin American colonies of Spain). It was also the case in the Philippines.

REFERENCES

- Baron, Barnett F. 1997. *Funding Civil Society in Asia: Philanthropy and Public-Private Partnerships*. (The Asia Foundation Working Paper Series.) Manila: The Asia Foundation.
- Benitez, Conrado. 1965. *Philippine Progress Prior to 1898: The Old Philippine's Industrial Development, Chapters of an Economic History*. Manila: Filipiniana Book Guild.
- Beyer, H. Otley. 1967. *Studies in Philippine Anthropology*. Edited by Mario D. Zamora. Manila: Alemar Phoenix.
- Bourke, Vernon J. 1960. *The Pocket Aquinas*. New York: Washington Square Press.
- Clavecilla, Wigberto P. 1991. *Philippines by Year 2000*. Manila: Quality Bookbinding and Printing Co., Inc.
- "Collective Behavior." 1983. In *Philippine Science Encyclopedia*, vol. 8. Manila: National Research Council of the Philippines.
- Cordero-Fernando, Gilda, and Nik Ricio. 1990. *Turn of the Century*. Manila: GCF Books.
- De la Torre, Visitacion. 1986. *History of the Philippine Civil Service*. Manila: New Day Publishers.
- de Tocqueville, Alexis. 1956. *Democracy in America*. New York: Mentor Books.
- Drucker Foundation. 1998. *The Community of the Future*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Dumol, Paul A. 1989. *Development and the Filipino People*. Manila: Development Bank of the Philippines (Lecture Series).
- Fores-Ganzon, Fr. Guadalupe. 1996. *La Solidaridad* (English Translation). Manila: Fundacion Santiago.
- Gilby, Thomas. 1952. *St. Thomas Aquinas: Philosophical Texts*. Great Britain: Oxford University Press.
- Gutierrez, Lito, ed. 1990. *Transition 1986–1990: The Chronicle as an Agent of Change*. Manila: The Chronicle Publishing Co.
- Mendoza, Thelma Lee. 1986. *Social Welfare Education in the Philippines: Problems and Prospects*. (Professional Chair Paper on Social Work Education.) Quezon City: Redo Publishing.
- Mercado, Monina A., ed. 1986. *An Eyewitness History of People Power: The Philippine Revolution of 1986*. Manila: The James B. Reuter, S.J. Foundation.

- National Historical Institute. 1990. *Filipinos in History*. Vol. 2. Manila: National Historical Institute.
- Presidential Management Staff. 1992. *The Aquino Management of the Presidency—People Empowerment*. Manila: Office of the President.
- Ramos, Fidel V. 1990, January 3. *Ulat sa Bayan* (Report to the nation). Malacañang.
- Salamon, Lester M. 1996. "Defining the Nonprofit Sector: The United States." *Working Papers of the Johns Hopkins Comparative Nonprofit Sector Project*, no. 18. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Institute of Policy Studies.
- Sleeper, Jim. 1997. *Liberal Racism*. New York: Viking Press.
- Villanueva, Buenaventura M. 1968. *The Barrio and Self-Government: A Critical Study on the Competence of Barrio Citizens to Conduct Self-Government*. Manila: Community Development Research Council.
- Zaide, Gregorio F. 1990. *Documentary Sources of Philippine History*. Manila: National Book Store.

Women in Philippine Politics and Society

Mina C. Roces

In 1921, fifteen years before women won the suffrage and barely a decade after women were allowed a university education, American Governor-General Leonard Wood announced publicly that “The Filipino woman is the best ‘man’ in the Philippines.”¹ Explaining the reasons for this controversial statement he said: “Somehow or other she is the great constructive force. She is the builder of the home, saves the money, makes the clothes, keeps the family together, and oftentimes helps to pay the gambling debts.”² How did women make the great leap forward from receiving only the bare fundamentals of education at the end of the nineteenth century to being the country’s “best man” in the span of so little time? Was it the colonial policy of the American regime that compelled society to bestow an assigned space for women in the public sphere? If so, how did women negotiate this space successfully and which public space did they eventually occupy? To what extent did Filipino society (both male and female) support the new changes that inspired the reinvention of the modern Filipina woman?

In actual fact, Governor-General Wood’s brash assessment of the accomplishments and strengths and reliability of the Filipina woman articulated what was to become the *unofficial* discourse on the Filipina woman of the twentieth century particularly in the postcolonial era. The official discourse up until today endorsed men holding the symbols of power while positioning women as the support system for the kinship group. Particularly in the American colonial era where women were still supposed to be closely identified with the home (the purported domestic sphere), any implication that women could be considered in any way equal or better than men was not to be acknowledged publicly in

any form. Hence, perhaps that is why such a statement had to be made by an outsider—a foreigner who happened to be the most powerful one at the time.

There is no doubt that American colonial policy introduced massive changes into the lives of women. For the first time women were to be given a space in the public sphere. Colonial policy gave women the chance to become leaders in the fields of education (where women were given scholarships on equal par with men to go to the United States for higher education), and civic work (the formation of women's clubs was also influenced by American women in the Philippines). In the political arena, American governor-general supported women's suffrage and pressured Filipino politicians to pass the suffrage bill. In this sense, American colonial policy was indeed beneficial to women's status (in keeping with this volume's theme of mixed blessings). But a more intriguing question remains: How have Filipino women negotiated that new space? Despite the barriers of colonial authoritarian rule, Filipino women at this time were clearly agents who were proactive in inventing what was to become the modern Filipina.

This chapter represents the first tentative step toward answering the above question as it grapples with women's responses to these new changes through a broad and general survey of women's history in the early twentieth century.³ At this present writing (2000) there is a vacuum in the scholarship on Filipino women between 1902 and 1946. While a number of publications have addressed women's roles in the Philippine revolution against Spain in 1896–1898 (particularly since the Philippines celebrated its centennial in 1996–1998),⁴ and a good number of scholarly writing has been published on women in the postwar years, women's roles in the colonial period have been given scant attention. Even a topical issue such as the Filipina suffragists has not sparked research or popular interest, although this is not unique to the Philippines.⁵ A number of biographies and autobiographies paint some very glamorous portraits of a number of prominent women of the times, but they remain rooted in the hagiographical tradition where kinship groups commission historians and journalists to write favorable accounts of particular women.⁶ The complex issues raised by the history of the suffragists, the highly visible almost obsessive participation of women in beauty contests, and women's huge contributions to civic work and education have not yet been investigated.

This general survey of women's activities will focus on four areas: women in education, women as beauty queens, women in civic work, and in politics. Women's participation in the labor force and in family life will unfortunately not be discussed here. Thus the chapter has an inherent bias toward the experience of elite women (here reflecting the primary sources used). The decision to focus on these four themes comes from the perspective that the participation in all four areas are inextricably linked. Although the period 1902–1946 was a watershed because it brought women into the public sphere for the very first time, women still had to tread carefully as patriarchal social values persisted, and it was uncertain how society would respond to new roles for women.

One way to investigate how women negotiated these spaces is to focus on

the biographies of the women who became prominent. A common feature seems to be that while they took advantage of new opportunities, none directly challenged cultural constructions of the feminine. Instead, they deliberately reinforced and endorsed cultural constructions of gender by identifying closely with the traditional view of women's roles while at the same time pushing its parameters. Thus, the unique paradox in the Philippines was that beauty queens were also suffragists; presidents of women's clubs; patronesses of charity, civic work, and the arts; and ran women's universities and colleges. The acceptable traditional definition of women in the public sphere was that of beauty queen.

In the printed media of the American period, women's most prominent profile was that of the woman as beauty queen, the most prestigious being the woman as Carnival Queen or Miss Philippines. An examination of the life stories of these beauty queens, however, revealed women negotiating space in the public sphere. As young ladies these women aspired to become beauty queens, achieving what was considered traditionally the pinnacle of all that was defined as feminine. Once proclaimed "traditional women," these women then proceeded to redefine the parameters of feminine duties to become leaders in the areas where new public spaces were opened for them. These women were exceptional persons who enthusiastically embraced new challenges and settled on new frontiers by reworking traditional women's roles so that the "modern" Filipina they "invented" could be accepted by colonial society still grappling with modernity (which in 1902–1946 was defined as Americanism).

An analysis of the suffrage movement must be contextualized in women's attempts to occupy these new public spaces at the precise time when not just one but a plethora of opportunities were open to them in a number of fields. Politics or political participation was only ONE of the many options now finally available for women. While in other countries suffragists prioritized the vote and political power, in the Philippines, suffrage never evoked the same emotional impact. Though a highly contested issue in the 1920s, women were reluctant generally to become militant advocates of suffrage. When noted American suffragist Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt visited the Philippines in 1912 to promote the suffrage movement, women hesitated to call themselves suffragists, forming a civic organization only because they did not want to embarrass the famous visitor. But in the mid-1920s, these reluctant feminists became prime advocates of the women's vote. One explanation for the apparent noninterest in politics is the cultural context. It was still considered crass to campaign and run for office even for males. After all, in the clash between the *Hispanistas* (who were the European-educated elite) and the *sajonistas* (pro-American or Americanized Filipinos) who by the 1920s were termed *modernistas* (standing for all that was "modern" or American values), *Hispanistas* (who were the dominant ones until the 1930s) accused the *modernistas* of being vulgar because they embraced American style politics and used political power to help their kinship group (practiced kinship politics—here defined as utilizing political power to benefit the kinship group).⁷

The corruption, nepotism, and political maneuvering and opportunism were

immediately tagged as uncouth. As late as 1945, Sergio Osmeña refused to campaign because it was not the dignified thing to do. Given this cultural climate it would be understandable that women restrained themselves from overt political agitation for issues such as the vote, the right to run for political office, or to lobby for prowomen legislation. On the other hand, education and civic work, closely perceived to be extensions of the women's roles as mothers were seen to be appropriate activities. In these areas women's enthusiastic, almost aggressive, involvement stood in stark contrast to their more timid response to political emancipation. Thus, the study of suffrage in the Philippine context is quite problematic and unique. But the woman's choice to prioritize education and civic work has proven to be beneficial in the long run. For, by choosing to focus on these areas seen as extensions of women's roles in the private sphere, they succeeded in acquiring prominence and power quickly. This did not mean politics was neglected; in the 1930s the debates on suffrage resurfaced with more urgency, and this time those women already established as major leaders in civic work and education became identified closely with prosuffrage.

But women did not focus on suffrage and official political power as the only political strategy for women's empowerment. From 1925 onward, wives of politicians joined election campaigns as they worked toward their husbands' electoral success. Women were already engaging in political actions, giving campaign speeches, some being accused of meddling in politics more than a decade before they got the right to vote. Suffrage may have appeared to have been a moot point since women were already participating in politics and even exercising unofficial power. Since the Filipino concept of power (*malakas*/powerful) sees power held by the kinship group, women were political agents and perceived to be powerful as members of the kinship group in power.⁸ Male politicians were in fact indebted to their wives for winning political office in the first place.

By the postcolonial era, the gendering of politics and power became more or less established, with men exercising official power and women exercising power unofficially through their connections with male politicians.⁹ Once male politicians were elected, their female kin had the option to exercise power behind the scenes. Such a gendering of power had its roots in the American colonial era where for the first time, Filipinos were given the opportunity to run for local and national office above the level of town mayor.¹⁰ In this sense, women already began to explore unofficial power and official power in the early decades of the twentieth century.

WOMEN'S ROLES IN THE SPANISH PERIOD

The general consensus among scholars writing on women's history in the Philippines is that the Spanish period was a largely negative era pushing back women's status in all spheres. While in the pre-Hispanic period women were

the weavers and the priestesses, the patriarchal values of the Iberian culture and the introduction of Christianity deprived women of their once powerful roles as priestesses, making them subordinate to men at home and in the public sphere. While women once commanded the spirit world, now they were relegated as auxiliaries, isolated from the public sphere (elite women were put in convent schools) and encouraged to spend time in church and at prayer in a new religion that denied women any form of leadership. Though women of the lower classes still dominated retail trade and the market, women of the upper classes were now confined to the domestic sphere, prohibited from government, and taught Christian doctrine, some reading and writing skills and sewing.¹¹ Nicanor Tiongson described the upper class *mestizas* as passive:

Her training in colleges for women, like Sta. Potenciana, turned her into a harmless, wilting lily by teaching her, to use Bowring's words, "to live modestly and under sound doctrine" and to "come out for marriage and the propagation of the race". This education produced the type of *mestiza* who dragged her feet, according to Jagor, whose conversation was "tedious and awkward" and who did nothing but join *confradias* and go to church, all veiled in black, or get dressed in gold and velvet and be laden with all the family jewels as she walked as *zagala* in a religious procession.¹²

The idealized Filipina woman of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries is represented by the character of Maria Clara in Jose Rizal's novels: the woman who was beautiful, passive, sweet, shy, reticent, demure, timid (almost vapid), but who "never had the courage to share the fate of her beloved, who was forced into an engagement with a Spaniard, who chose to enter the convent to flee from a loveless marriage, who made a more permanent escape from the vicissitudes of life into insanity,"¹³ which is testimony to the success of the Spanish influence on women's status. Women of means aspired to become wives devoted to husband, children, and the church.

On the other hand, lower class women in Manila continued to dominate the market as vendors and buyers and contributed to industry as *cigarreras* in the tobacco factories. They were also employed as seamstresses and domestic helpers. Those who received some education could become teachers and midwives while the lowest status profession was that of the *mujeres publicas* or prostitutes.¹⁴

Prior to 1863 females were not given any educational training above primary grades. Only the well-to-do families were able to provide some basic reading, writing, arithmetic, and needlecraft lessons for their daughters. Some schools were only for daughters of Spaniards and other local elites. Some of these included: the Colegio de Sta. Isabel (1632), Colegio de Sta. Catalina (1696), Colegio de Sta Rosa (1750), Escuela de Maestras (1864), Colegio de la Inmaculada Concepcion (1868), Colegio de San Jose de Jaro (1872), Assumption Convent (1893), and the Superior Normal School for Women (1893).¹⁵

Barred from participation in public and professional life, elite women were kept in the domestic sphere, only venturing to the public sphere in the context of church functions and as beautiful women in religious processions. At the same time their intellectual and personal growth was deliberately stunted for not only were they deprived of education but also were encouraged to evolve into submissive, colorless, timid, passive persons devoted only to prayers and occasionally charitable works.

But despite these limited opportunities, by the late nineteenth century up until the Philippine revolution against Spain in 1896, women were perceived to be both *katulong* (helpers) of the men and as agents of change.¹⁶ Historian Onofre Corpuz summarized the nineteenth-century's cultural construction of woman as "helper and partners in the hardships of life."¹⁷ This perception of women's roles Corpuz argues, was one underlying principle behind the Katipunan's (the secret organization that plotted revolution against Spain) decision to admit women members; though confined as it was only to wives and other members of the male *katipunero*'s kinship group.¹⁸ Author of the "Teachings of the Katipunan" Emilio Jacinto reasserts the role of woman as helper and mother: "Think not of woman as a thing merely to while away time but as a helper and partner in the hardships of life. Respect her in her weakness and remember the mother who brought you into this world and who cared for you in your childhood."¹⁹ Jose Rizal's "Sa Mga Kababayang Dalaga sa Malolos" (Rizal's Address to the Young Bachelor Women of Malolos) likewise reasserts the role of women as *katulong*, and as "mother," the person responsible for shaping the emerging "Filipino" and in his view also the person partly to blame for the country's weak state. "Gawa ñg mga ina ang kalugamian ñgayon ng ating mga kababayan, sa lubos na paniniwala ñg kanilang masintahin pusu, at sa malaking pagkaibig na ang kanilang anak ay mapakagaling" [It is the mothers who have created our present degraded life that our countrymen suffer, because of their over zealous faith in their loving hearts, and their great wish for their children to be great].²⁰ In December 1888, a group of young women from Malolos petitioned the Spanish governor general in the Philippines for permission to set up an evening school where they could learn Spanish. The women explained that they could not access the educational institutions in Manila because domestic duties prevented them from attending day classes.²¹ Rizal praised these women for being good examples to other young women who wanted to be enlightened. Their actions had heightened the hopes of the nationalists "sapagka't kayo'y katulong na namin, panatag ang loob sa pagtatagumpay" [because you are now also our helpers, we are now sure of our future victory].²² Twice in the address he sees women as *katulong*: "Di kami manlulumo kapag kayo'y katulong namin; tutulong ang Dios sa pagpau ñg ulap, palibhasa'y siya ang Dios nang katotohanan; at isasauli sa dati ang dilag ñg babaying tagalog" [We have no cause to feel depressed when you are our helpers, God will help remove the clouds, because he is the God of truth; as He returns to the Tagalog woman her former splendor].²³

One of the bestselling books of the nineteenth century was a guide on urban manners, Christian morals, and the duties of the *ilustrado* (European-educated elite) class of that period.* Written by a Filipino priest Don Modesto de Castro, the book written in Tagalog and published in the 1860s institutionalized proper social behavior combining Hispanicized Christian values with Filipino values such as *utang ng loob* (debt of gratitude), *hiya* (shame), and *paquiquipagcapoua tauo* (identifying and empathizing with others). Written in the form of letters between two sisters, one living in the city and one in the countryside, the monograph, though not concerned overtly with political issues, nonetheless spoke about “katungkulan sa bayan” [duties to one’s town or community since bayan was not yet imagined as a nation in the 1860s]. Since De Castro was speaking primarily to the *principalia* at the town level, he pointed out the *ilustrado* moral leadership responsibilities; *ilustrados* of that era saw themselves as the social and moral educators of their countrymen.²⁴ The book outlines “how to behave in public,” “how to set the table,” “how to serve food,” “how to write and fold a letter,” “how to blow one’s nose in a handkerchief,” “how to use a napkin,” “how to behave when visiting,” “which side men and women should be when taking a stroll,” and taboos such as “do not point at people with one’s fingers,” and “do not laugh and joke while visiting the sick or the dead.” But apart from the formal social niceties the book also deals with important life choices such as “how to choose a spouse,” “how to be good parents,” and “how to deal with death.”

Most of the letters were written by Urbana (the sister attending school in the city) to Feliza who lived in the rural Philippines. The manuscript not only reflected *ilustrado* values heavily, it also revealed the gendering of morality. Women were “moral guardians” responsible for the upbringing of young children. Moral education was their domain. In the book, instructions on how children should behave were outlined to Feliza, who was seen to be responsible for the upbringing of Honesto, her younger brother. Women were expected to teach Honesto the new patterns of social behavior expected in the new urbanized society of the late nineteenth century. Included in the curriculum of morals was *utang na loob* and *hiya*. It would have been expected that Honesto would eventually become a community official, hence the author’s obsession that the young boy learn his *katungkulan sa bayan* and *paquiquipagcapoua tauo*. It is only in a section on the roles of husbands and wives and the duties of parents that a male voice appeared in the form of two letters to the sisters: a father *confesor* and a *sacristan* who gave advice to the newly married Feliza and her husband Amadeo. It could be described as a woman’s book for apart from the “token space” assigned to the duties of a husband, and while some aspects of etiquette and manners were not specifically gendered, the bulk of the book was addressed to women. The fact that it was the most widely read book at that time highlights

*In the twentieth century some of the *ilustrado* were *Hispanistas* (meaning they were for Spanish culture as opposed to the *sajonistas* who were Americanized Filipinos). In the twentieth century the *ilustrados* (European-educated or Western-educated elites) became divided into two camps: the *sajonistas* (who were Americanized) and the *Hispanistas* (who embraced Spanish culture).

not only the point that women were well-read, but that they took their roles as moral guardians seriously.

One of the foremost values stressed in the book is *paquiquipagcapoua tauo* (identifying and fraternizing and empathizing with others). In various places of the book Father De Castro shows how it is related to *pag-ibig sa capoua tao* (love for one's fellowman or Christian love). Through specific examples, such as never treating the orphaned as lowly creatures, the book endorsed this Christian value as the duty of the *ilustrado*. All these virtues—including the Filipino values seen as obligations of the *ilustrado* class—were actually precursors of the civic duties that would be ushered in during the next era when “education for citizenship” would be introduced in the public schools and to all classes as “good manners and right conduct.” By the twentieth century good manners and right conduct and education for citizenship was no longer a gendered responsibility as all citizens of both sexes were equally exhorted to develop loyalties to the imagined community of the Filipino nation-state albeit a colonial nation state at that time. But in the late nineteenth century good manners and right conduct were associated with women in their traditional roles as guardian of morals as well as of agents of change.

In this sense, and at this critical juncture in Philippine history, women's image as the spokesperson for morals and proper behavior reflected the juxtapositioning of their traditional roles as guardian of morals and as mothers; as agents of change. Such a cultural construction of woman as moral guardian persists till today where women are expected to be charitable and to involve themselves in charitable organizations. In the nineteenth century, the heroine of Rizal's *Noli me tangere*, Maria Clara, gives her jewelry to a leper as an example of women exhibiting Christian charity and civic work. In the contemporary Philippines, female images of power see morality embedded in “woman” so that politics is seen to be “too dirty for women”²⁵ and a housewife turned presidential candidate can receive applause for saying in a campaign rally: “I have to admit I have no experience in lying, cheating, stealing, killing political opponents.”²⁶

The Philippine revolution is a site from which one could observe the intersection of women's dual (and sometimes contradictory) images as *katulong* of the male-dominated revolutionary discourse and as agents of change. As agents for change women were quite inevitably drawn into the revolution, playing various roles from soldiers, couriers, and spies, to nursing the wounded and shielding katipuneros from the enemies. The main contribution the recent historiography on women in the revolution has given us, is the dispelling of the predominant image of women's roles as confined to sewing the flag and/or holding social gatherings in public to disguise the Katipunan meetings held in secret.

Granted that individual women were important revolutionaries, how were women generally drawn into the revolutionary experience? Women's participation cannot be divorced from the kinship dynamics. From the beginning, members of the women's chapter of the Katipunan were recruited from the

wives, sisters, and daughters of the male *katipuneros*.²⁷ The president of the women's chapter was Josefa Rizal, the vice president Gregoria de Jesus, the secretary Marina Dizon, and the fiscal officer Angelica Rizal Lopez. The officers reflected the power structure of the Katipunan and the revolutions' male leadership and influence. Gregoria de Jesus was the wife of Andres Bonifacio, the Katipunan supremo, and Josefa was the sister of Jose Rizal and Angelica Lopez Rizal is the niece of both Josefa and Jose. Thus, not only were members recruited from the kinship relations of the male revolutionaries, women's power within the revolutionary structure reflected their kin ties with the male leaders of the revolution foreshadowing the gendering of postwar power and politics where men held official power and women held power unofficially through their kin ties with male politicians. So identified were women with the kinship dynamic that in a compilation of brief individual biographies of women in the revolution, most were identified as "wife of" a revolutionary figure.²⁸ This however is not to deny the other roles women played in the revolution—as generals, spies, and as soldiers.

Wives as *katulong* were not only expected to help in charity work but were also involved in the fund-raising aspect of the revolution. Salome Siaopoco, wife of General Mariano Llanera, for example, collected funds from Nueva Ecija, contributing also from her own personal cash, gold, and jewelry to raise funds for the army.²⁹ If one included the gathering of food, clothing, and other supplies as part of the "fund-raising" elements of the revolution, women appear quite prominent. As wives of *katipuneros*, and fulfilling their roles as *katulong* and as charity and civic-minded moral crusaders, this activity was a remarkably gendered one.

And it is precisely these roles—of *katulong* and the supporter of men and as agents of change—that women in the American period continued to endorse, and they were reluctant to alter these traditional definitions of the feminine. Perhaps because they did not overtly challenge cultural constructions they were able to permeate successfully and quickly new spaces opened to them in the public sphere largely supported by the society as a whole (including the men—though there was some controversy over the vote, see below). Thus, the developing modern Filipina was one who defined herself in the official discourse as a traditional woman (as a beauty queen, as a guardian of morals, as a civic worker, as a religious figure), but who in practice was already performing leadership roles (no longer auxiliary roles) in education (as presidents of universities and so forth), and civic work (as presidents of women's clubs), while slowly permeating the domain of men in business, politics, and the professions.

MODERNITY AND THE MODERN FILIPINA OF THE EARLY TWENTIETH CENTURY

If traditional definitions of women meant women were beautiful, moral guardians who were wives and mothers, what became the new definition of woman

in the twentieth century? In the early decades of the twentieth century up until the 1940s, “modernity” was identified with all that was American. Since “modern” was conflated with “American,” the *Sajonistas*, the Americanized Filipinos who enthusiastically embraced American culture and who aggressively participated in the new electoral politics of the new democratic system were the ones christened *modernistas*.³⁰ The modern woman was therefore one who spoke English, received an American-style education in the Philippines or abroad, and who was interested in a role outside the domestic sphere, though preferably in civic work, education, the arts, or business. Fashion was gendered: men wore American-style suits called *Americana* while the modern elite women wore the *saya* emphasizing women’s links to tradition or national identity. A glimpse of society’s female role models can be gleaned from the personalities who were popular at the time. In 1931 the *Philippines Free Press* encouraged readers to submit entries nominating “The Woman in the Philippines I would Most Like to Be and Why.”³¹ The winner was Sofia de Veyra, well known for her civic work. De Veyra was then president of the National Federation of Women’s Clubs, the most prominent women’s organization of the time. She was also a suffragette. But she won because she had been successful in both her home duties and her public work. Second place went to Maria Kalaw, a former beauty queen (Miss Philippines) who trained as a journalist.³² Interestingly, third place went to Mrs. Idelfonsa de Osias, a politician’s wife. Her endearing quality was her “ability to help her husband in his political duties, her opportunity for travel, her gracious personality, her success in the home.”³³ Mrs. Osias exemplified what was later to be the gendering of women’s roles in politics: Men were the politicians and women were the support system; men exercised official power, women exercised power unofficially through connections with male politicians. These three women epitomized the new ideal woman of the American colonial period. Although they reiterated the traditional definitions of the woman as beauty queen, moral guardian, and “helper of men,” they received recognition for their work in the public sphere. In this sense, they were already “modern” (Americanized).

THE CREATION OF NEW SPACES: COLONIAL POLICIES AND WOMEN’S RESPONSES

Education

The policy responsible for the most profound change in women’s status was education for both sexes. The introduction of the public school system for both boys and girls, the opening up of university education for women, and even university education abroad as government *pensionados* (students on scholarships), allowed women to qualify as professionals for the first time. And women eagerly embraced these new opportunities. Not only did they acquire university degrees both in the Philippines and in America, they also founded their own

universities and colleges for women and took on positions of leadership in these pathbreaking organizations.

The University of the Philippines was inaugurated in 1908. By 1947 there were 500 private colleges and technical schools. Catholic schools for women began to offer college degrees from the early 1900s. Assumption College, St. Scholastica's College (founded in 1906), Holy Ghost (now Holy Spirit), College in 1913, St. Theresa's College, Malabon Normal School, St. Bridget's Academy, St. Agnes' Academy, St. Louis School, and Rosary Academy were some of the more well-known private Catholic schools for women inaugurated at that time.³⁴ Girls schools were also organized by private individuals (mostly women also) who saw a steady demand for women's education in private, secular schools. Some of these included Instituto de Mujeres (established in 1900 by a group of women graduates from Assumption College), Centro Escolar University (1907) also founded by women, and Philippine Women's University (1919) inspired by Francisca Tirona Benitez.³⁵ Male students still outnumbered female students in both high school and college, and the turnout of women graduates at university particularly from the University of the Philippines was very low in the first two decades of the twentieth century.³⁶ (By the 1990s, women would outnumber men at the university level, both at the undergraduate and graduate levels.)³⁷ On the other hand, literacy levels increased from a female literacy rate of 10 percent (men were 30 percent) in 1903 to 57 percent for the female and 60 percent for the male by 1948.³⁸

Although traveling abroad alone was still frowned upon by conservative elements of elite societies, women went to the United States as government *pensionados*. They went to the University of California at Berkeley, Columbia University, Northwestern University, and the University of Michigan (as Barbour scholars).³⁹ In 1926 there were around 60 *pensionados* (both men and women) but there were already about 4,000 Filipinos (men and women) studying in the United States at their own expenses.⁴⁰ *Pensionados* were male and female students, supposedly "the best and the brightest" sent to study in America to absorb American ideas and ideals.⁴¹

Little is known of the numbers and experiences of *women pensionados* (an area clearly for future research). For this exploratory study, a profile of the Filipino Barbour scholars sent to the University of Michigan is very useful. A number of Barbour scholars became prominent academicians and notable women. The Barbour scholarships for Oriental women were announced in June 1917 aiming: "(1) to help oriental women attain status in their countries; (2) to prepare them through scientific and broad training to take positions of leadership, and to prepare them for a life of service; and (3) to acquaint them with western ideas and thereby bring closer understanding between the occidental and oriental people."⁴² While the greatest number of recipients were Chinese women, Filipinos comprised 13.4 percent of recipients from 1917 to 1955.⁴³ Filipinos first arrived in 1923, and a total number of thirty-eight received scholarships from 1914–1955.⁴⁴ Most Filipinos chose to study physics, chemistry and

natural science combined (343.2%),⁴⁵ but a few did education and English, political science, economics, and library science.⁴⁶ A total of 10 Ph.D.'s. and 19 Masters degrees were awarded.⁴⁷

The first Barbour scholar was Mrs. Maria C. Lanzar Carpio who took up her scholarship in 1923. Other notable Barbour scholars included: Encarnacion Alzona who went to the United States in 1932, and after returning to her home country became a professor at the University of the Philippines, a suffragette, and a historian, Estefania Aldaba (1939) who became secretary of social work in the postwar years; Maria Kalaw (our second most-admired woman) (1932) who became a senator; and Pura Santillan (1927) who became a professor at the University of the Philippines, a writer, and later a cultural officer for foreign affairs in the postwar years.⁴⁸ In more contemporary times, current Senator Miriam Defensor Santiago (senator since 1995) was a Barbour scholar in 1975.⁴⁹ Barbour scholarships did hope to create women of distinction in their home countries and certainly though Filipino women only became Barbour scholars in 1923, these few women distinguished themselves by being of great service to their country as they opened new doors for women in male-dominated territorial spaces.

The most popular degrees women enrolled in were in the fields of education and pharmacy; both considered closely associated with female occupations. Home economics was treated seriously at Philippine Women's University (PWU) where the founder Francisca Tirona Benitez and her daughter Helen Benitez (who succeeded her mother as president of the university) were instrumental in making that subject an acceptable academic science subject for college degrees.⁵⁰ According to Nick Joaquin (Benitez's biographer), PWU distinguished itself from the other women's colleges because it was going to be "modern"; by this Benitez meant "a college for girls, with the emphasis on patriotism, modernity and the English language."⁵¹ Modernity was identified with knowledge of the English language as well as the attitude that women were to be prepared to take proactive roles in the coming independent Philippines (since America promised eventual independence when in their view Filipinos were ready for it after passing democratic tutelage under the colonial ruler).

What Francisca envisioned was a school for teachers, whether the graduates went into classroom teaching or not. Just by being career women, community leaders, and models of the modern Filipina, they would be teaching their people the values of democracy, technology and education. The Filipina as *Ilustrada*: that was the product to be aimed at; so that the Filipina could illustrate independence, having earned independence in a school geared to modernize the Filipina's willingness to modernize.⁵²

The Instituto de Mujeres was patterned after the old convent school system while Centro Escolar de Señoritas was Spanish-influenced.⁵³ PWU prided itself in the use of English as the official language of instruction. The founders of the college, which in 1932 became a university, were all teachers (Benitez was a graduate of the Philippine Normal School), and all women were representative of

the early twentieth century's new "modern" woman: a "wife and mother" (PWC or PWU president Francisca Tirona Benitez was not addressed at the university as President Benitez or Madame Benitez but as Mama B), who did not hesitate to take strong new leadership roles in certain fields appropriately regarded as female domains. The other founders of PWU included Paz Marquez Benitez, renowned for her short story "Dead Stars," the model for the first serious piece of literature in English written by a Filipino.

Like Mama B of PWU, Miss Librada Avelino was founder and director of the Centro Escolar de Señoritas (inaugurated in 1907).⁵⁴ This women's institution offered women education from kindergarten to college degrees in commerce, law, business, education, pharmacy, and liberal arts.⁵⁵ In 1907 it had 250 students but by 1927 student numbers increased to 1,500.⁵⁶ The other rival private women's institution was the Instituto de los Mujeres, directed by Rosa Sevilla de Alvero. Both women were admired as women of distinction for their roles as educators.⁵⁷ Another woman founder of a less prominent establishment was Miss Mercedes Rivera, one of the original co-founders and assistant dean of Philippine Women's University and a graduate of the Philippine Normal School. In 1921 she became directress of her own women's college, the Young Ladies Academy.⁵⁸

Women's education thus did not herald merely the woman as student or the woman as *collegiala* or the woman as *pensionado* but also the woman as president of a university, the woman as dean, the woman as academician (*pensionados* in particular returned to become professors at the University of the Philippines and other women's colleges), and the woman as prominent short story writer. Though women were given equal education only at the turn of the century, barely a decade after that they were already founding their own universities.

Carnival Queen and Miss Philippines

Though beauty contests of the contemporary genre were first held at the beginning of the twentieth century and therefore closely associated with the American colonial period in the Philippines, in the nineteenth century beautiful women were chosen to parade as *reynas* (queens) and *zagalas* (escorts of the queen or princesses) at religious processions particularly the Santa Cruzan held in May in honor of the Virgin Mary. There were usually several *reynas* (Reyna de los Flores, Reyna Elena, etc.) at each festival. The Americans tapped this Filipino predilection for honoring beautiful women when they invented the Carnival. The Carnival was first held in 1908 right after the Americans "pacified" the Philippines. Tired of the war, the jovial ambiance of a carnival appealed to many, and the yearly events became a very popular tradition in Manila. One of the highlights of the Carnival was the proclamation of the Carnival Queen.

Until the 1930s elite women were primarily defined as beauty queens. In the *Philippines Free Press*, which generally covered reportage and analysis of major national issues, while women's stories made infrequent appearances, women as

beauty queens were displayed and discussed constantly and prominently. The periodical had its own beauty contest as well. Contestants for the Carnival Queen (and the heated battle between contestants prior to victory) and later Miss Philippines were given full coverage and prime space in the magazine.⁵⁹ In a large percentage of the cases when a woman appeared at all in the *Philippines Free Press* it was as a beauty queen including local titles such as Queen of the Iloilo Carnival.⁶⁰

I have argued elsewhere⁶¹ that the woman as beauty queen was an image of female power in the postwar years. The Tagalog word *maganda* does not simply mean beautiful. It is also connected with what the society considers good or virtuous. Leonardo Mercado goes as far as to argue that beauty is interchangeable with truth and good in the Filipino mind.⁶² The word *maganda* is used to refer to socially acceptable behavior, while its antonym *pangit* (ugly) is used to connote what is evil or bad or what is socially unacceptable behavior. A woman who is perceived to be *pangit* connotes what is evil or bad or what is socially unacceptable behavior. A woman who is perceived to be *maganda* connotes a woman who exudes the virtues of her gender.

In an editorial about Carnival Queens the *Philippines Free Press* contrasts the society's view of woman as someone atop a pedestal, to be worshipped by all, but isolated and protected from the real world, with the new modern woman's desire to reinvent herself as someone completely different.

During the Carnival we glorify Woman, placing her on a high pedestal, calling her queen and showering her with praise and attention. Thus we pay due homage to the eternally feminine qualities of womankind, to her beauty and grace and charm. This placing her on the throne, setting her apart from life and worshipping her from a distance, is man's age-old attitude toward Woman.

But Woman it seems, would change this concept of herself. She would climb down from her pedestal and join the hurly-burly of life. Witness the recent convention of the National Federation of Women's Clubs, where members of the fair sex discussed everything from politics to hygiene. Witness also the invasion of women in the various professions once believed the exclusive field of men.

Yet somehow the throne and the crown and the other trappings of the carnival queenship symbolize Woman's real position in the world. For as Gail Hamilton has put it, "No monarch has been so great, no peasant so lowly, that he has not been glad to lay his best at the feet of a woman."⁶³

The *Free Press* editorial succinctly articulated the female predicament. Society wanted to keep her on a pedestal—as a beautiful being to be cherished, worshipped, and admired but who was removed from the vicissitudes and struggles of everyday life. The same arguments were resurrected in the debate about female suffrage. But the women themselves were reluctant to remain on that pedestal, as defined and cherished by the men. Instead they wanted to leap off of that pedestal and become active in political and civic work and to take on new roles as leaders. On the surface it would appear that the Carnival Queen

epitomized the woman who adhered to society's patriarchal definition of her sex: The woman's role is simply to be beautiful and to be objectified, to achieve the highest status accorded to the Filipina woman, in being proclaimed to all and sundry to be the most desirable woman in the world. And, as such she could attract the most eligible man for a husband—the man needed to fulfill her womanhood (since a woman was still defined as wife and mother). But a more accurate interpretation of the woman as Carnival Queen would read her as typifying the ambivalent modern woman of the times. Thus, although the woman continued to be to be *katulong* or helpers of men and agents of change, by the twentieth century the new tenor of the times insisted that these roles be acknowledged officially in the public sphere as well.

A few examples of Carnival Queens who became active in other fields would illustrate the ambivalent symbol of woman as beauty queen and as agent of change. Pura Villanueva (queen in 1908) became a suffragist and someone who dedicated her valuable time to social work.⁶⁴ Prior to her reign she was already president of the Association Feminista Ilonga (more on this below). In 1918 she was made president of the Women's Club of Manila and editor of the Spanish section of *Woman's Outlook*—magazine of the National Federation of Women's Clubs (formed in 1921).⁶⁵ Paz Marquez (queen in 1912), our renowned short story writer, by 1919 reinvented herself as one of the founders of PWU, a suffragist and a university professor. She started the *Women's Journal* in 1919 and worked on the *Philippine Journal of Education* (the Philippine magazine for teachers founded in 1918).⁶⁶ Trining Fernandez (queen in 1924) became editor of the English section *Woman's Outlook*,⁶⁷ president of the National Federation of Women's Clubs, and an important patroness of the arts particularly in her work with the Manila Symphony Society. Maria Kalaw (daughter of the first Carnival Queen Pura Villanueva) trained as a journalist and ended her career as a senator. Trining de Leon (queen in 1921) married the first president of the independent republic and reigned as First Lady and a major officer of the Philippine Red Cross.

Women and Civic Work: Women's Clubs

Perhaps the area where women have been given the greatest appreciation and visibility in the public sphere is their role in civic work and charitable organizations. The foremost organization was the National Federation of Women's Clubs (NFWC) although women's involvement in the Red Cross and Associated Charities has always been recognized. The formation of women's clubs in the Philippines was influenced by American clubwomen, notably Mrs. Maud Neal Parker, a patroness of several women's clubs. She was also avid in writing about club activities in order to advertise the benefits women's clubs have made to the society and to inspire more women to join and help the country.⁶⁸ Prior to the formation of the National Federation of Women's Clubs in 1920, local or provincial women's clubs were organized in some provinces like Pangasinan

with the aim of providing education on child care. Women also lobbied for playgrounds.⁶⁹ Clubwomen were also expected to visit the homes of the sick and provide medicines.⁷⁰ The care of babies had an important priority in the club's plans⁷¹ thus underlining once again women's roles as mothers and care givers.

Women who were closely identified with the National Federation of Women's Clubs soon gained the reputation of becoming society's ideal women or ideal mothers. (In 1931 Sofia de Veyra was nominated as the woman most envied and admired in her time. Josefa Llanes Escoda (who during World War II died a heroine) also acquired status from her role as executive secretary of the NFWC⁷² while former Carnival Queen Trining Fernandez Legarda had a clear public presence as president of the NFWC and as a woman active in charity work. The latter image became inextricably linked to her identity, much more so than her beauty queen title.

Sofia de Veyra was a dean of the Rizal Institute dormitory and later was assistant dean in the Normal School dormitory in Manila. She learned English from American teachers and made her debut in social work as first president of the Gota de Leche in 1906. Together with former Carnival Queen Pura Villanueva and Miss Bessie Dwyer, she became part of the organizing nucleus of the NFWC (1912). She was president of the NFWC from 1923–1930 and vice president of the Catholic Women's League. She also was a member of the pardon board, the board of censorship, the Red Cross committee and continued to be dean of the Home Economics Department of Centro Escolar University.⁷³ Mrs. de Veyra's engagement in a plethora of activities mirrored the typical response of many prominent women in the era who were becoming associated with all that was "modern." They spoke English, they still defined themselves within the parameters of the traditional cultural construction of woman as wife and mother and as helpers of men but also agents of change. And yet, they began to add a new dimension to activities classified as acceptable women's spheres. By the 1920s Sofia de Veyra had become a suffragist, and the NFWC expanded its concern from social work to include women's political participation, particularly suffrage. Women's suffrage advocacy by the mid-1920s became associated with women's organizations and the definition of the modern woman.

The Suffragists and Women in Political Life

It is assumed generally that 1905, the formation of the Asociación Feminista Filipina and Asociación Feminista Ilonga (1907) was the birth of first wave feminism in the Philippines. In reality, although the word *feminista* was used by these associations, neither were militant advocates of suffrage at the time they were founded. Pura Villanueva who founded the Asociación Feminista Honga claimed that one of its aims was to enfranchise the Filipina.⁷⁴ Apart from Pura Villanueva's assertions (see her book on *How Women Got the Vote*⁷⁵),

there is little evidence to connect Asociación Feminista Ilonga with a determined agenda that prioritized women's suffrage at that time, while the Asociación Feminista Filipina was really a woman's organization devoted to charity and civic work or social welfare work; activities traditionally associated with women even in the nineteenth century. The word *feminista* more aptly translated to "women's organization" rather than "feminist organization" in this case.

A more accurate history of the suffrage movement might begin with the visit of well-known American suffragist Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt in 1912. A meeting was arranged between Mrs. Catt and a number of prominent women. But the women who attended the meeting were reluctant to become suffragists. If Pura Villanueva's Asociación Feminista Ilonga held the reputation of being prosuffrage, why did she not convince the others to embrace the cause and link it to her organization? In order not to disappoint Mrs. Catt, these "hesitant suffragists," which included Pura Villanueva Kalaw, Maria Villamor, Gorgonia Mapa, Amparo Lichauco, Sofia de Veyra, and Concepcion Felix (Calderon) Rodriguez formed an organization much like the typical women's groups: one that would look after the welfare of women and children.⁷⁶ The organization was called the Society for the Advancement of Women (later renamed The Manila Woman's Club).

American governor-general Francis Burton Harrison (1913–1921) and Leonard Wood (1921–1927) supported the women's vote, but it was only in 1923 that the National Federation of Womens Clubs placed it in their agenda.⁷⁷ The Philippine Association of University Women (PAUW—more on this later) put suffrage on its agenda also in the 1920s. If we apply the Western definition of first wave feminism, then first wave feminism was officially launched in the Philippines in 1923. Why did it take so long? A possible reason is that women chose to focus on gaining important ground in the fields of education and civic work. This did not mean that women were not interested in exercising political power. It was only after women had redefined themselves as modern women—speaking English, getting an education, and entering professions—that politics became the next frontier to be explored and conquered.

By 1923 the NFWC put suffrage as part of their agenda. Interestingly, although the *Philippines Free Press* itself supported suffrage⁷⁸ a majority of its readers including those who wrote on suffrage (admittedly most were male), were against it. Arguments against suffrage recalled the early twentieth-century's view that women should remain atop a pedestal to be worshipped and admired. The descent into the real world of politics was perceived to be demeaning and sullyng to women's otherwise pristine images.⁷⁹ This viewpoint is clearly expressed in a letter to the Philippine Legislative Assembly written by Perfecto E. Laguio who wrote a book entitled *Our Modern Woman: A National Problem* (1932):

The Filipina woman has ever been considered by Filipino man as having a high position and eminently worthy of respect. He places her upon a high pedestal. His love

for her is the purest that can be given by any created being. Looking around him, he sees the difference between Filipina women and women of other lands. Her splendor immediately comes to mind: her dewy eyes, her raven hair, her demure smile, her soft hands, her attractive figure—he looks up to these in admiration and worships her from afar.

But with the widespread occurrence of women's right to vote, all these will change. The leader of the women in this movement aims to be on an equal footing with men, to have the same right and responsibilities. If these are obtained, the Filipino woman will no longer experience the same high regard that Filipino men have for her. She will be lowering herself from the shrine where she is "lord of all she surveys" only to be placed on the level of men among whom the spirit of honor and valor are no longer to be found. She will undergo suffering to lose the potency of all that men have conferred on her over many centuries and the splendor that goes hand in hand with her history will completely fade from her womb. And this only to gain the vote that was never her heart's desire . . .

As a consequence of this, man will no longer entrust his pay envelope to his wife. At present, everything that the man earns is entrusted to the woman who disburses it according to her judgement. No questions are asked of her. She is greatly trusted. But this practice will appear outdated, once women get the right to vote . . . The Power of a woman over her husband and children will likewise be reduced, and she will be placed in a situation where she will be at pains to earn her living or obtain funds.⁸⁰

It was also argued that suffrage for women would result in the destruction of the home and neglect of the welfare of children.⁸¹ At the same time the other argument brandished against suffrage was that the women themselves did not want it.⁸²

By the 1920s, however, women began to give politics equal importance along with civic and charity work. In 1922 *La Liga Nacional de Damas de Filipinas* was organized to lobby for suffrage, with Dra Paz Mendoza Guazon as president. Maria Ventura formed the Women's Citizen's League in 1928 for a similar purpose. Women began to give speeches and participate in political debates on the suffrage issue. Two of the more vocal suffragists were Paz Policarpio Mendez (who already had a reputation as a writer since her short stories had been published in what was considered the prime periodical—the *Philippines Free Press*) and historian Encarnacion Alzona.

Alzona argued that the extension of the vote to women (regardless of whether the women demanded it or not) was "a happy presage for the future of democracy in these islands," because women could contribute much to the enactment of just legislation. To rebut the points made by those who rationalized women's marginalization from the vote with the argument that women needed to be protected from "dirty politics," she stressed that men were not being "solicitous" about women's welfare by shielding her from the "mud of politics" because women suffer the consequences of irresponsible politicians as much as the men. She also claimed that women's political involvement would not disrupt the peace at home.⁸³ All opponents were dismissed summarily with two rhetorical ques-

tions: "But, why deprive women of the vote because there are opponents of suffrage? Shall we abandon democracy because there are also opponents of democracy?"⁸⁴ When the Hernando Bill proposing women's suffrage was introduced to the legislature, Alzona described the campaign of the Filipina suffragists as quiet and essentially nonmilitant:

Many outstanding Filipino women demanded for suffrage in the past years. But witness the dignified and orderly manner in which they have expressed their wishes. The militant spirit of the Occident was totally absent. We have had no window-breaking, noisy suffragettes. The passive attitude of Filipino women toward the question of suffrage has been erroneously interpreted as proof of their disapproval of the enfranchisement of women rather than of their patience and love of peace and order. The character of our women forbids them to resort to the militant methods employed by British women, for example. They will wait for the duly constituted authorities to pass the law which will enfranchise them. They have confidence in the sagacity of our legislators.⁸⁵

Alzona explained women's calm and unemotional campaign as emerging from their inherent confidence that the male politicians would eventually see the light. My reading of the evidence so far suggests that perhaps women's more placid campaign for suffrage (which occurred very late) was because they were breaking ground in other fields. Political power was going to be the next public space they were contemplating.

Though the bill that advocated suffrage was introduced in 1933 and passed, a technicality arising from the change in the law, which would make the Philippines independent (the Hare-Hawes Cutting Law was rejected so a new one the Tydings-McDuffie Law replaced it), meant that the entire process of debating over suffrage had to be reenacted all over again. The final word on suffrage imposed the proviso that suffrage would be granted only if 300,000 women affirmed it in a plebiscite. The campaign for suffrage began in 1933, and in 1937 women's suffrage was won.

Though the "battle" for the vote did not appear to have been virulent or even ferocious enough to be labeled a fight or battle (there were also a number of male politicians who favored suffrage for women, the most prominent one being Rafael Palma), subsequent attempts of the suffragettes to lobby for prowomen legislation so soon after was much more impressive. A group of university-educated women organized themselves into the Philippine Association of University Women (PAUW) in 1928. Both Encarnacion Alzona and Paz Policarpio Mendez served terms as presidents of this clearly feminist organization. PAUW pressured for the amendment of the Civil Code (article 1387) so women had the right to dispose of their paraphernal property without a husband's consent.⁸⁶ PAUW also inspired the Tirona Bill (Senate) and the Ricohermoso-Fortich Bill (in the House of Representatives), which required the wife's written consent before the husband could sell their conjugal real estate property. Furthermore they asked for women's freedom to engage in business activities.⁸⁷ PAUW, like

the modern women who ran it, were not only first wave feminists agitating for women's rights but were also civic workers like their sisters in the NFWC. Hoping to make Manila a safer city, they suggested to the mayor that all electrical and telephone wires be placed underground because they were worried about the accidental electrocution due to broken electric wires. Unfortunately, such an idea was dismissed as too costly in the end.⁸⁸ They raised funds for disabled war veterans at the Quezon Institute, lobbied for the conversion of streets into temporary playgrounds (also a priority of the NFWC), and required subdivision owners also to set aside a portion of the estates for playgrounds.⁸⁹

In retrospect, penetrating the male-dominated realms of official power was not the only strategy these modern women adopted in their pursuit of female empowerment and increase in status. Since this was the first time that elections for local and national office was permitted, though women were not allowed to run for office until 1937, the wives and female kin of would-be male politicians from 1925 onward became visible on the campaign trail. Wives of politicians accompanied their husbands as they traveled the countryside seeking votes. In fact, many wives were already visibly seen to be instrumental in their husbands' electoral success. This is very significant since it was still considered uncouth by the social elite for males or females to promote themselves in public.

Mrs. Osias, who won third place in the *Philippines Free Press* contest for "most admired woman in the Philippines," was a politician's wife who acquired fame by becoming the first woman to ever campaign for her husband openly in public in 1925. It was the common perception that her help was instrumental in his election victory, a fact acknowledged by Senator Osias himself.⁹⁰ In fact, one writer suggested that there were exclamations of horror when she first openly campaigned for her husband.⁹¹ In 1928 her example was followed by Mrs. Angel Suntay from Bulacan, an American who attracted attention and admiration from the crowd because she gave speeches in Tagalog in contrast to the Speaker Manuel Roxas who endorsed the rival candidate and spoke in English.⁹² Both Mrs. Osias and Mrs. Suntay traveled around the country in campaign sojourns. By 1931, *Philippines Free Press* reported that the presence of wives at election campaigns and women giving speeches imploring the electorate to vote for their husbands was already *métodos antiguos* (an old practice). Mrs. Vamente gave campaign speeches, seen to be critical in gaining political ground although her husband lost.⁹³

A prime example is that of Doña Encarnación Luna de León from Malabon (Josephine Bracken), who was a good manager of the home and children during her nine years of marriage whose home management skills were acknowledged as responsible for the family's comfortable life. When her husband fell ill (with the flu) in the week before the elections, she took his place and gave election speeches. Due to her efforts, which included her talent for elocution, her husband emerged from the sick chamber "enfermo y débil, pero victorioso" [sick and weak, but victorious].⁹⁴ Mrs. de Leon was a student at Centro Escolar de Señoritas but gave up her studies to become a housewife.⁹⁵ In the postwar years, this *método antigua* (old political techniques) became common practice in the

gendering of Philippine politics with one more pronounced dimension. In assisting their menfolk get elected, women accessed unofficial power and could claim power in the man's name. At the same time, wives who had participated in their husband's political career then metamorphosed into politicians themselves at a later stage.⁹⁶ But in giving speeches and campaigning for their husbands from 1925 (more than a decade before women got the vote!), these women were already participating in politics and staking a claim on the future exercise of unofficial power. Whether women got the vote or not, women were already enmeshed in political affairs, political issues, and political processes.

Much like the modern woman suffragette who gave speeches for women to receive the vote, the wife who campaigned for her husband was also being modern. She penetrated the public sphere in the male-dominated field of politics at a time when campaigning for oneself was viewed by the conservative elite as brash Americanism. In fact, the proponents of women's suffrage were adamant in pointing out that women were already embroiled in political work by campaigning for husbands. Mrs. Araceli Adriatico Luna gave oratorical speeches in English, Spanish, and Tagalog. When her congressman husband was criticized by his rivals for "permitting his wife to meddle openly in politics," she replied, "Right today women are working in the fields and in the factories side by side with their men folks; in the higher professions it is the same. What then is new and wrong about a wife helping her husband in his political campaign?"⁹⁷ In fact the journalist writing about the debate predicted that because Mrs. de Leon was such a good speaker, if suffrage is passed, "she might be catapulted to the post her husband occupies at present . . . she has an irresistible appeal."⁹⁸

Philippines Free Press journalists were keen to point out that even those politicians against the suffrage issue were indebted to their female kin for their efforts in getting them elected in the first place. It was cited that Representative Guarina who was against the bill (although his wife and daughters supported it) could not have become congressman without the women in his life. "In Sorsogon it is quite generally conceded that the invaluable service of Guarina's daughters campaigning for their father's candidacy, contributed much to his return to the lower house."⁹⁹ The campaign for suffrage is not without irony. While *solons* (a journalistic term for members of the legislature) were debating about whether or not women should have the right to vote, these same women were already acting political by giving campaign speeches on the campaign trail. Furthermore, these same *solons* were indebted to these women for getting elected into office in the first place. In this sense, it was kinship politics, not only Western feminism that pushed women into political activities.

CONCLUSION

The most outstanding difference between the nineteenth-century woman and the women of the American colonial period is their educational attainments. The American educational policy gave women for the first time the opportunities to enter the professions and become doctors, nurses, lawyers and journalists, just

like the men. Public school education permitted lower-class women to gain some modicum of elementary education but it was the middle- and upper-class women who in acquiring secondary and tertiary education for the first time, received the tools that would allow themselves to articulate their ideas and their interests in the public sphere. And indeed these women distinguished themselves by excelling in the fields of education, civic work, and later as auxiliaries in political work (until suffrage was passed in 1937). The ease with which women immediately filled up these new public spaces open to them is remarkable and could be partly explained by society's support of their new modern roles. Although some of these new opportunities came from direct colonial policy, society seemed to endorse these new roles. In politics, however, it was preferred that women exercise power through the male so women's agitation for the vote—or to have the right to run for office—was much more resisted than women's eagerness to campaign for their husbands and perhaps later exercise power in his name. Thus, women's suffrage was contested but after the initial shock of Mrs. Osias's presence at campaign rallies, by the end of the 1920s, women campaigning and giving speeches to endorse male husbands or relatives was commonplace.

Some conservative bastions among high society's elite members may have still considered Mrs. Osias and her ilk as rather brash, but there is no doubt that they would agree that these women were modern. Filipino women must have had an acute sense of what new roles would be accepted easily by society, and hence they prioritized education and civic work above politics (official power). This strategy proved beneficial in the long run for they were successful in acquiring the very top positions and pushing the limits of women's leadership and hence empowerment in these areas. Though American policy on education for both sexes was beneficial to women, I have not examined the quality of that American education (one that has been critiqued by other historians, notably Renato Constantino as being "miseducation") on the national consciousness of Filipinos. There is already some evidence to show that women themselves were critiquing the ideological content of American education. For instance, although Mrs. Benitez wanted to instruct her pupils in English, the teachers were Filipino, not American and there was an emphasis on Philippine history, patriotism, and civic duty.¹⁰⁰

Once politics became a priority, in the late 1920s, women explored both official and unofficial power as avenues toward female empowerment. The suffragists opted for official power for women while the wives of politicians transformed themselves into their husband's alter-egos, giving speeches on the campaign trail, and perhaps later exercising power in his name. Once suffrage was granted women immediately elected Carmen Planas councilor in the first election where women were able to stand as political candidates.

Negotiating space was not just about entering new public spaces open to women for the first time. It was also about prioritizing what spaces to fill up first. It was also about employing strategies for women's empowerment and

success in the shortest time possible. Women in this period were enthusiastic about exploring all the opportunities available to them as quickly as possible. And yet, they did so without offering a radical definition of women's roles. The beauty queen just reinvented herself into a suffragist, the housewife into her husband's most avid campaigner, the teacher and mother into the president of a women's university, and the charity worker into a patroness. The changes were more dramatic in essence than they appeared to be on the surface. These women were also proactive in inventing the modern Filipina. In the postwar years modern would elicit different meanings,¹⁰¹ but in the first half of the twentieth century it meant speaking English, getting an education, and taking up new roles in the public sphere. Before the end of the colonial era women were definitely occupying spaces in the public sphere. It was then merely a question of whether they could outshine the men in the official gender discourse and whether they could gain equal stakes and power in politics and business.

NOTES

1. "Wood Advocates English and Newspapers and Praises Filipino Women," *Philippines Free Press*, October 29, 1921, p. 6.

2. Ibid.

3. This is the first part of an ongoing larger research project; a book on women in the American period in the Philippines.

4. See Paz Policarpio, "The Filipino Women During the Revolution," Digna Balangue Apilado, "The Women of Ilocos in the Revolutionary Era," Ma. Cecilia Locsin-Nava, "Teresa Magbanua: Women Warrior," Thelma B. Kintanar and Carina C. David, "Salud Algabre, Revolutionary," and Lilia Quindoza-Santiago, "Roots of Feminist Thought in the Philippines, all in *Review of Women's Studies* 5, no. 2, 6, no. 1 (1996); Fe B. Mangahas, "Ilang Tala Hinggil sa Teorya O Perspektiba sa Papel ng Kababaihang Pilipino sa Rebolusyon," Lilia Q. Santiago, "Ang Salaysay ng Babae, Pagkababae at Kababaihan sa Rebolusyong ng 1896," Victor C. Ramos, "Ang Babaing Rebolusyong ng 1896 Bilang Huwaran ng mga Kuwentong Pang-Mass Media," Regino P. Paular and Augusto V. de Viana, "Women Katipuneros' Counterespionage Activities," Lydia G. Garcia, "Ang Kababaihan ng Bulakan at ang Rebolusyon," Isagani R. Medina, "Ang Kababaihan ng Kabite sa Rebolusyon ng 1896," Ma. Luisa T. Camagay, "Ang Buhay Pamamilya Noong Panahon ng Rebolusyon," and Teresita G. Maceda, "Imahen ng Inang Bayan sa Kundiman ng Himagsikan," all in *Kumperensya '93 Ang Papel ng Kababaihan at Katutubo sa Rebolusyong 1896* (Baguio and Benguet: University of the Philippines Kolehiyo sa Baguio, and Benguet State University, 1995); Carmelita C. Corpuz, "Women in the Katipunan," in Erlinda H. Bragado, ed., *Filipinas in Dialogue* (Manila: De La Salle University Press, 1995); and Rafaelita Hilario Soriano, ed., *Women in the Philippine Revolution* (Metro-Manila: Printon Press, Kaanak '96, 1995).

5. See Melanie Nolan and Caroline Daley, "International Feminist Perspectives on Suffrage: An Introduction" and Patricia Grimshaw, "Women's Suffrage in New Zealand Revisited: Writing from the Margins," both in Caroline Daley and Melanie Nolan, eds., *Suffrage and Beyond: International Feminist Perspectives* (Auckland and Annandale: Auckland University Press and Pluto Press, 1994). These feminist scholars argued that

there had been a decline in scholarly interest on suffrage history perhaps due to the disappointments with first wave feminism.

6. See for instance Nick Joaquin, *Hers, This Grove* (Manila: The Philippine Women's University, 1996), and Nick Joaquin, *One Woman's Liberating: The Life and Career of Estefania Aldaba-Lim* (Manila: Anvil, 1996); Gertie Ampil-Tirona, *Empowering Woman: The Helena Z. Benitez Herstory* (Manila: Helena Z. Benitez Heritage Foundation, 1995); Maria J. Empig, *Helena Z. Benitez: The Educator* (Manila: Helena Z. Benitez Heritage Foundation, 1994); Maria Kalaw Katigbak, *Legacy: Pura Villanueva Kalaw: Her Times, Life, and Works 1886–1954* (Manila: Filipinas Foundation Inc., 1983); and Virginia Benitez Licuanan, *Paz Marquez Benitez: One Woman's Life, Letters, and Writings* (Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1995). Although not a commissioned biography, Ma. Luisa Camagay's brief essays in a collection of Alzona's writings is also extremely laudatory and uncritical. See Maria Luisa T. Camagay, *Encarnacion Alzona: An Anthology* (Quezon City: Office of Research Coordination, University of the Philippines, 1996). One autobiography that accurately described itself as an "ego-trip" is Paz Policarpio Mendez, *A String of Pearls: Memoirs of a Filipina Suffragist* (Quezon City: Kalayaan Press, c. 1993).

7. The clash between the *Hispanistas* and the *Sajonistas*, the conflict between kinship politics and Western values, is discussed in Mina Roces, "Compadrazco and Delicadeza in Philippine Political Culture," *Moussons* 1, no. 1 (2000). See also Mina Roces, *Kinship Politics in Post-War Philippines: The Lopez Family, 1945–2000* (Manila: De la Salle University Press, forthcoming), chapter 2.

8. See Mina Roces, *Women, Power and Kinship Politics: Female Power in Post-War Philippines* (Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 1998).

9. For an in-depth study on the gendering of Philippine postwar politics see either Mina Roces, "The Gendering of Philippine Post-War Politics," in Maila Stevens and Krishna Sen, eds., *Gender and Power in Affluent Asia* (London: Routledge, 1998), or Roces, *Women, Power and Kinship Politics*.

10. In the Spanish colonial era Filipinos (then called *indios*) could only fill the ranks of *gobernadorcillo* (town mayors) and *cabeza de barangay* (heads of the village).

11. Amaryllis Torres, "A Filipina Looks at Herself: A Review of Women's Studies in the Philippines," in Amaryllis Torres, ed., *The Filipina Woman in Focus* (Quezon City: University of the Philippines Office of Research Coordination, University of the Philippines Press, 1995), p. 6.

12. Nicanor Tiongson, "Woman in Nineteenth Century Philippines," in Alfredo Roces, ed., *Filipino Heritage*, Vol. 7 (Manila: Lahing Pilipino Publishing Inc., 1978), p. 1784.

13. Sr. Mary John Mananzan, "The Filipino Woman: Before and After the Spanish Conquest of the Philippines," in Sr. Mary John Mananzan, ed., *Essays on Women* (Manila: Institute of Women's Studies, St. Scholastica's College, 1987, 1991), p. 30.

14. See Ma. Luisa Camagay, *Working Women of Manila in the 19th Century* (Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press and the University Center for Women's Studies, 1995).

15. Carolyn Israel Sobritchea, "American Colonial Education and Its Impact on the Status of Filipino Women," in *Women's Role in Philippine History: Selected Essays* (Quezon City: University Center for Women's Studies, University of the Philippines, 1996), p. 82.

16. For a more in-depth discussion on these roles see Mina Roces, "Reflections on

Gender and Kinship in the Philippine Revolution 1896–1898,” in Miguel Luque Talaván, Juan José Pacheco Onrubia, and Fernando Palanco Aguado, eds, *1898: España Y El Pacífico Interpretación del Pasado, Realidad del Presente* (Madrid: Asociación Española de Estudios del Pacífico, 1999), pp. 379–89.

17. O. D. Corpuz, *The Roots of the Filipino Nation*, Vol. 2 (Quezon City: Aklahi Foundation Inc., 1989), p. 212.

18. Ibid.

19. Emilio Jacinto, “Teachings of the Katipunan,” in Teodoro Agoncillo, *The Revolt of the Masses* (Quezon City: University of the Philippines, 1965), p. 84.

20. Jose Rizal, “Sa Mga Kababayang Dalaga sa Malolos,” in Jose Rizal, *Escritos Políticos Y Historicos* (Manila: Rizal Centennial Commission, 1961), p. 58.

21. “La Petición de las Jóvenes Malolesas,” quoted in Rizal, *Escritos Políticos Y Historicos*, 65.

22. Rizal, “Sa Mga Kababayang Dalaga sa Malolos,” p. 56.

23. Ibid., p. 60.

24. Alfredo Roces, “The Illustrado Lifestyle,” unpublished manuscript, 1996, p. 4.

25. Interview with Congresswoman Consuelo Puyat-Reyes, Makati, Metro-Manila, January 11, 1994.

26. Miguela Gonzalez-Yap, *The Making of Cory* (Quezon City: New Day Publishers, (1987), p. 107.

27. Romeo V. Cruz, “Ang Pilipina sa Panahon ng Himagsikan at Digmaang Pilipino-Amerikano,” in *Women’s Role in Philippine History: Selected Essays* (Quezon City: University Center for Women’s Studies, University of the Philippines, 1996), p. 76; Corpuz, *The Roots*, p. 212, and Agoncillo, *The Revolt*, pp. 55–56.

28. See Rafaelita Hilario Soriano, ed., *Women in the Philippine Revolution* (Metro-Manila: Printon Press, Kaanak ’96, 1995).

29. Rafaelita Hilario Soriano, “Salome Saiopoco Wife of General Mariano Llanera,” in *ibid.*, pp. 136–40.

30. Nick Joaquin, “Pop Culture: The American Years,” in Alfredo Roces, ed., *Filipino Heritage*, Vol. 10 (Manila: Lahing Pilipino Publishing Inc., 1978), pp. 2733–44.

31. “Here’s Your Chance, Ladies!” *Philippines Free Press*, February 7, 1931, pp. 26–27; “Sectionalist or Nationalist?” *Philippines Free Press*, February 28, 1931, p. 16; “He Loves Them All,” *Philippines Free Press*, March 7, 1931, p. 22.

32. “The ‘Most Envied Woman’ in the Philippines,” *Philippines Free Press*, April 1, 1931, p. 6.

33. Ibid.

34. Sobritchea, “American Colonial Education,” p. 91.

35. Ibid. and Joaquin, *Hers, This Grove*.

36. Sobritchea, “American Colonial Education,” p. 93.

37. Patricia Licuanan, “A Situation Analysis of Women in the Philippines,” in Jeanne Frances Illo, ed., *Gender Analysis and Planning: The 1990 IPC-CIDA Workshops* (Quezon City: Institute of Philippine Culture, Ateneo de Manila University, 1991), p. 16, and Elizabeth Eviota, *The Political Economy of Gender: Women and the Sexual Division of Labor in the Philippines* (London and Manila: Zed Books and Institute of Women’s Studies, St. Scholastica’s College, 1992), p. 94.

38. Sobritchea, “American Colonial Education,” p. 92.

39. This list was taken from newspaper accounts in the *Philippines Free Press* from 1918–1934, and records at the Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan. But

more research needs to be done on the subject to gain a more exhaustive list of universities and colleges attended by women *pensionados*. Women nurses also went to American hospitals for training.

40. "Should *Pensionado* System be Abolished?" *Philippines Free Press*, August 14, 1926, p. 6.

41. Francisco Benitez, "The *Pensionado* System," *Philippines Free Press*, August 23, 1930, p. 7.

42. Avtar H. Singh, "Barbour Scholarships for Oriental Women at The University of Michigan 1917–1955," Term Paper for A 202 Dr. C. Eggertsen, n.d., unpublished manuscript, held at the Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan, p. 2.

43. *Ibid.*, p. 7.

44. *Ibid.*, p. 6.

45. *Ibid.*, p. 10.

46. *Ibid.*, Appendix E.

47. *Ibid.*

48. "List of Barbour Fellows," unpublished manuscript, Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan; *Permanent Record of Barbour Scholars with Numbers and Date of Initial Appointment*, n.d., Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

49. *Permanent Record of Barbour Scholars with Numbers and Date of Initial Appointment*.

50. Joaquin, *Hers, This Grove*, and Tirona, *Empowering Woman*.

51. Joaquin, *Hers, This Grove*, p. 39.

52. *Ibid.*, p. 18.

53. *Ibid.*, p. 63.

54. "In Some Respects She Stands the Foremost Woman in the Philippine Islands Today," *Philippines Free Press*, March 18, 1922, p. 12; "A Momentous Week at Centro Escolar de Señoritas," *Philippines Free Press*, January 22, 1927, pp. 32–33; and "Dos Madres De Centenares de Jóvenes Filipinas," *Philippines Free Press*, May 14, 1927, p. 59.

55. "Centro Escolar de Señoritas," full-page advertisement, *Philippines Free Press*, May 9, 1931, p. 62.

56. "A Momentous Week," p. 33.

57. See "In Some Respects" and "Dos Madres."

58. Vicente U. Villamore, "The Young Ladies Academy," *Philippines Free Press*, April 9, 1921, p. 13.

59. "The First Carnival Queen was Pura Villanueva, 1908," *Philippines Free Press*, February 16, 1924, p. 3.

60. "La Reina del Carnaval de Iloilo," *Philippines Free Press*, April 11, 1925, p. 56.

61. See Mina Roces, *Women, Power and Kinship Politics*.

62. Leonardo Mercado, *The Filipino Mind* (Manila: The Council for Research in Values and Divine Word Publications, 1994), pp. 88–89.

63. "The Eternal Queen," *Philippines Free Press*, February 7, 1931, p. 1.

64. D. L. Francisco, "Where Are the Queens of Yesteryear?" *Philippines Free Press*, January 16, 1932, p. 6.

65. Katigbak, *Legacy: Pura Villanueva Kalaw*, pp. 191–97.

66. Virginia Benitez Licuanan, *Paz Marque Benitez*, p. 65.

67. Francisco, "Where Are the Queens," p. 64.

68. See Mrs. Maud Neal Parker, "Women's Clubs of Pangasinan," *Philippines Free*

Press, September 21, 1918, pp. 5, 13; Mrs. Maud N. Parker, "Pangasinan Women's Clubs and Trancazo," *Philippines Free Press*, November 30, 1918, pp. 5, 11; Mrs. Maud N. Parker, "What Club Women are Trying to Do to Help Wronged Girls," *Philippines Free Press*, February 18, 1928, p. 4; Mrs. Maud N. Parker, "Remarkable Tribute to a Filipino Women," *Philippines Free Press*, April 25, 1925, pp. 22–23; see also "First National Convention of Women's Clubs in Philippines—January 31 to Feb. 2, 1920," *Philippines Free Press*, January 3, 1920, p. 20.

69. Parker, "Women's Clubs of Pangasinan," pp. 5, 13.

70. Parker, "Pangasinan Women's Clubs and Trancazo," pp. 5, 11.

71. "First National Convention of Women's Clubs," pp. 20–21.

72. Josefa Llanes Escoda, "What Social Work Offers You," *Philippines Free Press*, August 3, 1935, p. 14.

73. "Modest, Charming, Capable," *Philippines Free Press*, April 9, 1932, pp. 45, 56.

74. Mary Grace Ampil Tirona, "Pañuelo Activism," in *Women's Role in Philippine History: Selected Essays* (Quezon City: University Center for Women's Studies, University of the Philippines, 1996), p. 120.

75. Pura Villanueva Kalaw, *How the Filipina Got the Vote* (Manila: N.p., 1952).

76. *Ibid.*, p. 117.

77. "La Cuarta Convención de la Federación Nacional de los clubs de Mujeres," *Philippines Free Press*, March 8, 1923, p. 30.

78. *Philippines Free Press*, November 22, 1919, p. 1.

79. Remedios M. Melencio, "She is not One of the 'Militants,'" *Philippines Free Press*, February 11, 1922, p. 7, 15; "A Stirring Message to Philippine Women," *Philippines Free Press*, February 10, 1923, p. 4; Jose J. Gallito, "Fair Woman Again," *Philippines Free Press*, June 23, 1923, p. 26; "Shall Women Vote?" *Philippines Free Press*, September 19, 1931, p. 54.

80. Quoted in Lilia Quindoza-Santiago, "Roots of Feminist Thought in the Philippines," pp. 165–66.

81. Luz Martinez, "El Sufragio Feminino en Filipinas," *Philippines Free Press*, November 22, 1919, pp. 35, 40–41; "A Free Press Debate on Woman's Suffrage," *Philippines Free Press*, November 22, 1919, pp. 13–14; Melencio, "She is not One of the 'Militants,'" pp. 7, 15; Gallito, "Against Suffrage," "Fair Woman Again," p. 26; "Shall Women Vote?" pp. 8, 65; and "They Really Don't Care," *Philippines Free Press*, October 31, 1931, p. 6.

82. Encarnacion Alzona, "Shall the Filipina Women Vote?" in Maria Luisa T. Camagay, ed., *Encarnacion Alzona: An Anthology* (Quezon City: Office of Research Coordination, University of the Philippines, 1996), p. 57; "They Really Don't Care," p. 6.

83. Encarnacion Alzona, "Woman Suffrage in the Philippines," in Maria Luisa T. Camagay, ed., *Encarnacion Alzona*, p. 63.

84. *Ibid.*, p. 64.

85. Encarnacion Alzona, "The Hernando Bill," in *ibid.*, p. 61.

86. Encarnacion Alzona, "The Role of Women in Philippine Progress," in *ibid.*, p. 66. Mendez, *A String of Pearls*, p. 74.

87. *Ibid.*

88. Encarnacion Alzona, "Filipinas, 'Pearl of the Orient Sea,'" in Maria Luisa T. Camagay, ed., *Encarnacion Alzona*, p. 256.

89. Mendez, *A String of Pearls*, p. 75.

90. "Métodos Electorales," *Philippines Free Press*, June 13, 1931, p. 62.
91. Joaquin, "Pop Culture," p. 2736.
92. "Métodos Electorales," p. 62.
93. Ibid.
94. Ibid., pp. 62–63.
95. Ibid., p. 63.
96. For an in-depth study of female power, particularly unofficial power in the post-war Philippines, see Rocés, *Women, Power and Kinship Politics*.
97. "Another Argument for Woman's Suffrage," *Philippines Free Press*, July 16, 1932, p. 54.
98. Ibid.
99. "Do You Favor or Oppose Woman Suffrage?" *Philippines Free Press*, September 4, 1926, p. 36.
100. Joaquin, *Hers, This Grove*, pp. 79, 82–83.
101. See Mina Rocés, "Negotiating Modernities: Filipino Women, 1970–2000," in Louise Edwards and Mina Rocés, eds., *Women in Asia: Tradition, Modernity and Globalisation* (Sydney and Ann Arbor: Allen & Unwin and The University of Michigan Press, 2000).

REFERENCES

Primary Sources

- Camagay, Maria Luisa T. *Encarnacion Alzona: An Anthology*. Quezon City: Office of Research Coordination, University of the Philippines, 1996.
- De Castro, Presbitero D. Modesto. *Pagsusulatang Nang Dalawang Binibini na si Urbana at Feliza*. Manila: c. 1860.
- Jacinto, Emilio. "Teachings of the Katipunan," In Teodoro Agoncillo, *The Revolt of the Masses*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines, 1965.
- Kalaw, Pura Villanueva. *How the Filipina Got the Vote*. Manila: N.p., 1952.
- "List of Barbour Fellows." Unpublished manuscript. The Bentley Historical Library, The University of Michigan, n.d.
- Mendez, Paz Policarpio. *A String of Pearls: Memoirs of a Filipina Suffragist*. Quezon City: Kalayaan Press, c. 1993.
- Permanent Record of Barbour Scholars with Numbers and Date of Initial Appointment*. The Bentley Historical Library, The University of Michigan. N.d. *Philippines Free Press*, 1918–1934.
- Puyat-Reyes, Congresswoman Consuelo. Interview with author. Makati, Metro-Manila, January 11, 1994.
- Rizal, Jose. "Sa Mga Kababayang Dalaga sa Malolos." In Jose Rizal, *Escritos Políticos Y Historicos*. Manila: Rizal Centennial Commission, 1961.

Secondary Sources

- Apilado, Digna Apilado. "The Women of Ilocos in the Revolutionary Era." *Review of Women's Studies* 5, no. 2, 6, no. 1 (1996).
- Camagay, Ma. Luisa T. "Ang Buhay Pampamilya Noong Panahon ng Rebolusyon." *Kumperensiya '93 Ang Papel ng Kababaihan at Katutubo sa Rebolusyong 1896*.

- Baguio and Benguet: University of the Philippines Kolehiyo sa Baguio and Benguet State University, 1995.
- . *Working Women of Manila in the 19th Century*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press and the University Center for Women's Studies, 1995.
- Corpuz, Carmelita C. "Women in the Katipunan." In Erlinda H. Bragado, ed., *Filipinas in Dialogue*. Manila: De La Salle University Press, 1995.
- Corpuz, O. D. *The Roots of the Filipino Nation*. Vol. 2. Quezon City: Aklahi Foundation Inc., 1989.
- Empig, Maria J. *Helena Z. Benitez: The Educator*. Manila: Helena Z. Benitez Heritage Foundation, 1994.
- Eviota, Elizabeth. *The Political Economy of Gender: Women and the Sexual Division of Labor in the Philippines*. London and Manila: Zed Books and Institute of Women's Studies, St. Scholastica's College, 1992.
- Garcia, Lydia G. "Ang Kababaihan ng Bulakan at ang Rebolusyon." *Kumperensiya '93 Ang Papel ng Kababaihan at Katutubo sa Rebolusyong 1896*. Baguio and Benguet: University of the Philippines Kolehiyo sa Baguio and Benguet State University, 1995.
- Gonzalez-Yap, Miguela. *The Making of Cory*. Quezon City: New Day Publishers, 1987.
- Grimshaw, Patricia. "Women's Suffrage in New Zealand Revisited: Writing from the Margins." In Caroline Daley and Melanie Nolan, eds., *Suffrage and Beyond: International Feminist Perspectives*. Auckland and Annandale: Auckland University Press and Pluto Press, 1994.
- Joaquin, Nick. "Pop Culture: The American Years." In Alfredo Roces, ed., *Filipino Heritage*. Vol. 10. Manila: Lahing Pilipino Publishing Inc., 1978.
- . *Hers, This Grove*. Manila: The Philippine Women's University, 1996.
- . *One Woman's Liberating: The Life and Career of Estefania Aldaba-Lim*. Manila: Anvil, 1996.
- Katigbak, Maria Kalaw. *Legacy: Pura Villanueva Kalaw: Her Times, Life and Works 1886-1954*. Manila: Filipinas Foundation Inc., 1983.
- Kintanar Thelma B., and Carina C. David. "Salud Algabre, Revolutionary." *Review of Women's Studies* 5, no. 2, 6, no. 1 (1996).
- Licuanan, Patricia. "A Situation Analysis of Women in the Philippines." In Jeanne Frances Illo, ed., *Gender Analysis and Planning: The 1990 IPC-CIDA Workshops*. Quezon City: Institute of Philippine Culture, Ateneo de Manila University, 1991.
- Licuanan, Virginia Benitez. *Paz Marquez Benitez: One Woman's Life, Letters, and Writings*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1995.
- Locsin-Nava, Ma. Cecilia. "Teresa Magbanua: Woman Warrior." *Review of Women's Studies*, 5, no. 2, 6, no. 1 (1996).
- Maceda, Teresita G. "Imahen ng Inang Bayan sa Kundiman ng Himagsikan." *Kumperensiya '93 Ang Papel ng Kababaihan at Katutubo sa Rebolusyong 1896*. Baguio and Benguet: University of the Philippines Kolehiyo sa Baguio and Benguet State University, 1995.
- Mananzan, Sister Mary John. "The Filipino Woman: Before and After the Spanish Conquest of the Philippines." In Sister Mary John Mananzan, ed., *Essays on Women*. Manila: Institute of Women's Studies, St. Scholastica's College, 1987, 1991.
- Mangahas, Fe B. "Ilang Tala Hinggil sa Teorya O Perspektiba sa Papel ng Kababaihang Pilipino sa Rebolusyon." *Kumperensiya '93 Ang Papel ng Kababaihan at Katu-*

- tubo sa Rebolusyong 1896*. Baguio and Benguet: University of the Philippines Kolehiyo sa Baguio and Benguet State University, 1995.
- Medina, Isagani R. "Ang Kababaihan ng Kabite sa Rebolusyon ng 1896." *Kumperensiya '93 Ang Papel ng Kababaihan at Katutubo sa Rebolusyong 1896*. Baguio and Benguet: University of the Philippines Kolehiyo sa Baguio and Benguet State University, 1995.
- Mercado, Leonardo. *The Filipino Mind*. Manila: The Council for Research in Values and Divine Word Publications, 1994.
- Nolan, Melanie, and Caroline Daley. "International Feminist Perspectives on Suffrage: An Introduction." In Caroline Daley and Melanie Nolan, eds., *Suffrage and Beyond: International Feminist Perspectives*. Auckland and Annandale: Auckland University Press and Pluto Press, 1994.
- Paular, Regino P., and Augusto V. de Viana. "Women Katipuneros' Counterespionage Activities." *Kumperensiya '93 Ang Papel ng Kababaihan at Katutubo sa Rebolusyong 1896*. Baguio and Benguet: University of the Philippines Kolehiyo sa Baguio and Benguet State University, 1995.
- Policarpio, Paz. "The Filipino Women During the Revolution." *Review of Women's Studies* 5, no. 2, 6, no. 1 (1996).
- Quindoza-Santiago, Lilia. "Roots of Feminist Thought in the Philippines." *Review of Women's Studies* 5, no. 2, 6, no. 1 (1996).
- Ramos, Victor C. "Ang Babaing Rebolusyonaryo ng 1896 Bilang Huwaran ng mga Kuwentong Pang-Mass Media." *Kumperensiya '93 Ang Papel ng Kababaihan at Katutubo sa Rebolusyong 1896*. Baguio and Benguet: University of the Philippines Kolehiyo sa Baguio and Benguet State University, 1995.
- Roces, Alfredo. "The Ilustrado Lifestyle." Unpublished manuscript, 1996.
- Roces, Mina. "The Gendering of Philippine Post-War Politics." In Maila Stivens and Krishna Sen, eds., *Gender and Power in Affluent Asia*. London: Routledge, 1998.
- . *Women, Power and Kinship Politics: Female Power in Post-War Philippines*. Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 1998.
- . "Reflections on Gender and Kinship in the Philippine Revolution 1896–1898." In Miguel Luque Talaván, Juan José Pacheco Onrubia, and Fernando Palanco Aguado, eds., *1898: España Y El Pacífico Interpretación del Pasado, Realidad de Presente*. Madrid: Asociación Española de Estudios del Pacífico, 1999.
- . "Compadrazco and Delicadeza in Philippine Political Culture." *Moussons* 1, no. 1 (2000).
- . "Negotiating Modernities: Filipino Women, 1970–2000." In Louise Edwards and Mina Roces, eds., *Women in Asia: Tradition, Modernity and Globalisation*. Sydney and Ann Arbor: Allen & Unwin and the University of Michigan Press, 2000.
- . *Kinship Politics in Post-War Philippines: The Lopez Family, 1945–2000*. Manila: De La Salle University Press, forthcoming.
- Santiago, Lilia Q. "Ang Salaysay ng Babae, Pagkababae at Kababaihan sa Rebolusyong ng 1896." *Kumperensiya '93 Ang Papel ng Kababaihan at Katutubo sa Rebolusyong 1896*. Baguio and Benguet: University of the Philippines Kolehiyo sa Baguio and Benguet State University, 1995.
- Singh, Avtar H. "Barbour Scholarships for Oriental Women at The University of Michigan 1917–1955." Term Paper for A 202 Dr. C. Eggertsen, unpublished manuscript. The Bentley Historical Library, The University of Michigan, n.d.

- Sobritchea, Carolyn Israel. "American Colonial Education and Its Impact on the Status of Filipino Women." In *Women's Role in Philippine History: Selected Essays*. Quezon City: University Center for Women's Studies, University of the Philippines, 1996.
- Soriano, Rafaelita Hilario, ed., *Women in the Philippine Revolution*. Metro-Manila: Princeton Press, Kaanak '96, 1995.
- Tiongson, Nicanor. "Woman in Nineteenth Century Philippines." In Alfredo Roces, ed., *Filipino Heritage*. Vol. 7. Manila: Lahing Pilipino Publishing Inc., 1978.
- Tirona, Gertie Ampil. *Empowering Woman: The Helena Z. Benitez Herstory*. Manila: Helena Z. Benitez Heritage Foundation, 1995.
- Tirona, Mary Grace Ampil. "Pañuelo Activism." In *Women's Role in Philippine History: Selected Essays*. Quezon City: University Center for Women's Studies, University of the Philippines, 1996.
- Torres, Amaryllis. "A Filipina Looks at Herself: A Review of Women's Studies in the Philippines." In Amaryllis Torres, ed., *The Filipina Woman in Focus*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Office of Research Coordination, University of the Philippines Press, 1995.

American Rule in the Muslim South and the Philippine Hinterlands

Raul Pertierra and Eduardo F. Ugarte

In this chapter, we assess the characteristics and success of American colonization in the Philippine hinterlands. By this, we mean regions and provinces whose inhabitants traditionally had had minimal and often hostile contact with the central government. During nearly four centuries of Spanish rule, large areas of the Philippines remained relatively uncontrolled, despite repeated attempts to subdue their inhabitants. The highland dwellers of the Cordillera mountains in northern Luzon and various peoples in Mindanao and Sulu, particularly the Moros, retained a large degree of political, cultural, and economic autonomy during the Spanish period. This was exemplified in their refusal to accept religious conversion, which eventually became a symbol of resistance to colonial rule.

PAX AMERICANA

The introduction of modern firearms, especially the motorized warship, toward the end of the Spanish period may have completed the process of military domination, except for the outbreak of the Philippine revolution in 1896–1898. Large areas of lowland Luzon and parts of the Visayas succeeded in overthrowing Spanish rule. Local leaders among the native elite prepared to take the reins of government, but American intervention prevented it. A one-sided but, nevertheless, vicious war followed where each party saw itself as defending a righteous cause. In a letter written in 1899, Mabini argued that to capitulate to the Americans “would reinforce the belief of others that Filipinos lack culture

... or that they were an uncivilized country” (Diokno, 1994:6). This was precisely the American justification for invading the Philippines.

According to Worcester (1914), Filipinos had at most a blunted moral sense and could not be expected reasonably to govern themselves according to acceptable democratic standards. Therefore, it was America’s manifest destiny to liberate the islands of its corrupt *mestizo* leadership and educate its people in the arts of civilized government. This view prevailed despite opposing American voices such as Blount’s (1913) exposition of American duplicity in justifying its imperial policies. In 1899, Senator Carl Schurz, a noted member of the Anti-Imperialist League, described the Philippine-American War as criminal aggression against the people of the Philippines (Sullivan, 1991:81).

We also see the hinterland as exposing the essential nature of American colonization. This involved the control not only of the public sphere but also areas of private life hitherto limited to religion during the Spanish period. In addition to the disciplines of schooling and the needs of a growing cash economy, the new colonial power involved the control of disease and other abnormalities. The headhunter and the *amok-juramentado* and the leper represented gross deviations from normality and the Americans were determined to eliminate or isolate such aberrations.

RATIONALES FOR CONQUEST

The justification for America’s imperialist aims in the Philippines is undoubtedly complex, but we can identify certain significant elements. One was its increasing ambitions as a global power and its consequent challenge of British and European colonialism. Another was its desire for new markets and access to natural resources following the closing of its continental borders. The Philippines represented the extension into the Pacific of a new frontier. Finally, American imperialism, at least in the Philippines, was also based on a deeply felt civilizing mission (Adas, 1999). This was not limited to a moral agenda such as the elimination of slavery or headhunting or even to ameliorative programs resulting in improved public health or education. It also extended to the acquisition of knowledge for the benefit of future generations. The Philippines represented a new laboratory for an American triumphalist science (Anderson, 1998). Echoing this scientification of imperial conquest, Dean Worcester¹ explained the basis of American occupation to a Des Moines journalist in 1915 as “not one of politics but of ethnology” (Sullivan, 1991:183).

Once the Americans had decided to occupy the Philippines permanently rather than simply liberate it from its Spanish masters, administrators set out to organize the country’s civil government. Educated Filipinos quickly became part of this new bureaucracy and in little over a decade were starting to voice demands for increasing political autonomy. While these demands were becoming more

acceptable to the American authorities, the hinterlands remained as a major justification for a colonial presence.

In 1913, Worcester, a prominent bureaucrat and scholar wrote:

Filipino control would indeed be a very dreadful thing for the people of the hills, but I have some little hope that they have now progressed far enough so that they would be able to take care of themselves and keep their Filipino neighbors out of their territory altogether. Certainly the Ifugaos, Bontoc Igorots, and Kalingas might do this if they had a few guns. I hope they will be able to get them in the event that independence is granted to the Filipinos. (Sullivan, 1991:148)

Worcester is usually portrayed as one of the strongest supporters of tribal Filipinos and the founder of the Bureau of Non-Christian Tribes (1901). He was largely responsible for classifying Filipinos into religious affiliations as well as into ethnological categories. As a consequence, the Philippines was seen as consisting of Hispanized Catholic lowlanders, non-Christian highlanders, and Moros (Muslims). Each required different colonial policies to satisfy their particular needs. Worcester's usage above of the term Filipino referred only to Hispanized lowlanders.²

DISCOURSE OF PROGRESS

The American intervention in the Philippines was seen in the context of its civilizing mission. They were keen to show the world the modern, democratic way of managing a colonial society. In 1905, David Barrows, the director of education, published a history textbook, which was prescribed reading in government schools. In it, he located the role of Filipinos in the march of a universal history. Iletto (1998) argues that Barrows sees Filipinos as historical agents reproducing events that had already happened elsewhere, in Europe and the Americas, a century earlier. The Spaniards had initiated this Filipino participation in universal history but Spanish greed and ignorance prevented Filipinos from progressing beyond a medieval condition.³ Filipinos such as Jose Rizal protested against this stagnation of the nation's historical progress to no avail. Andres Bonifacio and Emilio Aguinaldo continued Rizal's struggle but were unable to overcome conservative elements in their own backgrounds.⁴ It is at this stage that American intervention was crucial. They provided Filipinos with the skills and knowledge to initiate the transition to modernity.

Most influential Americans subscribed to Barrows's depiction of the Philippine past and the possibilities of its future. But this future was threatened by persistent features of local society such as the superstitions taught by the friars and the moral failings of their Hispanized subjects. Non-Christian Filipinos were not as corrupted as their lowland counterparts, and Americans like Worcester were determined to save them from such contamination. For Americans accus-

tomed to the fears of miscegenation, the mestizo features of many Christian lowlanders must have cast doubts regarding their character.

THE SCIENCE OF CLASSIFICATION

The classification of Filipinos into religious categories partly followed the earlier Spanish practice but was premised on very different ends. While the Spaniards considered religious conversion to be one of their major colonial aims, the Americans, coming from a more secular background, saw their new subjects as requiring tutelage in the modern art of democratic government. To begin this task, they first had to classify Filipinos into appropriate stages of cultural and political development. Following conventional evolutionary models of the time, Filipinos were classified, in order of ascending civilization, into Negritos, Indonesians (Moros and people from the Cordillera), and lowland Malayans (Sullivan, 1991). The first group was seen as vestigial and a remnant of a bygone past. The second, while adhering to objectionable practices such as headhunting and slavery, nevertheless had redeeming features, of which a developed love of freedom expressed in a primitive democracy was the most laudable. The last group, while outwardly most developed, following centuries of colonial rule, including intermarriages with Asians and Europeans were, as a result, less authentic. This last group was, however, the most vocal and successful in convincing the Americans that they merited political autonomy.⁵

In 1914, Worcester proudly claimed that he was able “to reduce to twenty-seven the eighty-two non-Christian tribes” earlier identified by Ferdinand Blumentritt, the famous Austrian ethnologist.⁶ This followed the establishment of the Philippine Ethnological Survey (1903), whose first director, David Barrows, correctly objected to the use of tribes to classify ethnic boundaries, seeing them instead as culturally defined spatial agglomerations.

During this early period of American colonization, ethnographers mapped the hinterlands, identifying cultural differences. These cultural differences were solidified into political units called tribes, whose members henceforth began to view themselves as significantly different from one another. In the context of traditional village hostilities and conflicts, this new system of classification transformed past differences into ethnic divisions. This process of ethnicization is illustrated in the case of Zamora, a borderland community in Ilocos Sur, in which one of us has been conducting fieldwork since 1975 (Pertierra, 1988).

ETHNICITY AND LOCALITY

Zamora is located near the southwestern border of the province of Abra. Zamorans, who trace their ancestry from Sagada-Bontoc, speak Kankanai, while those whose ancestors came from Abra speak Itneg. In Zamora, communities whose members refer to themselves either as Kankanay or Itneg concentrated

in distinct villages (e.g., Macaoayan, Masinget). Gradually, most of their inhabitants began referring to themselves as Ilocano to indicate their assimilation into the broader lowland culture. The traditional marriage preference was for patrilineal cross-cousins which, when combined with uxorilocal residence ensured that men returned to their paternal villages. There they tilled their father's land and lived among cognatic kin. But their own sons would likely raise their families elsewhere. This practice resulted in alternate generations of men returning to their ancestral villages, while developing consociational ties in their wives' village.

Ethnicity was defined according to locality, while descent was traced genealogically. People in Zamora identify themselves as Ilocano, Itneg, or Kankanay, depending on locality (and on the discursive context) but they may trace descent elsewhere. When the Americans began to conceive of these differences as tribal, with its implied political loyalties, descent became conflated with locality and transformed into ethnicity. For this reason, Zamorans presently tend to identify locality with ethnicity despite having continuous ties with kin in distant localities. The process of Ilocanization simply exacerbated this tendency, so that within one or two generations (1900–1940), Zamora transformed itself from an Itneg-Kankanay community into an Ilocano one. There is no evidence that such a transformation was achieved through massive in-migration of lowland Ilocanos but rather through the conflation of local ties with ethnic roots.

Another major transformation in Zamora was the rapid conversion of its peoples to Protestantism. For nearly two centuries, Spanish missionaries passed through Zamora on their way to their highland missions. Just like their Igorot brethren, Zamorans resisted conversion to Catholicism. Their egalitarian and transactional cosmology contrasted strongly with a hierarchic and institutional Catholicism.⁷ In addition, political leadership was closely tied to religious practice. Conversion often meant acknowledging the religious superiority of Spanish priests with its implication of political subservience.

The arrival of the Americans in 1899 introduced forms of Protestantism, which were more accommodative of Zamoran practices.⁸ Their long exposure to Catholic missionizing had made many Christian concepts familiar. Following the introduction of village schools by the Americans, Zamorans rapidly accepted Protestantism. Zamorans embraced Protestantism when they realized they could interpret the Bible themselves rather than depend on outside authorities such as Catholic priests. Local leaders were able to retain control of their congregations and exercise some autonomy in religious practices. Presently, Protestant congregations still consist mainly of kin groups led by respected elders. In addition, they were able to tap the considerable resources made available by the new colonizers. Finally, as Zamorans began to refer to themselves as Ilocanos, they could still retain an ethnic differentiation by contrasting themselves as Protestants from the predominantly Catholic lowland Ilocanos. The latter referred to Zamorans and other recent converts as Bago or new Christians.

LOCAL VERSUS ETHNIC CULTURES

A similar process of claiming autochthonous origins despite their migrant status is reported for the Tausog of Jolo, in the southernmost part of the Philippines (Frake, 1998). Fierce defenders of Islam, Tausog identity has been reinforced strongly by its political orientations. This politicization of ethnicity has compounded the difficulties of achieving a Philippine national consciousness. The American classification of Filipinos into Christians, non-Christians, and Muslims exacerbated the problem by providing an ethnic basis for local differences.

A present illustration of the difficulties of disentangling local, cultural, and ethnic differences is expressed in the attempt to replace Igorot—a common term for people of the northern highlands—with Cordilleran, a more neutral and generic description. Igorot is sometimes used deprecatingly by lowlanders to denote backwardness and primitivity. Rather than forego their identity, many Igorots use this term proudly, pointing out their people's successful resistance to Spanish domination. The same applies to Moro. The term is oftentimes associated with piracy, rebellion, and the *amok*. Like the Igorots, Moros reverse its meaning to refer to its positive association with Islam.

However, the terms *Igorot* and *Moro* are unable to express the local and cultural differences among their members. For the former, Ibaloi, Kankanay, Bontoc, Kalinga, and Ifugao are more specific even if these do not express fully local differences. For the latter, Maranao, Tausog, Magindanao, Yakan, and Samal indicate cultural differences but these may be made to appear more exclusive and categorical than they really are. It is in this sense that ethnological classification, so keenly pursued by Americans, create the divisions they describe.

Just as classifications partly constitute their own objects, unclassified communities become nonexistent, at least for administrative purposes. This was the case with the Kalanguya or Kallahan (Resurreccion, 1999), a distinct community occupying the southeastern Cordillera. For administrative and ethnological purposes, they were classified either as Ifugaos or Benguet-Igorots. Lacking a distinct ethnological identity, they were not entitled to land nor to special grants allocated to ethnic minorities. This anonymity, despite occasional references in the ethnological surveys conducted in the region, persisted until 1969 when they were finally recognized as a separate ethnic group. The Kallahanes' unfortunate location, spanning three distinct provinces, made their recognition more problematic. Each of these provinces enjoyed distinct administrative status: The Mountain Province was set aside for the Igorots; Pangasinan was rapidly accepting Ilocano migrants; while Nueva Vizcaya was considered important for its mineral potential (Fry, 1983). In this case, national interests overran ethnological knowledge.

AMERICAN RULE IN MOROLAND

The governance of the Muslim Filipinos during the American interlude (1898–1946) can be divided into the period of direct American rule (1899–1920) and the later period of Christian Filipino control. The period of direct American rule can be broken into three phases: the military occupation between 1899 and 1903; the establishment and authority of the Moro province between 1903 and 1913; and the reorganization of the province into the Department of Mindanao and Sulu in 1914 and its increasing Filipinization until the department's demise in 1920. The administration of these periods pursued a policy of integration, which sought basically to pacify the Moros, assimilate them socially and politically into the recently established colonial state, and open up the southern Philippines to economic development.

The foundations of the policy of integration followed by the later Christian administrations were set during the American period. Here we focus primarily on the period of direct American rule, providing an overview of that rule's character, policies, justifications, aims, and the main effects on the Moros. However, we diverge from this approach in our discussion of the migration of Christian Filipinos to the southern Philippines, a program that was initiated by the Spaniards and promoted by the Americans. Since the program's impact on the Muslim Filipinos was not evident fully until the 1950s, we trace broadly the history to that point. Last, while we do not address the Muslim Filipino resistance to the American presence in Moroland, it should not be assumed that Moro hostility was uncommon and intermittent. As standard histories of the period show (Gowing, 1985), until the Battle of Bud Bagsak on the island of Jolo in 1913, that resistance was both serious and widespread.⁹

The outbreak of the Philippine-American War on Luzon in early 1899 made it imperative for the Americans to neutralize the Muslim Filipinos as a threat to their sovereignty over the southern Philippines. Of real concern to them was the possibility that the Moros would be enticed into the alliance with General Emilio Aguinaldo's revolutionary forces in Luzon and the Visayas. Such an alliance would have complicated vastly the Americans' efforts to extend their sway over the Philippines, for it would have presented them with armed resistance throughout the archipelago.

To prevent such an alliance, as well as to secure Moro acknowledgment of the U.S. dominion over the Sulu archipelago, Brigadier General John C. Bates negotiated a treaty with the Sultan of Sulu in August 1899, which was confirmed provisionally by President William McKinley in October 1899.¹⁰ Similar but unwritten agreements were also entered into with other sultans and *datos* (chiefs) in Mindanao. The gist of the Bates Agreement was that the Muslim Filipinos recognized the U.S. sway over the archipelago and promised to help suppress piracy and arrest individuals charged with crimes against non-Moros. In return, the United States pledged to respect the Moro's religion and customs, the sul-

tan's authority to manage the internal affairs of the sultanate, his rights and responsibilities, and those of his datos. The agreement achieved its purpose: between May 1899 and July 1903, no significant military confrontations occurred between American troops and Muslim Filipinos in the Sulu archipelago.

MORO PROVINCE: 1903–1913

With the abatement of the Philippine-American War in 1901, military officers began to push for the abrogation of the Bates Agreement on various grounds. Foremost was the incompatibility such officers perceived between the sultan's authority and the complete sovereignty of the United States over the archipelago. Other reasons were certain allegedly pernicious features of Muslim Filipino society and culture such as concubinage, polygamy, slavery, despotism, piracy, and the absence of law and order. It was reputedly the interplay of such features that was responsible for the sheer misery and precariousness of life in Moroland and the chaos that had reigned there since time immemorial.

The existence of slavery in a U.S. possession was made much of by commentators and seen as an affront to a nation that had abolished the institution in 1865 (*Manila Times*, 4 September 1902). Thomas Millard captured the American consensus on these perceived shortcomings of Moro society and culture, as well as the change in policy they necessitated, in a 1908 *Washington Post* article. Reflecting on the history of the American administration in Moroland, Millard, under a subheading revealingly entitled "Governed by Crude Laws" remarks that ("the mass of the people were practically under the domination of the datos, who exercised almost absolute power in the localities which they governed, and who frequently used this power to defraud and oppress their subjects. The laws were crude and their administration barbaric" (*Mindanao Herald*, 16 May 1908).

If these and other evils accounted in large measure for the Moro's barbarism, then redemption entailed abolition of these practices. In his annual report of the War Department in 1902, General Davis numbered the elimination of piracy, slavery, and polygamy among the aims of the United States in Moroland (Gowing, 1985). Peter Gowing comments that the above aim "constitutes an excellent statement of the American mandate in Moroland" (1985: 69). Indeed, he accepts the thesis that the Americans' replacement of their policy of noninterference in Moro affairs with one of direct rule¹¹ was in part a consequence of U.S. revulsion to the depravity and disorder of Moro society.

Yet not all U.S. reasons for extending their dominion over the Moros were as elevated as their official rhetoric suggested. While formally American change of policy tended to be vindicated by the claim that they were obliged positively to transform Muslim Filipino society and culture and impose order on native chaos, it seems to have been also driven by a desire to promote the development of the southern Philippines' natural resources. The richness of those resources,

as well as the potential opportunity they provided the colonial government, American capital, and immigrants, were leitmotifs in American writing throughout the American interlude in Moroland. By at least 1902 the region's commercial promise was apparent to American commentators. In a *Manila Times* article from February of that year, one such observer reported of Mindanao that, "Rich in its natural resources, it has possibilities of cultivation that warrant its being regarded the most fertile of all the islands." The island's possibilities were enumerated by Major General Leonard Wood in his First Annual Report as governor of the Moro province in 1904. Writing specifically of the Lanao District, he remarked that

the Province has great natural resources, which are almost entirely undeveloped. There is an almost unlimited amount of valuable timber, a great deal of it easily accessible, and there is a very large amount of fine agricultural land, well adapted to coconut, hemp, rice,—in short most of the island products. Rubber plants and rubber trees exist in large numbers, also gutta trees, although a comparatively small amount of this is at present being brought out. Nearly all tropical fruits grow well in the province. All that is wanted is someone to develop and make use of its almost inexhaustible resources.¹²

Commentators agreed that before the great natural wealth and latent resources of this southern archipelago could be developed properly, a number of problems had to be resolved: public sanitation, labor supply, transportation, telegraph and postal communication, bringing the wild tribes under the influence of government, improving the political and industrial condition for those already under government influence. And perhaps the most serious of these difficulties was that of security, which remained a source of concern until at least 1913. As a *Manila Times* article noted in 1908, following the murders of two Americans in Mindanao, "a dangerous condition exists in many districts in the Moro country. And it cannot be said that we are giving the country good government until we have established that primary requisite of government—security."¹³

The greatest threat to the security of both Americans and natives in Moroland was held to be those Muslim Filipinos who were unable to accept the sovereignty of the American administration. Their neutralization was hence required if American businessmen were to invest in the region and the bulk of peace-loving Moros were to till the soil for themselves or labor for American interests (Gowing, 1985). According to a *Cablenews American* (1904) report, it was the recalcitrance of the Muslim Filipinos that constituted the only obstacle to the permanent settlement of Americans in Mindanao. "Every person returning from Mindanao has been loud in the praises of the island, and the only drawback that has been offered to its permanent settlement has been the problem involved in the attitude of its people (Moros) toward the government."

Although the Bates Agreement was formally abrogated by President Theodore Roosevelt in March 1904, the steps American military officials took to extend their government's control over Moroland following the establishment of the

Moro province in 1903 effectively nullified it. The organic act of the province outlawed slavery, including Muslims tribal areas.¹⁴ It further obliged adult males to pay the *cédula* (registration) tax every year. Through these acts as well as other legislation, Muslims were forced to participate in what was rapidly becoming a Christian-led and dominated economy and polity. Civil courts were established and presided over by district governors and secretaries rather than the traditional *datos* or sultans. Christian immigration from the Visayas was encouraged to provide the needs of an expanding agriculture and commerce.

MORO RESPONSES

For many Muslim Filipinos, these measures posed a collective threat to the Abode of Territory of Islam (Dar al-Islam). The American policy of direct control and its rationales offended their pride and sense of independence as well as reflected adversely on their societies. The payment of the *cedula* and other taxes were not only onerous but, in their eyes, tantamount to their conversion to Christianity and a graphic acknowledgment of their subjection to the Americans. As late as the midsixties there were elder men who “refused to walk on the government road” built with the money raised from this tax, for fear of being transformed into nonbelievers (Kiefer, 1979).

The prospect of disarming the Moros was contemplated as early as 1904. According to William Howard Taft, then war secretary: “you will never succeed ultimately in the Moro country unless you disarm the Moros” (Wood, 1904). The idea was not acted upon because it was felt that its implementation would prove too costly, given the great store the Muslim Filipinos placed on possessing weapons. However, the continuing insecurity of conditions in Moroland and the obstacles it was raising for the territory’s commercial exploitation led General Pershing in 1909 to reconsider this option.¹⁵

The subject attracted much attention in the pages of the *Manila Times* and the *Cablenews American* in 1911. The disarmament of the Moros was seen to be “as necessary from the humanitarian standpoint as it is expedient economically.” Revealingly though, in the above newspapers it was American planters and business interests, not Muslim, Christian, or tribal Filipinos, that were commonly portrayed as being most at risk from the unsettled situation. This concern for American interests is particularly clear in an article entitled “The Moro Situation,” which appeared in the *Manila Times* in July 1911. Rejecting the claims of colonial officials that conditions in the Moro province “have never been better than they are at this time,” its author insisted that his readers face the unpalatable truth that

human life is not safe in Mindanao, that the years of American occupation have not made it possible for the isolated planter to sleep in peace and security. Even where the Americans are gathered together into communities, as at Jolo, the visitor gets nothing so quickly as the impression that they live in the midst of alarms, under considerable ner-

vous strain, that they have always with them a consciousness as of something impending, something threatening. This is neither healthy nor is it right. That it should be possible to say so in 1911 brings with it the unpleasant reflection that since 1899 we have not accomplished in Mindanao what we set out to do. Let us put into words just what we did set out to do—we were to make Mindanao as safe for the white man as any part of Manila. Have we made good? The answer is an emphatic no.

CHRISTIAN FILIPINO MIGRATION

The migration of Christian Filipinos to Moroland commenced toward the end of the Spanish period, which witnessed the substantial resettlement of Christians from the Visayas region to Mindanao. By the American period, Christians already outnumbered Muslims in Mindanao. The Americans strenuously promoted this immigration as they pursued a policy of integration. Between 1903 and 1939, 1.4 million Christians settled in northeastern Mindanao. This migration was seen as stabilizing the economic and security problems of the island. Moreover, the Moros of Sulu traditionally had enjoyed close relations with communities in Borneo and Malaya. In addition, there was a colony of Japanese settlers in Davao since 1904. All these raised concerns in Manila about the political security of the region.

Concerns about the overpopulation in parts of Luzon and the Visayas encouraged the program of immigration. These migrants were meant to teach and encourage the indigenous population, both Muslims and other non-Christians, to develop commerce and agriculture. Finally, the island's rich and untapped wealth attracted companies anxious to exploit these resources. This investment, it was believed, would eventually convince the Moros to accept their integration into the national government.¹⁶

Christian immigration was discontinued briefly during World War II but quickly resumed afterward. While earlier migrants tended to congregate in non-Muslim areas, after 1948 Christian migrants began settling in Bukidnon, Zamboanga, and Cotabato. While the lands these migrants occupied might not have been occupied, they nevertheless were considered to be under the customary ownership of Muslim and other non-Christian (tribal) groups. In the contests about land that ensued, non-Christians were at a decided disadvantage, being easy prey for foreign companies and Christian Filipinos more familiar with land and registration laws. By this time most of the appointed officials in these areas were Christians, including the Philippine Constabulary.¹⁷

The impact of direct American rule on the Muslim Filipinos was diverse and profound. Most broadly, implementing a policy of integration, which was adopted by later Christian Filipino administrations, laid the groundwork for the Moros' complete political incorporation into the Philippine State. In 1898, although weakened by their ancient struggle with the Spaniards, Moros were still fiercely independent and comprised the most dominant ethnic group in the south-

ern Philippines. By 1920, they had been subjugated effectively and placed under the control of an American administration staffed primarily by Christian Filipino civil servants. In pacifying the Moros, American rule seriously undermined their ability to resist the Christian Filipino migrant communities, political interests, and economic activities that would increasingly encroach on their territory and rights in subsequent decades. Moreover, in following the Spanish lead and encouraging the migration of Christians to Moroland, American rule contributed to a process that in time would alter dramatically the ethnic makeup of the region, reducing the Muslim population to a minority in most of their homelands. While it failed to destroy the Moros' traditional societies and political structures, American rule did modify them significantly by emasculating their sultanates, eroding the power and privileges of their ruling class.

THE RETENTION OF THE HINTERLANDS

While the promise of Philippine independence was a stated end of American colonization, the relationship between the metropolis and its periphery was seen as more permanent. Even while Filipino politicians were preparing to take over aspects of local government with the establishment of the Philippine Assembly in 1907, the Americans were making plans to retain control over other parts of the country (Fry, 1983). The Cordillera region was seen as offering a benign climate for Europeans, in contrast to the perils of the lowlands, as well as opportunities for temperate agriculture. Worcester was particularly attracted to this region, and he helped establish Baguio as a hill station for American officials. It was even considered as a more suitable capital for a new colony, particularly in the event that the Philippine lowlands eventually achieved independence.

The other region that merited special attention was the island of Mindanao. Its vast lands and reputed mineral resources were a great attraction to foreign investors. The Americans made peace with the Moros early and were prepared to subdue them militarily should this be necessary. But the interior of the island was sparsely inhabited, and their people showed the same appreciation for American assistance as the Igorots of northern Luzon. Extensive cash cropping, plantations, and cattle ranches as well as mining were seen as distinct possibilities for Mindanao's future. The creation of a permanent settlement of Americans in Mindanao was frequently advocated by American capitalists, settlers, and colonial officials based in the region. For example, in 1905 the American Chamber of Commerce of Zamboanga inaugurated a campaign to incorporate Mindanao and the neighboring islands as territory of the United States. The campaign was never officially countenanced by the colonial government and eventually fizzled out. However, the drive to establish a strong American presence in Mindanao led to "a more or less steady influx of Americans there" and to their domination of the region's agricultural industry by 1910 (*Mindanao Herald*, 1905).

The relationship between the peoples of these regions and the Hispanized lowland Filipinos was often hostile, a fact much exaggerated by the Americans.

For Worcester, “the Filipinos had no just claim to tribal territory whether it be the Igorot’s Luzon mountains or the Muslim south. The integration of tribal regions into a Philippine nation-state was neither possible nor desirable. . . . (T)hey should remain as American territory,” (Sullivan, 1991:151). While these remarks may presently appear incongruous, the continuing American occupation of Guam, Hawaii, Samoa, and Puerto Rico are equally unexpected. Having once described themselves as the new enlightened colonizers, the United States is now the only remaining colonial power.

OTHER HINTERLANDS

While the Igorot and the Moro initially appeared as Filipinos most in need of the civilizing process, their condition was in some ways more promising. Unlike their Hispanized counterparts, whose racial mixture and cultural experience predisposed them to duplicity, the former were more open to the full measures of American tutelage. In other words, it was in the hinterlands that America’s benevolent intentions were best appreciated. These benevolent intentions were also expressed in the containment of contagion.

The control of disease received as much American attention as did education and training for democracy. Campaigns against cholera, bubonic plague, and other infectious ailments were conducted tirelessly and effectively (Ileto, 1989). Tropical medicine became a new specialization in which Americans achieved global fame, and the Philippines became their field laboratory (Heiser, 1936). According to Anderson (1998), colonial medicine extended the boundaries of civility and citizenship. The colonial subject, deprived of political rights, was an ideal patient. This was best illustrated in the case of Philippine lepers. During the first decade of American rule, they conducted a survey of lepers and established the Culion Leper Colony. Hitherto, these unfortunate people had been left to the kindness of kin or lodged in asylums and leprosaria where they received palliative care in the final stages of their illness. No attempts were made by the Spanish authorities to isolate lepers and treat their condition clinically.

The Culion colony was based on an earlier one in Molokai, Hawaii, where American authorities decided to incarcerate patients infected with Hansen’s bacillus. The same program of complete and lifelong isolation was practiced in Culion. Once bacteriologically identified, patients were shipped to the colony and underwent a rigorous medical regime. This was complemented by an equally rigorous social and psychological routine. Culion “was planned as an exemplary site of production of self-possessed, disciplined colonial (and proto-national) subjects. Public health officers urged the inmates to transcend their tainted embodiment, to abstract themselves from class and traditional community, and to abstain from promiscuous contact of any sort” (Anderson, 1998:708). Their members were expected to work diligently, educate themselves, and otherwise act as exemplary subjects of a modernizing nation. The general population was

instructed to denounce lepers to the authorities, and they were systematically collected in a “leper ship,” that visited the islands each year. Force was rarely required. “When it is remembered . . . that this often involved the life-long separation of wife from husband, sister from brother, child from parent, and friend from friend, it will be appreciated that forbearance was necessary under such circumstances” (Anderson, 1998:713). What better example of benevolent assimilation!

This experiment in the containment of contagion ended in 1935 when Filipino legislators approved the Nolasco Bill. This effectively ended compulsory seclusion for lepers. Not until the 1980s would Filipinos themselves suggest equally draconian measures. This time the curtailment of civil rights was being proposed to prevent the spread of HIV and AIDS (Anderson, 1998).

CONCLUSION

We have argued in this chapter that American policy in the Philippines can be viewed meaningfully from the perspective of the hinterland. The United States considered itself the exemplar of modernity—the land of engineers and inventors as Mark Twain pointed out. The project of modernity gives central prominence to the control of nature and society. Spaces threatening such control usually elicit normalizing practices, with their corresponding discourses. To justify American imperialism, the Philippines had to be portrayed as requiring intervention. Initially, the country was seen as suffering from the neglect and abuse of the Spaniards. The Americans would rescue Filipinos from Spanish colonial incompetence. When the Philippine revolutionary government, having expressed its gratitude for American assistance, began to exert control in the countryside, the Americans embarked on a war of conquest. Peoples of the highlands and the Moros, who had until then been largely autonomous, were seen as potential allies against the Catholic lowlanders. The Americans initially courted their support and encouraged their sense of difference from lowland Christian Filipinos.

If Apolinario Mabini (a leading nationalist, author, and adviser to Emilio Aguinaldo) was claiming civilization on the part of Filipinos, this was clearly problematic in societies that practiced headhunting or slavery. Americans were convinced that they could eliminate such practices more effectively than any Filipino government, while at the same time, protecting these minorities from the rapacity of mestizo officialdom. They succeeded in eliminating these offensive customs and practices but in the process hardened the divisions among Filipinos. The peoples in the Cordillera are still victims of these divisions, and the Moros continue their struggle for a separate nation.

The American civilizing mission had many benefits for Filipinos, including those in the hinterlands. Public health, education, and civil administration were improved significantly. The structures for a modern economy were established and Americans seemed keen to become its major investors. Great expectations

were held for the colony of a nation whose imperial projects were meant to be exceptional. Unfortunately, the American colonial project never attained the unrealistic expectations of its planners. There were too many contradictions for it to succeed. Good intentions at times masked duplicity or self-interest. In most cases the American colonizers supported elite interests, thus ensuring the continuing basis of exploitive relationships that eventually erupted into the Huk rebellion. Even well-motivated programs such as the Culion Leper Colony contained within it unexamined notions about the competence and obligations of modern medicine and its implications for colonial subjects. Much of American colonial policy contained a sense of hubris. The white man's burden would be transformed into an American triumphalism. All considered, this American civilizing mission had at best mixed blessings.

NOTES

1. Dean Worcester was one of the most prominent bureaucrats during the early American period. He had visited the Philippines as part of a scientific expedition in 1888 and was one of the few Americans who had specialized knowledge of the Philippines. He clearly was attached to the islands and invested successfully in its economy. He died in Manila in 1924 (Sullivan, 1991).

2. Worcester made a strong distinction between the lowland Hispanized Filipinos and those living in both the interior and highland areas. These latter had retained many of their traditions throughout the Spanish period and from Worcester's perspective were not as corrupted by Spanish colonialism.

3. David Barrows had worked among American Indians before arriving in the Philippines where he assisted Worcester in his ethnological research. Barrows became an influential director of education and his text *A History of the Philippines* (1905) was used extensively in schools. In it he presented a progressivist view of history, which was the standard paradigm of his day. As Iletto (1998) has argued, Barrows's text presented Philippine history as a replay of events that had happened earlier in Europe (e.g., the French Revolution), and in this sense local history was merely duplicative. The West leads the way and the rest of the world follows behind.

4. Jose Rizal is the foremost Filipino hero executed by the Spaniards in 1896 for writing seditious texts. His execution enraged Filipinos and inspired Bonifacio and Aguinaldo to initiate the revolution against Spain. Bonifacio was a relatively poor and self-educated printer who founded the revolutionary organization (Katipunan), which was later taken over by more educated members of the local elite such as Aguinaldo.

5. The Americans saw themselves as modern colonizers spreading the doctrines of science and democracy as opposed to earlier colonizers such as the Spaniards who were more concerned with religious conversion or the British and Dutch whose main concerns were the economic exploitation of their colonies.

6. Blumentritt was a prominent Austrian ethnologist who had corresponded with Rizal but who never visited the Philippines. Blumentritt's classification of Philippine peoples was generally accepted by the ethnological world of his day. Worcester used Blumentritt's classification but, following extensive expeditions throughout the country, reduced Blumentritt's categories from eighty-two to twenty-seven. This reduction was

partly to facilitate administration but resulted in the ethnological loss of marginal or peripheral communities.

7. A transactional theology refers to religious practices and rituals that involve forms of haggling with the spirits or gods. This is similar to the way Filipinos relate to saints whose favors they invoke and is contrasted to the purely supplicatory relationship with Christ or God.

8. Forms of Protestantism, for example, Methodists, Evangelicals, Church of Christ, Baptists.

9. The Battle of Bud Bagsak occurred on 11 June 1913. Brigadier General John J. Pershing led a combined force of Philippine Scouts, Philippine Constabulary, and regular soldiers in an assault on several prominent Moro authorities and their followers ensconced on the mountain. Lasting five days and resulting in between 500 to 2,000 Moro deaths, the battle effectively marked the end of serious Muslim Filipino resistance against American rule in Moroland.

10. Prior to his taking command of American troops in the Sulu archipelago, General John C. Bates was in command of the department of southern Luzon. The president was unable to unreservedly ratify the agreement because the existence of slavery in Moroland “could not be recognized by the United States,” and because of “the right of Congress of the United States, under the Treaty of Paris, to disapprove or annul the agreement altogether.” See “Bates Agreement,” *Manila Times*, 19 November 1902.

11. By direct rule we mean the subjugation of the Muslim Filipinos, the undermining of their traditional political systems, the emasculation of their ruling class, and the imposition of a colonial administration.

12. By 1910, the overwhelming majority of plantations in Moroland were owned by foreigners. Of ninety-seven holdings consisting of 100 hectares or more, sixty-one were owned by Americans, nineteen by Europeans, twelve by Christian Filipinos and Moros, and five by Chinese (Gowing, 1985:222).

Wood quote cited from *First Annual Report of Major General Leonard Wood, U.S. Army, Governor of the Moro Province* (Zamboanga: 1904), 21–23.

13. On the night of 1 April 1908, Harry M. Ickis and his guard, a constabulary soldier, were murdered as they slept in an isolated hut in the mountains between the Umayan River and Linabo in Sirugao. Ickis was a mining engineer employed by the Bureau of Science.

14. The Organic Act was the law that created the Moro province as a political and administrative entity.

15. General John Pershing was one of several military officers—among them General George W. Davis, General Leonard Wood, and Major Hugh Lennox Scott—who began their careers in the “Indian Wars” against the Apache and the Sioux. As a captain, Pershing led a number of military expeditions against rebellious Muslim Filipino communities settled around Lake Lanao in Mindanao between September 1902 and April 1903. Pershing’s successes in his Lanao campaign led President Theodore Roosevelt to promote him from captain to brigadier general over the heads of more than 800 senior officers in 1906. Transferred to the United States because of poor health in 1903, Pershing returned to the southern Philippines in 1909 as governor of the Moro province.

16. The Americans had established plantations soon after their arrival in Mindanao. Initially these were only open to Americans and certain Europeans. Up until 1917 only Americans had settled in Momungan, an agricultural community in Lanao province. However, that year it was decided by the Insular government’s Department of Agriculture

and Natural Resources that the movement of Filipinos into the area would be encouraged in order to “foster a feeling of solidarity between American and Filipinos in the colony.” To this end, a new administrator was appointed to oversee the colony’s affairs and “launch a campaign to interest Filipinos in seeking homesteads there” (*Manila Times*, 11 October 1917).

17. The Philippine Constabulary in Moroland was the American colonial equivalent of a state police force in the United States. Its main duty was to maintain order. Established in 1903, by 1904 the corps had 17 officers (all of whom were Americans or Christian Filipinos) and 353 enlisted men (one-third Moros) (Gowing, 1985).

REFERENCES

- Adas, M. 1999. “Improving on the Civilizing Mission?” *Itinerario* 23(4):44–66.
- Anderson, W. 1998. “Leprosy and Citizenship.” *Positions* 6(3):707–30.
- Blount, J. 1913. *The American Occupation of the Philippines 1898–1912*. New York: Oriole Editions.
- Diokno, M. 1994. “Perspectives on Peace during the Philippine-American War of 1899–1902.” *South East Asia Research* 1:5–19.
- Frake, C. 1998. “Banditry in the Southern Philippines.” *American Anthropologist* 86(2).
- Fry, H. 1983. *A History of the Mountain Province*. Quezon City: New Day.
- Gowing, P. 1985. *Mandate in Moroland*. Quezon City: New Day.
- Heiser, V. 1936. *An American Doctor’s Odyssey*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Ileto, R. 1989. “Cholera and the Origins of American Sanitation Order in the Philippines.” In *Imperial Medicine and Indigenous Society*, ed. D. Arnold. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- . 1998. “Knowing America’s Colony.” *Philippine Studies Occasional Papers Series* 13, Center for Philippine Studies, University of Hawaii.
- Kiefer, T. 1979. “Parrang *Sabbil*: Ritual Suicide Among the Tausog of Jolo.” *Bijdragen tot de Taal-Land-Vilkenkunde* 129:120.
- Pertierra, R. 1988. *Religion, Politics and Rationality in a Philippine Municipality*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Resurreccion, B. 1999. “Engineering the Philippine Uplands: Gender, Ethnicity and Scientific Forestry in the American Colonial Period.” *Bulletin of Concerned Scholars* 31(1): 13–30.
- Sullivan, R. 1991. “Exemplar of Americanism.” *Michigan Papers on South and Southeast Asia* 36. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.
- Wood, L. 1904. *Leonard Wood Papers*. Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress.
- Worcester, D. 1914. *The Philippines Past and Present*. New York: Macmillan Company.

Cacique Democracy and Future Prospects in the Philippines

Julio Rey B. Hidalgo

INTRODUCTION

The word *cacique* originally referred to an Indian chief of the West Indies or Latin America. For this chapter, and as used in the Philippine setting, the term encompasses the collective classes of local *hacenderos* (landowners) and *principales* (socially prominent local community members, whose families include former village chieftains, as well as municipal or barrio officials) who wield economic, political, or social power within their spheres of influence. In his book, *The Making of a Nation*, John J. Schumacher, S.J., wrote of the *caciques*:

I distinguish the three terms “landlords”, “principales”, and “caciques” on the basis of the foundation of their power, though, as is obvious, one man could combine in himself all three sources of power. The landlord’s power over his tenants was of course economic; the principales were those who were actually holding political power in a town, or as past officials, still participating both directly and through their families in the political affairs of the town; the power of the cacique connoted a wider, though often informal, kind of power, based on wealth, whether in land or not, and political connections, whether formal or informal.¹

This chapter focuses on the behavior of this stratum of Filipino society within the context of the “American style” democracy that was transplanted to the Philippines during the closing years of Spanish rule. Appropriately, Dr. Hazel McFerson regards America’s influence on the Philippines as a “mixed blessing.” On the one hand, thanks to the zeal and systematic effort of the early American Thomasites, access to primary level education was democratized and made avail-

able to the general masses, not just to the *ilustrado* class as during the Spanish colonial period. Formal curricula and standards of measuring academic achievement were defined and implemented, unlike the haphazard methods of the Spanish friars. On the other, together with this educational system came the subtle yet pervasive enculturation of the Filipinos to the “American way.” Public education focused on imparting basic literacy skills such as reading, writing, and arithmetic. Sanitation, horticulture, and home arts subjects were also included. English became the language for education, social communication, governance, and business transactions. Filipinos soon learned basketball and baseball. They developed a taste and liking for American food and snacks. They relaxed to the music of the big bands. But the evolutionary process conceptualizing and clarifying key sociopolitical ideas were relegated to the background—What makes a nation? What ought to be the Filipino identity? How is national interest defined and how secured? How should Filipinos relate to the people of other nations in a manner that respects the will and aspirations of this larger community of mankind?

America also gave its model of democracy, political systems, and institutions of governance for the Philippines to emulate, reaping for itself the international prestige of having nurtured the “first democratic nation in Asia.” The influx of American capital and technology into export-oriented firms, public utilities, and extractive industries opened up the Philippines to foreign trade. It improved domestic capacity to develop and tap natural resources and provided jobs to a growing labor force. But underneath the outward spectacle of economic growth and the heady levels of business profits earned by American investors and their Filipino counterparts, the centuries-old social, economic, and political structures that defined relationships between the upper crust of society and those below remained essentially unchanged and dangerously lopsided. They still are pretty much the same today. Only the names and faces have changed.

American culture, values, political ideas, jurisprudence and legal systems, and institutions for governance were never really planted on untilled, raw land. In fact, even the Spanish stratum was not the starting matrix of the people’s sociopolitical awareness. Prior to the arrival of the Iberian conquistadors, there were diverse proto-Filipino communities (*barangays*), each speaking their own language, scattered along numerous coastal and riverbank settlements throughout the Philippines’ over 7,000 islands. These pre-Hispanic inhabitants had their own functioning structures of community organization that defined the various economic, social and political roles, rights, duties, and obligations of the different social classes in that era.

Bear in mind that over 300 years of Spanish colonial presence have deeply percolated into the soil of the people’s collective social consciousness and now mirrors its genetic imprint on today’s generation of Filipinos. This process of “foreign enculturation” has been so extensive, so thorough, and so prolonged that it is very difficult for Filipinos to look at and study themselves. Permeating the external, visible structures and methods of the social, economic, and political

order, the colonial past continues to shape the Filipino people's value hierarchy, habitual mindsets, social interaction patterns, analytical tools, and decision-making style.

This chapter proposes to take a brief look at the cumulative impact of American and Spanish colonial rule on Philippine society, particularly on the "Filipino style" democracy that evolved from American tutelage. Focusing on the forces that impacted national events during the revolution against Spain (1896–1898) and the early stages of the Filipino-American War, it offers possible reasons why the Filipino revolutionaries and the people of that era failed to achieve the goals and original motives of the revolution. Moving on to recent experiences after the 1986 EDSA "People Power" revolution, it discusses pragmatic considerations of social change, defines interaction requisites for the process to be sustainable, and suggests possible areas of further study that must be considered seriously by Filipinos today. As a people living in a nation that is supposed to be democratic and free, the strategic importance of completing a thorough national self-critique and historical contextualization cannot be overemphasized. Hobbled by the insular fragmentation of Filipino society, hemmed in by the reality of globalization and the increasing interdependence of national economies in ways that no longer acknowledge or respect traditional concepts of territoriality, national interest and sovereignty, this chapter considers how a politically inexperienced nation such as the Philippines might navigate the uncharted seas of the twenty-first century.

SOCIOPOLITICAL ARRANGEMENTS IN THE PRE-HISPANIC *BARANGAY*

Due to the country's insular geography, the early Filipinos lived in sites that were close to rivers or coastal areas. Topography and rainfall distribution were the principal determinants of economic life and settlement patterns. Migration of communities took place via boats (*balanghai*), which were approximately eighteen meters long and could carry one small clan or family.² This community unit was called a *barangay*, and its head was usually the leader of the boat that the settlers rode. Its social structure was kin-based, an extended family membership that was traced from both parental lineages.

In his book, *The Roots of the Filipino Nation*, Onofre D. Corpuz³ makes the interesting observation that one common feature to the *barangays* was the absence of public buildings to house the government or management of community business or the transaction of civic affairs. He opines that the lack of public edifices was mainly due to the absence of a recognized institution that was seen by the people of the *barangay* as representing their community *as a civic entity*, as distinguished from the person of the chief, who was the leader of the community *as a kin-group*. For Corpuz, the family/kinship basis of the *barangay*, as well as its person-centered leadership and parochial system of local govern-

ment, worked to splinter the population of the islands into numerous small and separate communities.

This self-centered outlook was exploited in numerous instances during the Spanish and American periods, as the colonialists pitted Filipinos from different regions and social classes against each other to quell rebellions, safeguard their interests, and consolidate political power through cooptation, guile, coercion, or actual use of force. The behavioral repercussions of this colonial experience can still be seen today. Compared with other immigrants in the United States, Filipinos have the highest number of various ethnic/regional associations, each with its own dialect and set of officers. Several thousands of nongovernment organizations (NGOs) or people's organizations (POs) have also mushroomed since President Corazon C. Aquino took power after the 1986 EDSA "People Power" revolution that toppled the dictatorship of President Ferdinand E. Marcos.

In the *barangay*, one's claim to the rank of *datu* (village chieftain) was conditioned largely by one's ability to attract a sizeable following. Typically, this meant popularity, based on one's ability to initiate the establishment of obligations with others. In order to be perceived and accepted as the chief, one had to be the most capable of securing the necessary means to engage in a series of reciprocal exchanges with others in the community. The *datu's* social status and preeminence was confirmed by deferential behavior that the villagers accorded him. This could be expressed by way of rendering temporary services, voluntarily offering a portion of a follower's annual harvest and physical goods, assistance in military expeditions, and by the manner in which the *datu* was addressed in public.

In essence, therefore, the *datu's* sociopolitical power emanated from the recognition and acceptance of his authority by members within the same community. But unlike the more abstract and universal concept of law and authority understood in the West, it was personalistic, localized, and usually taken within the context of community needs and concerns. Herein we see the cultural underpinnings of such traditional Filipino values as *utang na loob* (personal indebtedness for favors received), *pakikisama* (cooperation), and *hiyâ* (personal sense of social propriety and the consequent need to safeguard one's social "face" in order to avoid public shame). With few exceptions, local government leaders (e.g., governors, mayors, councilors, *barangay* members), grass-roots people's organizations, and ward leaders still largely influence the outcome of current local elections.

Below the *datu* were *maginoo* (the village elite), and a slave (*alipin*) class. Members of the last group were commoners, and not chattel slaves, as usually understood in European feudal society. William Henry Scott provides a concise but clear description of the subtle nuances of this lowest social level.⁴ Basically, an *alipin* was a person indebted to another. His subordination was obligatory in the sense that the other was one's creditor and not lord. The first kind of slave had land rights and was called *namamahay* (householder). The second subclass, called *aliping sa gigilid* (hearth slave), included those who had lost these land

rights as captives taken in wars or raids elsewhere, or those purchased from outside the community.

A person entered the *namamahay* status by inheritance (e.g., the debt, indenture, or sentence passed from one's parents), by dropping down from the *magingino* (village elite below the chieftain) class, or by rising up from the *gilit* category. The opportunity for mobility to a better social ranking was, therefore, possible and allowed. If one's debt stemmed from legal action or insolvency, the *alipin* and his creditor agreed on the duration of bondage and the equivalent cash value for its redemption. From pre-Hispanic times, one can clearly see the close relationship between patron and client, the precursor of modern-day *compadrazgo* (ritual kinship) system. The former was socially bound and morally expected to support and protect those living under his care; the latter were as equally bound to demonstrate loyalty, obedience, and deference to the wishes and interests of their master.

POLITICAL HIERARCHY AND SOCIAL STRATIFICATION UNDER SPANISH RULE

Spanish conquest of the barangays followed three distinct steps. First was the formal act of *entrada* (military possession) into unconquered territory, which was evidenced by a scrap of paper signed by a soldier, drafted as a notary. Next came the implementation of the *reducción* (literally, the subjugation of the land and its people) through the *encomienda* (a system of recognition by the Spanish king that rewarded favored Spaniards by giving them the right to collect tributes from specific inhabitants of a given territory). The final step was the consolidation of conquered villages (*reducciones*) into administratively convenient groups of settlement areas (*pueblos*), and the physical relocation of local inhabitants into a capital (*cabecera*) clustered around a chapel (*visita*), which was headed by a Spanish friar or curate.

Sociopolitical stratification was superimposed on the local population according to the norms of the colonizer. The most prominent were members of the clergy (curates and priests), who were regarded as "ecclesiastical persons" and therefore exempt from taxation (*personas exentas*). Next came the colonial administrators: from the *gobernador y capitán general* (governor general) who reported to the king via the viceroyalty of Nueva España (Mexico), down to the *alcalde mayor* (provincial governor). Spiritual power resided in the religious clergy; the colonial officials held political power. Filipino bureaucrats who sat in lower-level or nominal positions occupied the bottom rung. The families of the *gobernadorcillo* (municipal administrator) and the *cabeza de barangay* (barrio administrator), as well as those of former datu, were collectively recognized as the *principales* (a class of notables among local inhabitants) and enjoyed some small measure of social status.

Social position was also determined genetically. The original Spanish settlers in the Philippines regarded themselves as *peninsulares* (Spaniards born in

Spain). Those born in the colony were known as the *insulares*. As far as the former were concerned, anybody born in the Philippines was *ipso facto* inferior. To show their contempt, the peninsulares called the latter “Filipinos.” The natives, on the other hand, were called “*indios*,” a pejorative appellation associated with the North American Indians who were indigenous inhabitants of the frontier territories that the early pilgrims and settlers were seeking to colonize.

TAXES, TRIBUTE, AND ECONOMIC EXPLOITATION

The income-generating mechanisms set up by the Spanish colonial government were established for two basic reasons. First, the Spaniards, not being producers, had to be maintained through the labor and resources of the natives. Second, the king of Spain felt obliged to reward certain Spanish conquistadors and other selected individuals for their services to the crown. Because of the foregoing, the early Filipinos were actually “allocated” and assigned among the conquistadors and other favored Spaniards for the latter’s service and fortune-making.⁵ This laid the foundation for the predatory economic exploitation of the local inhabitants and the country’s natural resources by authorities and private persons. It created the mold of interaction between those above and those below, a trait that persists today in many forms.

Spanish colonial law institutionalized the system through the *repartimiento*—from the Spanish “*repartir*”—meaning “to allocate, allot, or distribute.” The cumulative impact of the various taxes, tributes, monopolies, and levies imposed on the local people was the development of interaction patterns between the political ruling class and the governed, between the financially capable and better-educated *ilustrados vis-à-vis* the unwashed masses. Through the centuries, this socioeconomic and political web spawned a general milieu that was conducive to abuse by those in positions of authority or by those with substance and financial means. The system enriched a lucky few but impoverished a whole population. In time, it created a “totem-pole” pecking order that eventually became a matter of course and normal expectation for those above and a given fact of life to be borne by those below. Sadly, for today’s Filipinos, the very same inequitable social and economic conditions that the Philippine national hero, Dr. Jose Rizal, satirized in his novels, *Noli me tangere* and the *El filibusterismo*, remain as stark realities that seemingly defy solution despite the passing of 400 years and the recent celebration of the 1998 Philippine Centennial.

Teodoro A. Agoncillo cited the various forms of tax collections levied on the people at that time.⁶ Direct taxes included the *buwís* (personal tribute, which may be paid in cash or in kind, partly or wholly) and income tax. Indirect taxes included the *bandalâ* (annual enforced sale or requisitioning of goods, such as rice or coconut oil, to the Spanish local authorities, paid in the form of promissory notes). By 1884, the *buwís* was replaced by the *cédula personal* (personal identity paper), which was used not only for taxation purposes but also to control

the physical movement of local inhabitants within and migration across territories.

Another institution, which had far-reaching effects in the life of the indios was the *encomienda*—from the Spanish word “*encomendar*,” meaning “to entrust under one’s custody.” As mentioned earlier, it was through this system that the king rewarded certain favored Spaniards by “allocating” territories and granting them the right to impose quotas of labor and produce on the people living in these areas. The labor component under the *repartimiento* was called *polos y servicios* (literally “services rendered under a yoke”). Under the *polos*, the barangays were given quotas of manpower to deliver for public projects such as building churches, government edifices, and road repairs. The *servicios* referred to menial work in the homes of Spaniards and in the friar residences. Because of these onerous impositions, arbitrarily enforced by corrupt officials, profiteering individuals, and even the Spanish friars, the natives became adept in “avoidance” tactics. Curiously, there is a colloquial witticism today that says “*Kung may gusót, may losót*” (“Where there’s a hitch, there’s a way out”), which reveals this ingrained subliminal behavior tendency of trying to put one over the law, the establishment, or those in higher social positions.

The abuses that accompanied the implementation of the *encomienda* system and the *repartimiento*, the excessive and oftentimes arbitrary taxes, quotas, and levies imposed by the Spanish authorities and their native alter-egos on the people, combined with the ill-concealed attitude of racial superiority that the Spanish friars and government officials treated all indios, slowly but steadily built up to flashpoints in various parts of the country. Some rebellions resulted in various areas of limited success and temporary gains. None, however, went beyond their provinces or regions or succeeded in mobilizing the national population, as what happened during the revolution of 1896–1898, which finally ended over three centuries of Spanish rule.

MANILA-ACAPULCO GALLEON TRADE

Between 1565 and 1815, the only regular maritime fleet service from the Philippines to the Pacific Ocean was the Acapulco galleon that shuttled to and from Acapulco de Juárez in Mexico and the Philippines. Although the galleon trade opened up the Philippine colony to foreign trade, it benefited only a very small circle of privileged Spaniards—the Spanish governor, members of the *consulado* (merchants with consular duties and rights) who were usually *insulares* (Philippine-born Spaniards), and Spanish residents in Manila.

The vast fortune that the galleon trade gave to selected individuals and the need to defend the Spanish colony against foreign powers (notably British and Dutch) spurred the building of man-of-wars and galleons. For this, the Spanish government relied on the *polos* (forced labor). The most severe effects of this system involved the *cortes de madera* (felling of trees from forests, hauling them from the mountains, and sawing the logs into planks for shipbuilding).

Conscripted male natives were forced to serve for months at a time. As a result, galleon construction severely interfered with planting and harvesting schedules. A man, chosen for the polos but unable to work (e.g., illness of a family member; crop ripe for harvest), had to borrow money (called *falta* or *upa*) to pay someone else, if available, to work in his place. If unable to pay off the debt, the conscript either worked it off, ended up as a servant, or totally lost his property. Due to severe hardships and family dislocation, many natives fled from the *pueblos*. Those who did were regarded by the Spaniards as “lawless” *remontados* or *tulisanes* (bandits). This system of forced labor was one of the factors that led to the early uprisings against Spanish rule.

WHY THE EARLY REBELLIONS FAILED

The failure of the various rebellions during the 17th century up to the mid-eighteenth century was not lost to the Filipinos in the other provinces. The resulting crop failures, mass starvation, and severe hardships that were the direct offshoot of the *cortes de madera*, the *reales compras* (levies imposed by Spanish authorities over the Filipinos’ agricultural produce), and the obligatory tribute collections impressed upon the early Filipinos the futility of attempting any large-scale revolt. Divided by insular geography, unable to forge a common cause and plan of action because of their diverse regional dialects, prevented from learning the Spanish language or evolving a national *lingua franca*, and pitted against one another by the Spaniards through the cunning use of native collaborators from other provinces or regions, the people suffered separately.

The various leaders of the previous uprisings were respected only by their local people and not by a national following. As in the days of the pre-Hispanic barangays, the concept of law and leadership remained parochial, kinship-based, and narrow in objectives. The basis of original interaction among the early tribal communities were premised on their own local concerns and needs, lacking any appreciation of the concept of national citizenship and obligations to a wider community outside of their habitual scope of relationships. The concept of nationhood, shared common interest, and of the necessity for unified action transcending family ties and regional groupings still had not taken root in the minds and hearts of the early Filipinos. It did not occur to them to band together and fight their colonial oppressors as one. As a result, no uprisings of any meaningful magnitude and extent of coordination occurred again until the end of the Propaganda movement in the last quarter of the 1800s.

PUEBLO SCHOOLS AND PUBLIC EDUCATION UNDER THE FRIARS

The *reducción* prepared the people for easier civil administration by local government authorities. The local population was organized into the *doctrina*, as a preparatory step before the formation of curate-dominated parish commu-

nities. Although the doctrina was not a formal unit of colonial government, it was, in terms of its effects on the people, the most powerful and influential administrative institution of the regime.⁷

The schools in the doctrinas were not really schools in the full academic sense but merely schools of primary letters, operated exclusively to further religious instruction. Not having any core curricula or an objective grading system, and silent especially on operational matters, these schools were run at the absolute discretion of the Spanish friars and by the rules of their respective religious orders. Between 1570–1863, there were no government regulations on the conduct of public schools.

In the Philippines, the Spanish friars were unchallenged lords of the doctrina. Not subject to diocesan bishops, they reported only to the superiors of their own missionary orders in Spain. Even government authorities could not compel their obedience because, by definition, members of the clergy were “ecclesiastical persons” and thus beyond the scope of temporal authority. To illustrate, a law in 1550 provided that, whenever possible, Spanish language schools be founded for the natives’ instruction in the Christian doctrine. It ordered the teaching of Spanish because it was held that religious indoctrination could not be accomplished in any of the native languages. Nothing ever happened to this decree. Subsequent reiterations of this original law were done in 1574, 1634, 1636, and 1638—all to no avail.

Aware that the friars had been violating and ignoring colonial laws, royal *cédulas*, or decrees of the governor-general on this matter for over 200 years, the regime finally issued another law in 1752 prohibiting “schools in any other language” than Spanish. It further ordered that the contemplated Spanish language schools be paid out of the town’s treasury funds. As before, the clergy paid no heed. A portion of a report submitted by a royal fiscal to the Spanish king in 1767 provides a clue as to why the friars stubbornly refused to obey:

in repeated royal decrees, this matter of the instruction of the Indians in the Spanish language is especially enjoined; but, notwithstanding this, the notion of the said religious has prevailed that the Indians shall remain ignorant of the said language, in order that no Spaniard may obtain information of what is going on in the villages. There are many innumerable instances which have occurred, of the curas of the doctrines punishing the Indians who talked with the Spaniards in our language.

In the villages close to this capital there are many Indians who understand the said language very well, but when they are in the presence of any religious they reply in their own Tagal language to the Spaniards who ask them questions in Castilian, through their fear of the father; and the latter never speaks to the Indians in Spanish, even though they may be proficient in it.

This is convincing that the intention of the religious orders is certain and evident, that the Indians shall not know our language, so that they may be more secure of the doctrines not being taken away from them, of the bishops not attempting to visit them, of the non-enforcement of the laws (none of which are enforced) of the royal patronage, and of the

continuance of the despotism with which they govern the Indians in both spiritual and temporal matters, without fear of any noticeable result.⁸

The Spanish friars were uncooperative with regards to Spanish because they considered an uneducated Filipino who learned Spanish a future “*filibustero*.”⁹ Teaching Spanish to the natives would equip them with a common language, which could foster national unity among a people who were fragmented by their diverse dialects and insular geography. Apolinario Mabini, the acknowledged “brains of the Philippine Revolution,” wrote about the combined efforts of both Spanish officials and the friars to keep the Filipinos ignorant:

If the Spaniards were to maintain their dominion they had to perpetuate the ignorance and weakness of the indio. Since science and wealth signify strength, it is the poor and ignorant who are weak. However, it was deemed indispensable to give the indio some religious education in order to prevent him from reverting to his ancient superstitions. It was the kind of education that was meant to accustom him to keep his eyes fixed on heaven so that he would neglect the things of this world. The indio was to know how to read his prayers and the lives of the saints which were translated into the native dialects; but it was deemed necessary that he should not know any Spanish, for if and when he would come to understand the laws and orders of the authorities, he would cease to consult the friar curate. He was not supposed to read dangerous books, and thus these books coming from abroad or published locally had to pass a rigorous censorship controlled by ecclesiastical authorities. Commerce with neighboring countries which professed Islam was prohibited. There was a ban on Japanese immigration and a restriction on Chinese immigration. They [the Spaniards] tried to stifle the echoes . . . of the revolutions of the American colonies against England, of France and the Spanish colonies, in order not to awaken the Filipinos from their long slumber. . . . In brief, the Spanish government, in collusion with the friars, succeeded in isolating the Filipinos, both intellectually and physically, to prevent the Filipinos from receiving any impression except that thought expedient for them to have.¹⁰

Dr. Jose Rizal wrote a bitter summation of the impact of Spanish education on the Filipino people:

little by little . . . lost their old traditions, the mementos of their past; . . . gave up their writing, their songs, their poems, their laws in order to learn by rote other doctrines which they did not understand, another morality, another aesthetics different from those inspired by their climate and their manner of thinking. Then they declined, degrading themselves in their own eyes; they became ashamed of what was their own; they began to admire and praise whatever was foreign and incomprehensible; their spirit was dismayed and it surrendered.¹¹

THE REFORM MOVEMENT AND THE PHILIPPINE REVOLUTION OF 1896

The fight for religious supremacy in the doctrina between the Spanish friars and the secular clergy (principally Filipino priests) escalated during the late

1860s. Staunchly refusing to acknowledge the visitorial authority of the diocesan bishop over parishes under its jurisdiction, the friars threatened to abandon the doctrinas if they were compelled to abide by ecclesiastical rules. This brought the subject of the secular priests into the foreground. The lack of secular priests to replace the friars would not only result in neglect of doctrinal work. More to the point and perhaps of greater practical reason, if the friars left their posts, who would collect the tributes from the pueblos? The struggle also reflected a deeper contest between the diocesan authorities and the religious orders. While the friars and curates were answerable only to the religious superiors in their respective orders, the secular priests were under the jurisdiction of the diocese.

As more Filipino secular priests were ordained, the “Filipinization” of the parishes threatened the political power base and material interests held for so long by the friars. Inevitably, the friars branded the Filipino secular clergy leaders, particularly Fr. Mariano Gomez, Fr. Jose Burgos, and Fr. Jacinto Zamora, as antifriar and anti-Spanish. It was also only a matter of time before an incident occurred that could serve as a pretext for denouncing those whom the Spanish friars considered as “troublemakers.” The trigger came with the Cavite Mutiny of 1872. Some 200 Filipino Cavite Arsenal workers complained about unreasonable deductions to their already meager salaries because of additional tribute impositions ordered by the newly appointed governor general, Rafael de Izquierdo. They also expressed sympathy for their kin and friends working in the artillery corps who had lost their exemption privileges from tributes and the *polos y servicios*, which had been granted to them since the mid-eighteenth century, now abruptly terminated by Izquierdo. Although the revolt was only a local event, the Spanish authorities regarded it as part of a national movement to liberate the Philippines from Spain. Accordingly, the three Filipino priests were convicted as the agitators of this anti-Spanish movement. They were executed by garrote on February 17, 1872.

The year 1872 burned itself into the consciousness of the youth, who grew up to be the next generation of Filipino leaders that would eventually bring Spanish colonialism to its end in 1898. In 1872, Jose Rizal was 11 years old; Apolinario Mabini was 8. Andres Bonifacio, the founder of the revolutionary organization Katipunan (Brotherhood) and a Freemason, would later employ the acronym “GOMBURZA” (in honor of the martyred priests Gomez, Burgos, and Zamora) as a password and mode of recognition for its members.

Fearing for the safety of their sons under the increasingly repressive Spanish regime, the Filipino ilustrados sent their young men to Europe. The exodus of this class of wealthy or educated scions peaked during the late 1880s to the early 1890s. There in Madrid, imbibing the liberal ideologies spawned by the French Revolution and taking full advantage of individual freedoms that were unheard of in the Philippines, they worked with a small group in Manila and launched the Propaganda movement.

The Propagandists denounced the abuses of the local authorities and friars in the Philippines. Calling for genuine reforms and redress to the injustices com-

mitted against the Filipinos, they lobbied for parliamentary representation of the Philippines in the Spanish Cortés. They clamored for the fundamental freedoms that were enjoyed in Madrid but not in their homeland—freedom of speech and of the press, freedom of association, freedom of religion, and especially freedom from arbitrary arrest and detention and exile or imprisonment without a trial. It was only later that they proposed assimilation of the Philippines as a province of Spain so that Filipinos, as Spanish citizens, could no longer be subjected to oppression and the heavy burden of taxes they were forced to pay.

Life as a reformist in Madrid was not exactly comfortable or secure. To labor in a foreign land, away from family and friends, without regular financial support or material sustenance, without any idea of how long it might take to achieve, if at all, the goals of the cause proved to be a litmus test for the idealistic reformers. The *ilustrados*, after all, were of two kinds—the wealthy and the educated; those who were motivated by nationalistic goals and those who had a more mundane and practical agenda. Although the outward activities of campaigning for political reform might have been the same, the underlying motives, perceptions, and limits of personal dedication to the patriotic effort in the face of insuperable odds, differed.

Through its newspaper, the *La Solidaridad*, the Propagandists tried to propagate their aims and objectives to sympathetic Spaniards and other countries. After six years it became apparent to those in Madrid and the *ilustrados* in the Philippines who were financing the effort that Spain was more concerned with its internal problems (i.e., the September Revolution of 1868, which was primarily directed against the extravagant and irresponsible rule of the Bourbon Isabella II) and the future of its remaining colonies (i.e., Cuba vis-à-vis the intentions of a rising power, the United States). The reforms that the Filipino Propagandists were fighting for would not be granted. Neither would assimilation of the Philippines into Spain be possible, not only because of deep-seated racial prejudices about the *indio*, but also because of the economic burdens that the proposal implied for Spain. Ironically, although the efforts of the Propagandists failed to attract sufficient sympathy and meaningful support from other liberal countries, the movement had raised the expectations of the centuries-oppressed *indios*. Since neither option appeared feasible, the only remaining alternative was violent change—revolution.

To the wealthy reformists, however, a violent upheaval would upset the status quo and, in the process, threaten or destroy the socioeconomic conditions upon which their family fortunes were built. The nagging question and unspoken concern was that, if their efforts toward social reform succeeded, might not its price be the loss of their positions of power and material advantage that their forebears had bought with so much toil and personal sacrifice? In the Philippines, land, the haciendas, and the crops that grew were the principal barometers of wealth. On this subject, neither the *encomenderos* descendants of the original Spanish conquistadores and other prominent Spaniards who were rewarded by the King of Spain for their services to the Crown, the friars, nor the affluent

ilustrados were open to any suggestion of agrarian reform and the diminution of established power they already enjoyed.

The idea of revolutionary change was just as unpalatable to the educated class. History had shown that no uprising could succeed without the necessary arms with which to fight the enemy. Indeed, the first Cuban revolution against Spain failed precisely because of a lack of arms. Neither could violent change alone lead to any fruitful outcome and improve a people's well-being because, without a guiding philosophy to channel popular indignation, a revolution would only succeed in destroying everything in its path.¹² On Rizal's perception of and attitude toward revolutionary change, Corpuz comments lengthily:

Rizal regarded the Revolution in its wholeness. A revolution would entail a contest of arms that, if successful, wins national liberty. But fighting is only part of the revolution; the other part is the building of civic structures to establish the justice that the people had fought for. To Rizal the Filipino Revolution was a struggle to win both liberty for the nation, and after victory, to ensure that the masses who fought in battle are governed by civil institutions that promise a just and lawful society.

A revolution by the upper classes ends when victory in arms is won; the purpose of this revolution is the transfer of political power into the hands of the victorious upper class bloc. This is because justice to the upper classes means simply that they hold power. On the other hand a people's revolution is won not in the mere change of political power; it is not won until after social justice has been established in the post-revolution society. This just society is impossible without democracy, without the people participating effectively in political power, and therefore the Filipino Revolution, the people's revolution, was aimed at the collective goals of national liberty, social justice, and popular democracy.¹³

FILIPINO IDEAS ON DEMOCRACY, SOCIAL JUSTICE, POPULAR GOVERNMENT, AND NATION-BUILDING

A revolution is an attempt by a people to rid itself of the social structures and systems that have prevented their attainment of a better life. For a revolution to succeed and bear fruit, it requires a common perception, a unified understanding, and a clear definition of what constituted the past social ills and their origins and, equally as important, a clear vision and plan of action to guide the direction of the violent process of change toward desired social goals.

As the guiding light of the revolution, Apolinario Mabini wrote three documents that collectively embodied his proposed blueprint for social regeneration, the promulgation of social justice, the realization by Filipinos of their national identity, and the achievement of genuine national independence from foreign domination. For Mabini, the external revolutionary process must have its twin component: an *internal revolution of the people's hearts and mind*. One was futile and meaningless without the other.

The first document was *El Verdadero Decalogo* ("The True Decalogue"). In ten pithy aphorisms, Mabini sought to distill the essential qualities for awakening

this internal turning about of the fulcrum of social consciousness. To his compatriots, Mabini wrote:

In order to build the proper edifice of our social regeneration, it is imperative that we change radically not only our institutions but also our manner of behaving and thinking. It is necessary to have both an external and internal revolution by establishing our moral education on a more solid foundation and purging ourselves of those vices, the majority of which we have inherited from the Spaniards. Should we not have these conditions, our people will find themselves daily more decimated and impoverished by civil war and internal dissensions until they will be completely annihilated, with the generous blood of our martyrs unable to prevent it.¹⁴

Mabini maintained that both aspects of the revolution were inseparably intertwined. No external revolution could hope to achieve its desired ends as long as the people had not thoroughly purged their minds and hearts of those attitudes, values, habitual mindsets, modes of social interaction, ways of perceiving and acting upon situations, which their past colonial masters had enculturated in them. Neither could any internal revolution of a people's collective consciousness ever occur as long as the country was under foreign subjugation, in whatever form it took—military, political, or economic.

Cesar Adib Majul encapsulated Mabini's "The True Decalogue" as follows:

It exhorted the love of God and one's honor; the first as the foundation of truth and justice and the second as the force causing men to become truthful, just and industrious. God was to be worshipped in a manner dependent on the conscience of the individual, a faculty which singled out what was good or evil. It was a duty to develop one's talents, but always within the path of what was judged as good and just. The nation was to be loved as the patrimony of the race, something inherited from ancestors to become the future of the descendants. The happiness of the nation was to take precedence over that of the individual. The people were not to recognize any person as an authority unless he had been properly elected by them. They were to work for the formation of a republic and reject a monarchy. While the latter implied a dynasty and the ennobling of a single family or group of families, the former "makes a noble people, dignified by the use of their reason, great on account of their liberty, and prosperous and resplendent by their labor." One's neighbor was to be loved, but he was to be regarded not merely as a neighbor but as a fellow member of the community with whom the patriot was "tied by the same fortunes, the same joys and sorrows, and identical aspirations and interests."¹⁵

The second document of Mabini's grand plan was his "*Ordenanzas de la Revolución*" (Structures of the Revolution). The work sought to explain the reason for the revolution, why it was justified, and how it was to be organized and directed. It was a magnum opus, presenting a comprehensive outline for the political, administrative, economic, military, and judicial structure of a proposed revolutionary government. Mabini justified the revolution against Spain as "just, as long as it tries to destroy a government that was foreign and a usurper."¹⁶

He added that a revolution against a nonalien (i.e., presumably a Filipino) government was also justified in the event that such government abused the powers entrusted to it by its people. This second point fully supports one of Mabini's precepts in "The True Decalogue" which said that a people were bound to political obedience only to a government that represented the deliberate choice and consent of the people.

The third document was Mabini's "*Programa constitucional de la república Filipina*" (The Constitution of the Philippine Republic). Consisting of 130 articles grouped into ten titles, the paper defined citizenship and individual rights, the national territory and general structure of the republic, Congress, the Senate, provincial and local governments, the executive, the judiciary, taxation, the military, and public instruction. It drew heavily from the moving spirit and philosophy that was contained in the *Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen* of the French Revolution and embodied the liberal political ideologies of the republicans in Spain.

It is significant to note that, as a former teacher, Mabini devoted an entire title on the matter of public instruction. For Mabini, education was not merely supposed to equip the people with basic literacy and academic qualifications for private enterprise or public service. In his proposed constitution, more than just defining the individual rights of all Filipino citizens, he stressed that the State must make the people more aware of their civic duties and responsibilities, as members of a national community, bound together in a common pursuit of shared well-being and national interest. The ultimate goal of education was to build a nation of citizens who are literate, well informed, concerned, and active participants in self-government, not merely passive, self-seeking, and socially apathetic individuals. Sadly, Mabini's fear is exactly what characterizes the national awareness, inner motivation, behavior tendency, and value system of Filipinos today.

AMERICAN OCCUPATION OF THE PHILIPPINES

The entry of American forces at the closing stage of the Philippine revolution against Spain introduced an unknown factor to the political situation. How would America comport itself vis-à-vis the objectives of the Filipino revolutionaries? Would it respect the nascent local aspiration for genuine independence and self-determination, as the American Founding Fathers had done during their struggle against British tyranny? Or might America behave like any other colonial power who now saw an opportunity to extend its presence outside its own continent? Mabini's nuts-and-bolts pragmatism and penetrating insight on this subject was evident when he first met General Emilio Aguinaldo, when the latter read the Proclamation of Independence at Kawit, Cavite, on June 12, 1898. In his book, *Apolinario Mabini—Revolutionary*, Cesar Adib Majul described the exchange of conversation between the two:

After the normal courtesies and gentle remarks that might have graced the meeting, the first question propounded by Mabini thrust to the background his physical infirmity and brought to the front his sense of realpolitick: was there a formal agreement or treaty between the American authorities and Aguinaldo regarding the final disposition of the Islands? The negative response cast a dark cloud on all around. Again: Might not the promises remain merely verbal and ambiguous? If so, was not the declaration of independence premature and imprudent, for while it disclosed to the Americans the intentions of the Filipinos, they, on the contrary, were keeping theirs a secret?¹⁷

From this vignette, it can be gleaned that although the coming of the Americans closed the Spanish empire in the Philippines, the Filipino revolutionaries regarded their arrival with serious misgivings. Although vastly different in military capability, technological attainment, national economic wealth, and political ideology, the newly arrived Americans heralded a mere changing of alien masters who both belonged to a common racial genotype and harbored colonial dreams.

By August 13, 1898, the Spaniards saw their untenable position in the face of the superior American forces and the Filipinos who had besieged the walled city of Manila. Actually, as early as June, Madrid had already instructed the Spanish governor-general to capitulate, when it became unavoidable, to the Americans but not to the Filipinos.¹⁸ Not wishing now to suffer the humiliation of defeat at the hands of the indios, the Spanish general Fermin Jaudenes insisted to the Americans that there should be a mock battle in Manila Bay, after which the Spanish forces would surrender. He went on further to demand that the Filipinos should not be allowed to enter Manila and participate in its surrender. Commodore George Dewey and General Wesley Merritt accepted the terms, but did not reveal this agreement to their ally, General Emilio Aguinaldo.¹⁹

Aguinaldo knew that the Filipino troops had bottled up effectively the Spanish forces inside the walled city of Manila. In fact, the Americans did not have to worry about any Spanish maneuver since their Filipino allies were effectively doing the job of watchdog. But the steady arrival of American reinforcements puzzled Aguinaldo. Why did General Merritt instruct Major General Francis Greene to request Aguinaldo's "cooperation" by having the Filipino forces evacuate the bayside so that the Americans could occupy it? His instincts warning him, Aguinaldo demanded that Merritt's request be conveyed in writing. Greene promised to do so after the evacuation. With this verbal promise, Aguinaldo naively moved his troops to give way to the Americans, who promptly consolidated their positions within the city. After General Greene failed to keep his promise, the sham was manifest and the true military objectives were clear. What began as a friendly alliance deteriorated into a silent hostility, and Philippine-American relations started on this sour note of betrayal.

Meanwhile, back in Washington, America and Spain were already discussing the draft of a proposed protocol of peace that would end hostilities between the two nations. Again, the Philippines was left out of the negotiations—much like

the Asian practice of prearranged marriages, wherein the groom and bride do not have any meaningful say or choice on a life they will have to share, and a future that is decided for them by their respective parents or elders.

The Treaty of Paris, signed on December 10, 1898, demanded formal cession by Spain of the entire Philippine colony to the United States, in return for the sum of U.S. \$20 million. The treaty, however, could not automatically take effect until after the American Senate had ratified it. Many senators were initially against the treaty, calling it unfair to the Filipinos. But Fate intervened once more, as it did when Andres Bonifacio's revolutionary movement, the Katipunan (Brotherhood) was discovered through a disclosure made under the seal of religious confession. On a dark night, February 4, 1899, American soldiers on patrol over a bridge fired at an unknown person who failed to give the expected countersign. Private Grayson of the Nebraska Regiment narrated the incident:

I challenged with another "Halt." Then he immediately shouted "Halto" to me. Well I thought the best thing to do was to shoot him. He dropped. Then two Filipinos sprang out of the gateway about 15 feet from us. I called "Halt" and Miller fired and dropped one. I saw that another was left. Well I think I got my second Filipino that time. We retreated to where six other fellows were and I said, "Line up fellows; the niggers are in here all through these yards."²⁰

Washington media portrayed the incident as an act of treachery by the Filipinos and an insulting refusal of President William McKinley's wish to liberate and Christianize the Filipinos, whose rights he had pledged to guarantee under the military regime. With this news, the tide changed in favor of the Treaty of Paris. Shortly after the treaty's ratification, McKinley issued his "Benevolent Assimilation" Proclamation, which was the first official indication of American foreign policy regarding the Philippines. The statement bluntly stated that America would stay in the Philippines by exercising its "right of sovereignty over the Filipinos." And it was prepared to enforce its will over the entire country by military force.

AMERICAN EXPANSIONISM IN THE PACIFIC

The Filipinos' misgivings were corroborated by the cumulative turn of events. Having just recently broken the yoke of Spanish oppression that had chained the Philippines for over three centuries, the Filipinos were dead set on obtaining full independence. This clashed with the business objectives of powerful American industrialists who looked at the Pacific, especially China, as a vast untapped market for their surplus domestic production. For example, the National Association of Manufacturers (NAM), formed in 1895, was established with the specific goal of promoting American exports. For this influential group, "free trade" and unrestricted exports were the only means to maintain a high employment rate and sustained economic growth. Of course, America's policy of

extreme industrial protectionism was glossed over conveniently. Through a system of tariff barriers and quotas, America enjoyed rapid industrialization, and the American public, in turn, took this industrial boom as proof of the superiority of their economic system.

In terms of political ideology, there was John Fiske's doctrine of Manifest Destiny (1885) and the Social Darwinists' contention about the greater adaptive value of the Anglo-Saxon culture and institutions that they claimed to have been the reason why this race successfully subjugated others. Admittedly, there were American anti-imperialists who were highly critical of this evolving Pacific expansionism. But, taken together, the tide of political sentiments and the imperatives of economic necessity at that time went in favor of American involvement in the Philippines.

The international environment of imperial expansion by other European nations also argued against leaving the Philippines alone. In his book, *Face of Empire*, Frank H. Golay gives an overview of the global disposition of colonies in the 1800s.²¹ Britain dominated the Atlantic sea-lanes and had enough colonial possessions to keep itself occupied. Spain was having problems with the stability of its colonial governments in Mexico and Cuba. In the Caribbean and Latin American areas, there was the combined presence of Britain (Jamaica, Trinidad, the Bahamas, British Guiana, British Honduras), France (Martinique, French Guiana), and the Netherlands (Dutch Guiana, Curaçao, Danish Virgin Islands). In the Far East, France expanded its influence from Cochinchina, to include Annam, Tonkin, Cambodia, and Laos. Britain held Burma, the sultanates of the Malay Peninsula, and North and West Borneo. In 1886, New Guinea was partitioned among Britain, the Netherlands, and Germany. With all this rush for colonial territories, America felt that it had to join the race soon or else there would be nothing left. As the gateway to China, the Philippines was strategic and, therefore, could not be left on its own without America's overarching guidance and presence.

ECONOMIC GROWTH AND AGRARIAN UNREST UNDER THE AMERICANS

The abolition of the Spanish *encomienda* system in 1718 did not change the fundamental disparity of lifestyles between landlords and tenants. Indeed, a small number of Filipino *inquilinos* (lessees of friar estates) became economically affluent and formed the emerging class of Filipino landed aristocracy in the nineteenth century. They, in turn, became the ogres who preyed upon their less-fortunate compatriots, and it was principally due to the former's oppressive action that agrarian unrest spread throughout the country.

After the Spanish regime and with the coming of the Americans, the landlord-tenant socioeconomic structure did not change. *Although the revolution swept aside the Spanish ruling class, the Filipino upper class rushed into the vacuum.* The circumstances of the peasants remained the same however: poverty, igno-

rance, tendency to gambling, and fatalism. For their part, the American colonial administrators could have taken effective steps to resolve the agrarian problem, but “they did not, for the men they placed at the helm of the government were, in general, of the *cacique* class, the class which learned from and inherited the Spanish colonial’s technique of mass exploitation.”²²

America’s colonial presence in the Philippines became a “mixed blessing.” The country’s educational system vastly improved, making Filipinos the most literate throughout Asia. Agricultural exports and the extractive sectors grew significantly. But the trade-off was the full opening of the domestic market to the inflow of surplus American production, especially consumer goods, and the granting of “parity rights” to American investors in the exploitation of natural resources. In politics, Gabriel Kolko described America’s administration in the Philippines as follows:

The United States built upon the landed oligarchies it found in place after its conquest of the islands in 1899–1901. Regional politics, with its largely family-based local alliances, became the hallmark of the American-imposed political structure after 1907 as United States–style boss politics and patronage merged naturally with the existing social order, co-opting some new members into the local ruling class but leaving its basic institutional role unchanged.”²³

POLITICAL SUPPORT AS AN INSTRUMENT OF FOREIGN POLICY

During the 1950s and up to the late 1960s, Philippine economic policy remained oriented toward the export of raw materials and agricultural products, unrestricted importation of American consumer goods, and dependence on foreign capital. Any attempt to establish local manufacturing capability for basic industrial goods was thumbed down as obstructive to free trade. President Carlos P. Garcia enunciated the “Filipino First” policy in 1958 and launched an “austerity program” to mobilize national savings, consistent with the idea of self-sufficiency. In reaction, both Filipino vested interest groups who benefited from lucrative export quotas to the U.S. markets, as well as American investors who had substantial interests in the Philippines moved to plot his downfall. They supported Vice President Diosdado Macapagal. As to why the United States behaved in this fashion, Kolko wrote:

The United States supported the victorious Macapagal in the November 1961 elections . . . because he favored a restoration of the U.S.–Philippine bilateral trade system to its original form—notwithstanding a formidable nationalist contingent in Congress. His first major act upon taking office was to implement IMF and U.S. Treasury recommendations and lift all exchange controls, in return for which the Philippines, which had earlier been denied IMF and World Bank loans, received \$300 million in U.S. and IMF aid. With the peso devalued by about half, the Philippine economy once again became an open hunting ground for U.S. businessmen, most of whom still preferred sending previously

blocked profits out of the country rather than investing further—to the extent, in fact, that in no year after 1945 had new foreign investment equaled profits repatriated to the United States. Macapagal's economic program, the price of continued IMF aid, was consciously antinationalist, and the major damage it inflicted on local business interests led to an end of the rapid economic growth of the manufacturing sector that had occurred during the 1950s.²⁴

In his twilight years, Macapagal frankly admitted in his own newspaper column: "It is a fact that the US government was decisive in the choice of the presidents since the Filipinos elected their president in 1935. Until President Cojuangco-Aquino, *"no candidate for Philippine president opposed by the American government ever won."*²⁵

"Nationalist" economic policy recommendations were branded as "communist" and "anti-American," and vigorously assailed in local newspapers as being associated with the *Hukbalahap* (farmer-insurgents). Direct foreign investments grew, attracted by the lucrative profits to be made from a vast supply of highly literate but dirt-cheap labor, abundant raw material supplies, and a "friendly" economic policy toward American interests. Central Bank regulations enabled foreign investors to borrow more from domestic credit sources and discriminated against Filipino businessmen in the allocation of dollars for imports. Repatriation of profits was open to foreigners, yielding them attractive payback periods and rates of return.

On the political scene, especially for those aspiring for the presidency, it became a mandatory ritual to visit Washington and hopefully obtain Uncle Sam's open support, if not tacit endorsement. Matters concerning foreign policy, trade, and investments were usually taken up during such official trips. To the Filipino politicians, the unwritten and generally applicable truism was (to paraphrase an old song)—"whatever Uncle Sam wants, Uncle Sam gets." Those who abided or were willing to hew to this expectation were supported (never mind if they turned out later to be sons of bitches, to use President Franklin Roosevelt's characterization), or until such time that Washington deemed the incumbent or candidate more of a liability than an asset to American interests.

THE CHURCH AS AN ALTERNATIVE POLITICAL FORCE

Ferdinand E. Marcos ascended to the presidency in 1965, defeating his rival, former President Diosdado Macapagal. Agrarian unrest had persisted all throughout the 1950s under the Huk movement of the peasant leader, Luis Taruc. It continued to fester in the late 1960s, especially since the Philippine economy was tied to the rise and fall of the United States. The psychological breaking point was breached when the sugar barons in the Visayas continued their lavish parties and celebrations, showing little or no sensitivity to rein in their "ostentatious display of wealth" in the face of grinding poverty that the masses suffered. U.S. ambassador William Blair wrote about the political lead-

ership of this time: “The Filipino leadership is drawn from landowning families. Hence few Filipino leaders feel any strong commitment to major change in the countryside, since their family and personal interests lie in perpetuating the status quo.”²⁶

Completing his first term in 1969, Marcos ran again and won a second four-year term that was supposed to end in 1973. Faced with growing agrarian unrest, increasingly strident criticism from militant labor groups and radical student organizations, urban terrorism, and barred by the Constitution at that time from seeking reelection, there was only one way to resolve all these problems with one clean stroke. In September 1972 Marcos declared martial law, centralizing all government power unto himself. All throughout the Marcos regime, the United States consistently acted in a manner that would enhance and safeguard America’s political and business interests. When Marcos decided in 1985 to hold snap elections the next year, Stephen Roskamm Shalom wrote:

from Washington’s point of view, fair elections between Marcos and any of his likely elite opponents would further U.S. interests, for the elections would either serve to enhance Marcos’s legitimacy (if he wins) or transfer power to a far more legitimate, but also pro-U.S. leadership (if he loses). The United States does not want elections so fair that the disenfranchised poor might for once achieve a say over their destiny, nor so fair that the issue of the U.S. bases might be seriously raised. To Washington, elections are not intended as a genuine exercise in self-determination; rather, as U.S. Senator Bill Bradley recently put it, elections in the Philippines are a necessary component of any successful counter-insurgency campaign.”²⁷

It was during the Marcos dictatorship (1972–1986) that the Church rose in prominence and activity as an alternative political force. Meanwhile, Marcos enlisted the active support of the military establishment by bloating the defense budget and rewarding loyal officers with virtually unlimited authority, subject only to his control. The writ of habeas corpus suspended, Marcos’s absolute power and ruthless efficiency with which the military carried out his orders intimidated the general public. National and local politicians subserviently obliged Marcos in his every whim as former political oppositionists were silenced through incarceration and the disbandment of the legislature. Government became synonymous with whatever the dictator and his ruling political party, the Kilusang Bagong Lipunan (New Society Movement) wished to do.

Meanwhile, several businessmen opposed President Marcos because the public perception of widespread corruption and cronyism resulted in a severe loss of investor confidence and a general downturn in business profitability. What was even more appalling was how the law was used to take over large private corporations owned by the opposition and subsequently turned over to the favored few within the Marcos clique. Not much could be done to denounce this to the public. The media was muzzled, government-owned or controlled, or belonged to the Marcos clique. Meanwhile, ordinary Filipinos were chained to

the basic problems of daily survival. Numbed by their day-to-day struggle to eke out a below-poverty subsistence, skeptical of facetious government propaganda, and aware that lofty idealism can never fill empty stomachs, the masses became inured to the systematic and massive graft and corruption that the politicians and profit-driven businessmen committed. It was under this prevailing sociopolitical and economic situation that the Roman Catholic Church, as the spiritual shepherd of approximately 80 percent of the Philippine population, emerged as the only credible and viable countervailing force in the realm of local politics.

Three years after Senator Benigno Aquino Jr.'s assassination in August 1983, the EDSA revolution erupted in February 1986, driving Marcos and his clique out of political and economic power and, for a time, banishing them from the Philippines. Corazon C. Aquino, the late senator's wife, became president and served for six years, during which time she restored democracy and the fundamental liberties that Marcos curtailed. While Marcos was exiled in Hawaii, this "hate figure" was erased from the public consciousness. When Marcos died, his residual influence dwindled to that of his widow and children, further diffusing the moral indignation and outrage he once evoked. During President Aquino's term, many of the former politicians and business interest groups closely associated with the late strongman slowly but steadily filtered back into the Philippines. By 1991, a number of those who fled the country in 1986 had again managed to win elective positions in both national and local government. Others recovered their government-sequestered business interests through legal maneuvering or astute negotiations. As the French wryly quipped: "*Plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose*" (The more things change, the more they are the same.)

After President Aquino's term, the Church resumed its vigilance and critical collaboration when General Fidel V. Ramos (cousin of Marcos and the quondam Philippine constabulary chief) won the presidency in 1992. Barely one year in office, President Ramos introduced the unpopular Value-Added Tax (VAT) as a means of shoring up government revenue and as part of his administration's commitment to the prescriptions strongly recommended by the IMF. Something that was previously unheard of and totally unexpected happened. An "ad hoc" tactical alliance emerged, composed of three formerly disparate segments of Philippine society—the clergy and lay religious organizations, remnants of the former "Left," and some segments of the military—calling itself "Kill-VAT."

Another opportunity for this unusual combination of forces came during the 1995 local elections. Meetings were sponsored by some private individuals, actively participated in by these tripartite sectors of influence, for the purpose of cobbling a list of municipal, provincial, congressional, and senatorial candidates that commonly would be acceptable for endorsement to the local electorate. The Catholic Bishops Conference of the Philippines (CBCP) did not formally acknowledge or recognize this collaboration as an "official" act of the Church. However, the extent of character background screening (done by both

armed groups), monitoring of public statements and stances by the candidates vis-à-vis specific issues, review of their legislative performance, and the coordinated dissemination of gathered information to parish-based organizations, such as the local Basic Ecclesial Communities (BEC) and lay ministries (e.g., Catholic Charismatic groups), left no doubt that the Church considered this effort as extremely important. Pastoral letters were issued to all parishes, proposing evaluation criteria for selecting candidates to national and local elective offices. The effort also reached out to the business and professional communities, women's organizations, sociocivic clubs, members of the academe and student/youth groups, peasant groups, selected members of the military and police, and employee organizations in some government offices.

As the Ramos administration's term drew to a close in 1997, the government, along with certain civilian-military groups, mobilized a so-called "peoples" organization to test public receptivity to certain proposed amendments to the Constitution. As far as public perception was concerned, it seemed that the principal motivation of the effort was to remove the present term limits of incumbent elective officials, although not necessarily just that of the president. Camouflaging the underlying rationale for the move, the "Cha-Cha" (acronym for "Charter Change") proponents included many "red herring" proposals—a change in the design and colors of the Philippine flag; the synchronization of local and national elections; taxation of assets owned by the Catholic Church; reevaluation of the principle of separation between Church and State; as well as the redefinition of Philippine land and sea territory. Sensing again that something was afoot, and aware of the creeping but steady return of "rehabilitated" Marcos forces, the Church lost no time in organizing a mammoth "Anti Cha-Cha" march and rally at the Quirino Grandstand at Luneta Park in Manila. It was held on September 21, 1997, to coincide with the twenty-fifth anniversary of the declaration of martial law. Confronted with a highly charged public resistance to the idea, the Ramos gambit fizzled out.

A VACUUM OF NATIONAL CIVIC CONSCIOUSNESS AND POLITICAL MATURITY

The confusion of events during the Philippine revolution, specifically the transition period between the end of Spanish rule and the start of the American occupation, effectively prevented Filipinos from achieving the "internal revolution" that Mabini held to be the key to nation-building. After the pacification campaign by the American military, domestic peace and order normalized and businesses flourished dramatically during the pre-World War II years. Public confidence returned, interrupted only by the outbreak of World War II. But as soon as the war ended, it was gung-ho and happy-days-are-here-again. Once more, the urgency of "internal revolution" receded into the background.

By 1943, 73 percent of Philippine foreign trade was held by the United States, nearly all of it with tariff preferences. The local economic oligarchy wanted

guaranteed access to the American import market for agricultural commodities. American business interests in the Philippines, particularly concentrated in public utilities, mining, and export-oriented agriculture, was larger than in any other nation in Asia. Both groups wanted nominal political independence with continued economic dependence.²⁸ Business was as good as it got, and nobody was complaining.

After its 1946 independence but still fastened to America's economic apron strings, the Philippines became embroiled in the Korean War (Philippine Expeditionary Force to Korea or PEFTOK) and the Vietnam War (Philippine Civic Action Group or PHILCAG). Most recently, the Philippines sent a token contingent to the United Nations peacekeeping forces (UNTAC) during the Gulf War in 1991. At the time the author was writing this chapter, the ratification of the Visiting Forces Agreement (VFA) by the Philippine Senate appeared to be a foregone conclusion, barely seven years after the U.S. bases pulled out from Philippine soil in 1992.

Amidst the push and pull of world events, and the contradictions generated by the contending paradigms of "globalization" versus "economic nationalism," this glaring lack of national civic consciousness and political maturity continue to bedevil Filipinos today. Today, the Philippines has all the external trappings: jurisprudence, political institutions, and systems of democratic government. But, among Filipinos, there is little or no understanding of, nor commitment to, the philosophical insights, civic values, and attitudes to make social justice and true freedom a working reality for all. America's influence has turned out to be a "mixed blessing," in the sense that it failed to help provide an atmosphere that would initiate and encourage a self-introspective review by Filipinos of their national affairs, best interests, and desired future. This statement, however, may be too naïve to make and may belong to the realm of wishful thinking. Indeed, since when did any colonial or world power voluntarily provide the people of its former colonies or client states an opportunity for self-discovery and unification? The late statesman, Senator Claro M. Recto, perceptively admonished Filipinos of his era, which today's political and economic leaders ignore at our own peril:

Though we may feel the deepest admiration and respect for the American people, for their sense of fairness and their spirit of self-criticism, their love of liberty and justice, their patriotic pride, their deep and constant concern for their world destiny, and their thoroughness in the enforcement of their rights, still we should not believe, and I think it is wrong for us to believe and to act as if we believed, that American policy can ever have any objective other than the security, welfare, and interest of the American people.²⁹

The reaction patterns, behavioral tendencies, and habitual modes of analyzing situations are disturbingly consistent. Like their ilustrado predecessors, today's upper crust of Philippine society focuses almost exclusively on *their* concerns—local peace and order; a managed labor situation; and consistency in the for-

mulation and implementation of laws governing trade, finance, and taxation. Meanwhile, as the common indio had been during the Spanish and American colonial eras, their attention remains confined to the chain of economic necessity and the problem of daily survival. In this dark swirl of social, economic, and political forces, there is no indication of any “internal guidance” system, no framework on how to begin to craft a coherent vision and plan for nation-building, no understanding of how to initiate sustainable and meaningful societal reform.

PRAGMATIC CONSIDERATIONS OF SOCIAL REFORM

A nation is made up of diverse sectors of society, each with its own viewpoints, values, priorities, concerns, attitudes, motivating forces, and overriding goals. Therefore, any effort that seeks to initiate the process of social change must include all segments, precisely because social justice, the greatest common good, and peace are goals on which every sector has an equally valid stake.

Today’s Philippine society has two fundamental kinds of members. First are those who have had access to higher education, who are relatively financially stable or even affluent, and whose sphere of activity and social influence extends to other groups. Like the tip of an iceberg, these are the sectors of society that usually stand out in the social, economic, and political realms. Situated in the loci of socioeconomic and political power, they are the movers and decision-makers who create events and influence the news. The second part—the general public, the average Filipino “masa”—is usually fragmented and content to watch from the sidelines. Though more numerous, their usual focus of opinions, range of alternatives, and scope of actions involve basic needs and more pragmatic concerns. It is very easy, though not necessarily valid, to form the perception that this segment is apathetic and difficult to attract toward such an abstract concept as social reform.

It is through their *built-in attitudinal and motivational filters* that each group in Philippine society views, analyzes and interprets all local and national events, issues, and concerns. After undergoing some sort of preliminary digestion, each group gravitates toward certain preferred outcomes and tentative goals, whose clarity of formulation may range from vaguely perceived outlines to concrete and specific agendas. Latitudes of concessions and alternative courses of action that may be the subject of future discussions or negotiations are evolved. At the last stage, public stances and pronouncements are finalized and made. These end results are what we see in the daily news.

FAILURE OF ADVOCACY GROUPS: WHAT’S MISSING?

From the days of the Reform movement in Spain up until now, numerous groups have sought and continue to reach out to their countrymen, awaken their hearts and minds to the problems and issues that affect all Filipinos, and generate

enough groundswell of public determination to push for certain desired changes. *Be informed. Be concerned. Be involved.* This has always been, and still is, their battlecry. Unfortunately, their efforts could not be sustained, resulting to their inactivity and inevitable dissolution. There are many possible reasons behind such abortive attempts: (1) lack of adequate and sustainable fund support; (2) unavailability of committed leaders and workers willing to work over the long haul and at considerable self-sacrifice; (3) conflicting agenda and priorities among interacting groups, whether arising from intrinsic motivations and objectives or influenced by extraneous interests through agents within; and (4) outright repression by the government, vested interests, or power blocs whose intrinsic values and desires for continued access to power and material advantages were threatened by the concomitant changes that reform implied.

In today's democratic space, beyond the more obvious reasons cited above, it is perhaps the *lack or the absence of certain unspoken and unwritten interaction qualities* that prevents well-meaning groups from arriving at an initial framework of mutual understanding or crafting even a tentative area of intra-group collaboration. These "make-or-break" factors include, among others:

1. Group Orientation—Ability and willingness to focus group goals and activities toward the definition, clarification, and pursuit of national interest and the greatest common good, transcending the valid but necessarily circumscribed concerns and fragmented objectives of religious, political, ethnic, ideological, business, and/or vested interest groups;
2. Openness—Basic respect for and a genuine effort to engage other groups in an atmosphere of utmost good faith, sincerity, frankness, and a minimum level of initial cooperation;
3. Confidence Building—Identification of demonstrable or verifiable milestones of individual performance against which to gauge each group's behavioral consistency and its fulfillment of mutually agreed commitments and undertakings;
4. Interaction Style—Intellectual flexibility and negotiating openness that does not exclude other groups a priori or impose conditionalities, an interaction setting that facilitates and encourages genuine exchange of views and ideas, with minimal distortions arising from preexisting mind sets and/or fears brought about by past interaction experiences.

Without these core prerequisites, the initial store of goodwill and lofty idealism cannot be sustained. Discussions will tend to degenerate into ill-conceived programs at best, or interminable debates at worst. Rowing in different directions, the group can hardly expect to proceed unerringly toward shared goals. Today's advocates for meaningful and sustainable change must not lose sight of these practical lookout points for *productive* social interaction, or they will unwittingly plant the seeds of their own group's irrelevance. They may make a lot of noise, but attain little by way of producing a society of informed,

concerned, and involved Filipinos that will sustain and replicate itself over the long haul.

ESSENTIAL QUALIFICATIONS OF NATIONAL LEADERSHIP

All human organizations have a public and visible face. It is through this external mask or persona that the world at large looks at the group and judges its activities. Fortunately or unfortunately, each leader brings to the table the product of a lifetime's personal value systems, habitual mindsets, analytical tools, and decision-making styles. Whether the advocacy group recognizes it or not, likes it or not, the individual and collective public image of its leaders can either promote, hinder, or totally block the achievement of the group's ideals and desired social goals.

Each leader must be known to be ethical and moral, both in private and public life. A recognized genius or technocrat with a checkered or dubious past will not do. These are the "guns for hire," who peddle their talents and expertise to whomever can best reward their personal goals. This is where many self-styled leaders fall flat on their faces. Philippine history has had more than its fair share of armchair intellectuals, "technocrats," and well-meaning people who had the right head but the wrong heart. During times of conflict—especially those that imperil personal fortunes, family interests, or entail significant sacrifice—there always were, and still are, leaders who calculate how best to align themselves pragmatically with whomever may emerge as the victorious contender. Invoking the voice of sobriety, reason, or the greatest common good, they readily compromise hard-won ideals on the altar of "honorable peace." They may agree with the principles and objectives of the group; they may even join the fray. But only up to that point when they ask: "How will my business be affected?" "What about my stockholders?" "What about my family?" Not that these leaders love their country less. They simply love their personal and group interests more.

Beyond moral character, the most important requirement for leadership is *personal commitment to Filipino values and a deep understanding of the country's social, economic, and political history*. Without this final piece, leaders will tend to be mired in their own group interests—political, business, religious, ideological, or others. They may see the larger picture, but may not have the insight to do what must be done. There is a Zen anecdote about a master and his disciples discussing the idea of service. The master was known to favor action over noninvolvement. But he always insisted on "enlightened" action. The disciples wanted to know what "enlightened" meant. Could it be "right-intentioned"? "Oh no," said the master, "Think how right-intentioned the monkey is when he lifts a fish from the river to save it from a watery grave."

Similarly, our leaders—political, religious, business, military, and so forth—may see the magnitude of the problem confronting the country. They may sincerely want to do something about it. But if they do not have the essential

qualities for national leadership, they will probably behave like “the monkey who dived into the water to save a fish from a watery death.” They may also fail to muster the will to do what is necessary, precisely because their group ties are stronger and deeper than impersonal and conceptual social concerns.

Sadly, there are no identifiable leaders today who have a deep understanding about the roots of our inability to define our Filipino identity, discover our national soul, and determine our national interest. And so, whether chained to their interest groups and parochial concerns, whether misinformed or ignorant about our national past, many political, business, and religious leaders are no more than well-meaning guides who are myopic at best—or blind at worst, leading a disoriented and equally blind Filipino people. Precisely because of all the previous caveats, it is imperative that one who would champion genuine social reform must embody, *by actual deed and not mere verbal declaration or intellectual comprehension*, the essential qualities that make for a visionary and worthy exemplar for all Filipinos to emulate.

AREAS OF STUDY AND GROUP ADVOCACY

There appear to be five generic areas of concern that can serve as a unifying envelope for study and group advocacy:

1. Economics—National economic policy formulation to foster and safeguard domestic businesses and production capabilities (especially in the light of rapid globalization and an increasingly electronically connected world), stimulate savings and investments, and minimize external vulnerability;
2. Foreign Relations—Definition of appropriate foreign relations policies toward major world economic and political aggrupations (e.g., ASEAN; the American Union; Mainland China and the geographically dispersed but economically potent Chinese immigrants; India; the independent Russian states; the European Union; and the Middle East);
3. Politics—Analysis and policy recommendations on Philippine governance structures and political institutions for improved social accountability, faster service responsiveness, and more effective delivery capability to all Filipinos;
4. Security—National security (e.g., food, water, and environment; internal peace and order; strategic oil supplies and essential commodities; territorial integrity and national sovereignty; investment in manpower development and education; prevention of economic manipulation, whether from internal or external origin; and so on); and
5. Social—Safeguarding and enhancement of social justice and democratic principles, as well as other social issues.

OUTREACH METHOD AND TARGET AUDIENCES

There must be an outreach program that will stimulate the exchange of information, social interaction, and encourage the publication of articles, studies,

and policy papers on vital issues affecting Philippine affairs. This can be done through two principal modes of propagation: (1) Organized public fora (e.g., symposia, lectures, luncheons, dinners, conventions) and (2) Print publications and broadcast means (television, radio, Internet).

It has been suggested that the initial target audiences should not focus on the masses but those who make and influence events and the news. Ordinarily, this approach would make sense because it seeks to maximize potential result vis-à-vis the use of finite resources. According to sound management principles and rational analysis, this should be the best way to go. But, why has this method not worked? To understand the answer, we must go back again to the narrow circle of concern, the vested interests and unspoken motives, the attitudinal and intellectual biases that each group member carries. Scarcely will tentative discussions have started when, unwittingly, these built-in, deep-seated criteria will begin to work beneath the visible interaction process. Inputs are then analyzed in terms of the overriding interests of those who comprise the group, especially its most dominant members. Ranges of options are proposed, weighed, and discarded on the basis of these same filters. Strategies and action programs are defined, consistent with these values, but not necessarily those of other sectors.

The colorful history of the Philippines has repeatedly shown how well-meaning, but closed-circle, groups presumed to speak for the hearts and minds of the rest of Filipino society. They started off with lofty ideals, seeking the high ground of sustainable and meaningful reform, only to end up as another elite “convenor group” or “council of elders,” mouthing what they thought were the priorities and aspirations of the larger part of Filipino society. And yet, the social, economic, and political cancer is still there—robust and seemingly indestructible. This was Rizal’s prime focus in his satirical *Noli me tangere* and *El filibusterismo*. This is what Mabini cautioned about when he wrote the *La revolucion Filipina*: the stubborn persistence of group interests and the predictable behavior of those coming from the upper level of society to comport themselves and deal with change in a manner that will preserve their favored position.

This is precisely what happened during the Malolos Congress (1898), which drafted the first republican constitution. Majul stated that, at any given time, only 25 percent of its representatives were elected, while the rest were appointed, belonging to the ilustrado class.³⁰ Men such as Pedro Paterno (president), Benito Legarda (vice president), Gregorio Araneta (secretary), Felipe Buencamino, and T. H. Pardo de Tavera were all known, if not for their relative wealth, at least for their social prestige. The real issue behind the squabble for leadership focused only on one question:

would it be the ilustrados coming from the prominent and relatively well off segment of the Filipino population, or would it be the military commanders and their followers who originated from the peasantry. . . . ? That Mabini, an ilustrado, would have strong sympathies for the latter while all the time fearing and condemning some of their abuses only reflected that his origins were closer to those of the latter.³¹

Looking at the current political situation, it is not difficult to understand why nothing significant has happened within the Philippine “democracy” in terms of real social change. With very few exceptions, the “haves” think and behave principally to safeguard and advance their self-interests. Yet, they are the first to duck or fly away at the slightest hint of any instability. The “have-nots,” through decades of repeated disappointments, have developed a thick carapace of skepticism about the motives of those in power and a cool indifference toward issues that are not perceived as tied up with daily necessities. Besides, seldom have they been sought out or given an equal opportunity to express their most pressing concerns, their most urgent needs, their deepest longings, and their highest aspirations.

Like the poles of a battery, the “haves” and “have-nots” must connect before any current can flow. Reduced to simplest terms, the process of building a nation involves captivating the heart and the mind of a people. It needs to have the heart of all its people, for it is the collective heart that will give the passion, the faithful commitment, and the discipline needed to endure through arduous times. It needs the head, for it is the collective wisdom of exemplary leaders who will provide the guidance and light, the understanding of how and why we must pass this way, where we should head toward, and how to get there.

Having said this, it means that any attempt at social change must involve similarly minded and motivated representatives of certain key sectors in society. They include, among others:

1. Businessmen in top corporations and national economic/finance policy planners, the so-called “movers and shakers” of the country;
2. The religious clergy (i.e., Roman Catholic; Protestant; Iglesia ni Kristo; Muslim) and lay ministries, who collectively are the moral compass of the Filipino people;
3. The academe and the youth, who are the nation’s future leaders;
4. Selected personnel (as individual participants) of government agencies that have wide-ranging spheres of influence locally and externally;
5. Media executives and opinion-makers, who collectively shape and determine the contents of public consciousness, whether for good or ill; and
6. Selected military and police officials, including leaders of other armed groups who have the capability (whether historically or potentially) to affect political stability, and, more important, who have an equally valid stake in the determination of our country’s national interest and the well-being of Filipino citizens.

This is the only way we can hope to understand each other and work with each other. This is how we can start from a small thread of initial goodwill and ultimately weave it into a sturdy cable of verifiable commitment to national goals. This is how we can build, out of the flimsy planks of tentative openness to others, a politically mature Filipino nation.

NOTES

1. John J. Schumacher, S.J., *The Making of a Nation: Essays on Nineteenth-Century Filipino Nationalism* (Manila: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1991), 253–54.
2. Onofre D. Corpuz, *The Roots of the Filipino Nation*, 2 vols. (Manila: AKLAHI Foundation, Inc., 1989), 1:6.
3. *Ibid.*, 1:38–39.
4. William Henry Scott, *Looking for the Pre-Hispanic Filipino* (Manila: New Day Publishers, 1992), 84–103.
5. Corpuz, *Roots of the Filipino Nation*, 1:80–81.
6. Teodoro A. Agoncillo, *History of the Filipino People*, 8th ed. (Quezon City: Garotech Publishing, 1990), 81–85.
7. Corpuz, *Roots of the Filipino Nation*, 1:161–66.
8. *Ibid.*, 1:220.
9. Agoncillo, *History of the Filipino People*, 97.
10. Cesar Adib Majul, *Apolinario Mabini—Revolutionary* (Manila: National Historical Commission, 1970), 25.
11. Agoncillo, *History of the Filipino People*, 100.
12. Majul, *Apolinario Mabini*, 47.
13. Corpuz, *Roots of the Filipino Nation*, 2:203.
14. Majul, *Apolinario Mabini*, 53, quoting Mabini, “A mis compatriotas,” *La Revolución Filipina (con otros documentos de la época)*, 2 vols. (Manila: Bureau of Printing, Documentos de la Biblioteca Nacional, 1931), 1:105.
15. Majul, *Apolinario Mabini*, 56.
16. *Ibid.*, p. 60, quoting Mabini, “Ordenanzas de la Revolución,” *La Revolución Filipina*, 1:105.
17. Majul, *Apolinario Mabini*, 8–9.
18. Corpuz, *Roots of the Filipino Nation*, 2:347.
19. Agoncillo, *History of the Filipino People*, 194–95.
20. Corpuz, *Roots of the Filipino Nation*, 2:401.
21. Frank H. Golay, *Face of Empire: United States–Philippine Relations, 1898–1946* (Manila: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1997), 2–7.
22. Agoncillo, *History of the Filipino People*, 443–44.
23. Gabriel Kolko, *Confronting the Third World: United States Foreign Policy: 1945–1980* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1988), 25.
24. *Ibid.*, 186–87.
25. Diosdado Macapagal, “Thoughts,” *Manila Bulletin* (May 21, 1995): 12, 34.
26. H. W. Brands, *Bound to Empire: The United States and the Philippines* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), 291.
27. Stephen Rosskamm Shalom, *The United States and the Philippines: A Study of Neocolonialism* (Manila: New Day Publishers, 1986), vii.
28. Kolko, *Confronting the Third World*, 28.
29. Emerenciana Yuvienco Arcellana, *The Relevance of Recto Today: A Review of Philippine-American and Other Relations* (Quezon City: Office of Research Communication, University of the Philippines, 1996), 24.
30. Majul, *Apolinari Mabini*, 92.
31. *Ibid.*, 108.

REFERENCES

- Agoncillo, Teodoro A. *History of the Filipino People*. 8th ed. Quezon City: Garotech Publishing, 1990.
- Arcellana, Emerenciana Yuvienco. *The Relevance of Recto Today: A Review of Philippine-American and Other Relations*. Quezon City: Office of Research Communication, University of the Philippines, 1996.
- Brands, H. W. *Bound to Empire: The United States and the Philippines*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Corpuz, Onofre D. *The Roots of the Filipino Nation*. 2 Vols. Manila: AKLAHI Foundation, Inc., 1989.
- Golay, Frank H. *Face of Empire: United States–Philippine Relations, 1898–1946*. Manila: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1997.
- Karnow, Stanley. *In Our Image—America’s Empire in the Philippines*. New York: Random House, Inc., 1989.
- Kolko, Gabriel. *Confronting the Third World: United States Foreign Policy: 1945–1980*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1988.
- Mabini, Apolinario. “A mis compatriotas.” In *La Revolución Filipina*. Vol. 1. Manila: Bureau of Printing, Documentos de la Biblioteca Nacional, 1931.
- Mabini, Apolinario. “Ordenanzas de la Revolución.” In *La Revolución Filipina*. Vol. 1. Manila: Bureau of Printing, Documentos de la Biblioteca Nacional, 1931.
- Macapagal, Diosdado. “Thoughts.” *Manila Bulletin* (May 21, 1995).
- Majul, Cesar Adib. *Apolinario Mabini—Revolutionary*. Manila: National Historical Commission, 1970.
- Schumacher, John J.S.J. *The Making of a Nation: Essays on Nineteenth-Century Filipino Nationalism*. Manila: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1991.
- Scott, William Henry. *Looking for the Pre-Hispanic Filipino*. Manila: New Day Publishers, 1992.
- Shalom, Stephen Roskamm. *The United States and the Philippines: A Study of Neo-colonialism*. Manila: New Day Publishers, 1986.

Appendix 1: Annotated Chronology of Selected Events in Philippine-American Relations¹

Hazel M. McFerson

1898

- February 15 Explosion sinks the battleship USS *Maine* in Havana Harbor.
- April 21–25 U.S. Congress declares war with Spain; formal outbreak of the Spanish-American War, which Theodore Roosevelt, U.S. secretary of the Navy, called the “Splendid Little War.”
- May 1 Commodore George Dewey defeats Spanish fleet in Manila Bay.
- May 4 President McKinley decides to send 8,500 troops to the Philippines.
- May 19 General Emilio Aguinaldo, a 27-year-old Chinese mestizo and Katipun leader,² returns from exile on board the American naval vessel, the USS *McCulloch*, dispatched to Hong Kong; Aguinaldo was in exile from December 27, 1897 to April 1898.
- May 12 General Wesley Merritt appointed commander of U.S. Army occupation in Philippines.
- May 20 Aguinaldo organizes an army of Filipinos under American auspices, with arms supplied by Commodore Dewey, who urged Aguinaldo to rally the Filipino army against the Spanish. Aguinaldo issued a call to arms for a general uprising against Spain at the end of the month.
- Aguinaldo meets with U.S. Counsel Wildman, who agreed to act as the latter’s purchasing agent for arms to be used in the uprising, which is supported by the Americans.
- May 24 Aguinaldo proclaims the establishment of a provisional government, which he will administer “with the advice of distinguished persons

until the time when these Islands . . . under our complete control, may form a constitutional republican assembly and appoint a president and cabinet, into whose hands I shall then resign the command of the Islands.”

- June 12 Aguinaldo proclaims independence of the Philippines from Spain at Kawit, Cavite, with the encouragement of the United States, and established a provisional government—the Philippine Republic, under the first democratic constitution known in Asia. A proclamation, the “Act of the Declaration of Independence” is modeled on the American one, is signed by 98 persons, and is witnessed by L. M. Johnson, an American “Colonel of Artillery”; Commodore George Dewey declined to attend the ceremonies. Apolinario Mabini, a lawyer and political thinker, becomes Aguinaldo’s principal advisor. Mabini’s Constitutional *Program for the Philippine Republic* is published in July. The declaration proclaimed by Aguinaldo stated in part: “we proclaim and solemnly declare, in the name and by the authority of the inhabitants of all these Philippine Islands, that they are and have a right to be free and independent; that they are released from all obedience to the crown of Spain; that every political tie between the two is and must be completely severed and annulled.” American military commanders refuse to address Aguinaldo as president of the revolutionary government.
- June 23 General Aguinaldo issues a decree providing for: (1) reorganization of local governments that were already freed from Spanish control and (2) election of delegates from each province to constitute the Revolutionary Congress. The aims of the government are: the struggle for the independence of the Philippines until all nations, including the Spanish, shall expressly recognize it, and to prepare the country so that the true Republic may be established.” Aguinaldo addresses a letter to Admiral Dewey asking him to forward the decrees to Washington, D.C., and stating, “the desires of the [provisional] government are to remain . . . in friendship with [America].” Aguinaldo created a subcommittee on diplomacy to conduct diplomatic negotiations for the recognition of the independence of the Philippines.
- June 25 Arrival of General Wesley Merritt in Cavite to assume general overall command of the U.S. occupation forces in the Philippines.
- June 30 Arrival of the first American troops in Manila.
- August 13 Manila (Intramuros) is captured and occupied by American forces under command of General Wesley Merritt. Filipinos are prevented from participating in the battle of Manila, an event that they considered the major battle in their war for independence. Dewey and the Spanish authorities entered into a secret agreement for the surrender of the city on the condition that no Filipino forces were to enter Intramuros or the Walled City, which constituted the heart of Manila.

- August 18 Merritt receives instructions from Washington not to give in to Filipino demands for joint occupation of Manila and to make them recognize American authority and military occupation of the city.
- August 22 Merritt is replaced by Elwell S. Otis who became the first military governor of the Philippines.
- Establishment of first American School for Filipinos at Corregidor, Philippines, by American soldiers. An army lieutenant became the first superintendent of schools in Manila, August 1898.
- September 8 Otis declines to accept Aguinaldo's request for joint occupation; Otis warns that he would be "obliged to take action . . . within a very short space of time should you decline to comply with my government's demands."
- September 15 In accordance with the decrees of June 18 and 23 Malolos Congress convenes at the Basilica of Barasoain for the purpose of drawing up a constitution for the new republic. Pedro A. Paterno is elected head of the Congress. The Malolos Congress creates a Filipino Republic whose government is "popular, representative and responsible" with three distinct branches: the executive, the legislative, and the judicial. The new republic establishes schools, a military academy, and the Literary University of the Philippines. Government finances are organized and new currency is issued. The army and navy are established on a regular basis, having regional commands.
- Otis writes letter requesting that Aguinaldo withdraw his troops from Manila.
- October 1 Philippine U.S. consul Felipe Agoncillo meets with U.S. president William McKinley in Washington to plead for Philippine independence; President McKinley refused Agoncillo on the grounds that Spain would object and that the Philippines were not recognized by foreign powers.
- October 26 President McKinley gave instruction to the U.S. peace commissioners to demand annexation of the whole Philippine archipelago.³
- November 23 A commission is appointed and charged with "informing the civilized world . . . of the capacity of the Filipinos to govern themselves."
- November 29 Malolos Congress approves new Constitution for the new First Philippine Republic. The document is modeled on the constitutions of France, Belgium, and Latin American countries and is approved.
- December Publication begins of a series of books in the "Our New Possessions" mode to familiarize Americans with new territories acquired in the Spanish-American War, including the Philippines.⁴
- Anti-imperialist league is formed in Boston, Massachusetts, and claims 30,000 members; among them are reformers Jane Addams and

Carl Schurz, novelist Mark Twain and philosopher William James, labor leader Samuel Gompers and industrialist Andrew Carnegie. All oppose the colonial mission, believing it will prove ruinous to the pursuit of American ideals at home.

December 10 The Treaty of Paris is signed.⁵ Spain ceded the Philippines to the United States for \$20 million under Article III of the Treaty. Treaty is submitted to the U.S. Senate for ratification. *La Independencia* (Independence), a newspaper published in Manila by a revolutionary, General Antonio Luna, states “people are not to be bought and sold like horses and houses. If the aim has been to abolish the traffic in Negroes [in the United States] because it meant the sale of persons, why is there still maintained the sale of the countries with inhabitants?” (See appendix 2 for Treaty of Peace document.) The U.S. government agreed to protect the property rights of Catholic friars. For more than 300 years under Spain, the Roman Catholic Church had acquired about one-tenth of all improved land in the Philippines. The discontent of Filipino peasants over the land issue contributed to the Philippine Revolution of 1896–1897 against Spain.

December 21 President McKinley issues a proclamation to extend American sovereignty over the Philippines and calls for benevolent assimilation (see appendix 3).

Establishment of the Bureau of Insular Affairs in the War Department to administer American colonial policy.

1899

January 1 General Aguinaldo declared president of the new Philippine Republic; the United States refuses to recognize the new government.

January 4 The Benevolent Assimilation proclamation is published in the Philippines, prompting Aguinaldo to issue his own proclamation condemning “violent and aggressive seizure” by the United States and threatening war.

January 5 Aguinaldo urges Filipinos to declare independence from the United States.

January 8 General Elwell S. Otis, the military governor, begins negotiations with Aguinaldo’s emissaries to negotiate the Philippine compromise proposal for “independence with limitations.”

January 20 President McKinley appoints the first Philippine Commission (the Schurman Commission), a five-person group headed by Dr. Jacob Schurman, president of Cornell University, and including Admiral Dewey and General Otis, to investigate conditions in the islands and make recommendations. In the report that they issue to the president the following year, the commissioners acknowledge Filipino aspirations for independence; they declare, however, that Filipinos are not ready for it. The commission recommends the establishment of civil

government and the replacement of the military governor with a civilian governor, establishing a bicameral legislature, autonomous municipal and provincial government, and a system of free public schools.

- January 23 The Malolos constitution is promulgated, which establishes a new independent Philippine Republic. Malolos Congress ratifies the independence proclamation of June 12. The Constitution creates a Filipino state with a “popular, representative and responsible” government consisting of three branches: the executive, the legislative, and the judicial. Legislative powers were vested in the Assembly composed of elected delegates. Aguinaldo is elected president of the government by the constituent assembly.
- January 29 Cancellation of the seventh session of negotiations coincident with the arrival in Manila of the last of six regiments of the U.S. Army.
- February 4 American soldiers, under the command of Private Willie W. Grayson, fire upon and kill Filipino soldiers at the San Juan Bridge, thereby beginning the Philippine-American War for Independence.⁶ The following day, General Arthur MacArthur issued an order to advance against the Filipino troops. The war lasts for more than two years. The Americans commit 126,000 soldiers; the fatalities are 4,234 Americans and 16,000 Filipino soldiers. Famine and disease claim as many as 200,000 civilians by the end of the war.
- February 6 The U.S. Congress ratified the Treaty of Peace, with 57 voting “yes” and 27 voting “no” (see appendix 2). In return for Spain ceding to the United States the archipelago known as the Philippine Islands, the United States paid Spain the sum of \$20 million within three months after the exchange of the ratifications of the treaty. The United States paid Spain \$100,000 for the cession of the Islands of Cagayan de Sulu and Sibutu and their dependencies. Article IX of the Treaty of Paris provides that Congress would determine the civil rights and political status of the native inhabitants of the territories ceded to the United States.
- February 12 Publication of English poet Rudyard Kipling’s “White Man’s Burden,” *McClure’s Magazine*, described Filipinos as “your new-caught sullen peoples, half devil and half child.”
- February 14 U.S. Congress adopted a Joint Resolution that denies U.S. citizenship to Filipinos: “That the ratification of the treaty of peace with Spain is not intended to incorporate the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands into citizenship of the United States, nor is it intended to permanently annex said islands as an integral part of the territory of the United States.”
- March 4 Arrival of the First Philippine Commission to the Philippines (the Schurman Commission), which remains in the Philippines for six months.

- March 19 The Queen Regent of Spain ratifies the Treaty of Paris.
- March 21 First meeting of the Schurman Commission, which is authorized to prepare a preliminary draft of a proclamation to the people of the Philippines.
- April 4 A proclamation establishes “The supremacy of the United States must and will be enforced throughout every part of the Archipelago, and those who resist it can accomplish no end other than their own ruin.” The Commission enacts Act No. 74, which mandated English as the medium of instruction and provided for the training of Filipino teachers and the opening of a normal school in Manila. Twenty-five thousand copies of the proclamation are disseminated in English, Spanish, Tagalog and several other Philippine languages.
- April 11 Exchange of treaty ratifications in Washington by both Spain and the United States thereby officially ending the Spanish-American War.
- April 15 Filipino resistance leaders under the leadership of Apolinario Mabini issues a manifesto urging Filipinos to continue their struggle for independence, which stated in part: “And since war is the last resource that is left to us for the salvation of our country and our national honor, let us fight while a grain of strength is left us; let us acquit ourselves like men, even though the lot of the present generation is conflict and sacrifice. It matters not whether we die in the midst or at the end of our most painful day’s work; the generation to come, praying over our tombs, will shed for us tears of life and gratitude, and not of bitter reproach.”
- May 2 Secretary of State John Hay cabled the Schurman Commission, its commissioners, who were then in Manila, to offer autonomy to the Filipinos under the sovereignty of the United States.
- May 7 Aguinaldo formed a new cabinet replacing Pedro Paterno with Apolinario Mabini as cabinet president.
- May 12 Secretary of State John Hay proposes a plan for a colonial government consisting of a governor-general, a cabinet appointed by the president, and a general advisory council elected by the people whose electoral qualifications would be “carefully considered and determined.”
- May 20 Admiral Dewey left Manila aboard the USS *Olympia* for the United States.
- May 29 The Philippine court system is reestablished. Cayetano Arellano is appointed the Chief Justice; all Spanish systems not conflicting with U.S. sovereignty are revived. Spanish is made the official language of the courts.
- July 3 Opening of public schools with American, Spanish, and Filipino teachers.

August 20 The “Bates Agreement” is signed between General John C. Bates, representing the United States, and the sultan of Sulu, Jamal-ul Kiram II, pledging a policy of noninterference on the part of the United States (in 1903, a Moro province is established, however, by the Americans). Under the agreement slavery is outlawed, schools teaching a non-Muslim curriculum are established, local governments challenging the authority of traditional community leaders are organized, and a new legal system replaces *sharia* or Islamic law.

1900

January 31 The *Report of the Philippine Commission to the President* of the First Philippine (Schurman) Commission is issued recommending the end to military government, the establishment of a civil government, and a system of public education.

March 6 The Second Philippine Commission (the Taft Commission) is appointed by President McKinley and headed by William Howard Taft. The commission is granted legislative as well as limited executive powers. Between September 1900 and August 1902 it passes 449 laws. A judicial system is established, including a Supreme Court, and a legal code is drawn up to replace antiquated Spanish ordinances. A civil service is organized. The 1901 municipal code provides for popularly elected presidents, vice presidents, and councilors to serve on municipal boards. The municipal board members are responsible for collecting taxes, maintaining municipal properties, and undertaking necessary construction projects; they also elect provincial governors.

May 2 Arthur MacArthur replaced General Otis as military governor of the Philippines.

June 3 Second Philippine Commission, headed by Judge William H. Taft arrives. Its purpose is to organize a civilian government to administer the Philippines, as laid out in McKinley’s policy: “In all forms of government and administrative provisions which they are authorized to prescribe, the commission should bear in mind that the government which they are establishing is designed not for our selfish satisfaction, or for the expression of our theoretical views, but for the happiness, peace, and prosperity of the people of the Philippine Islands, and the measures adopted should be made to conform to their customs, their habits, and even their prejudices, to the fullest extent consistent with the accomplishment of the indispensable requisites of just and effective government. At the same time, the commission should bear in mind, and the people of the Islands should be made plainly to understand, that there are certain great principles of government which have been made the basis of our governmental system, which we deem essential to the rule of law and the maintenance of individual freedom.”

June 21 General Arthur MacArthur, the U.S. military governor of the Phil-

ippines, offers amnesty to the Filipino nationalists to bring an end to the rebellion that began in opposition to Spanish rule. The amnesty will grant full pardon to all Filipinos taking part in the rebellion, on the condition that they take an oath of allegiance and acknowledge the sovereignty of the American government.

- July 19 Department of State memorandum denies the American citizenship of Filipino seamen, ruling that “a man may be a citizen in one sense of the word, or from certain points of view, or for certain purposes, yet not in every sense nor for all purposes.”⁷
- September 1 The Taft Commission becomes a colonial legislative body with authority to raise taxes, appropriate funds, fix tariffs, and set up law courts.
- September 1900 to July 1901 Implementation of “pragmatic materialism,” which included the passage of more than 150 laws dealing with the establishment of the civil service, the organization of the bureaus of education, forestry, treasury, audits, and others, the improvement of the port of “Manila,” the establishment of provincial and municipal governments, taxation, and the administration of justice. Also, major improvements in public health and education; progress in agricultural and industrial development, however, was limited. See discussion of land policy below (appendix 5).
- December 23 The most important step in establishing a new political system under American sovereignty is the “policy of attraction,” which depends on the collaboration of the Filipino elite. The Federalista Party is formed by Trinidad H. Pardo de Tavera, a descendant of Spanish nobility, and Benito Legarda, a rich landowner and capitalist. Both had quit Aguinaldo’s government in 1898. The party recognizes American sovereignty. The party advocated statehood for the Philippines and the spread of the English language “so that by this medium the American spirit may be infused, its principles, political usages, and grand civilization adopted, and the redemption of the Filipino people be radical and complete.”⁸ In 1901 de Tavera and Legarda are appointed the first Filipino members of the Philippine Commission of the legislature, which gave them input into the appointment of provincial governors, members of the Supreme Court, and top civil servants.
- 1900–1904** The *Insular Cases* in which the U.S. Supreme Court held that the Philippines was a part of the United States for some purposes but not for others, and that Filipinos were nationals but not citizens of the United States. As nationals, Filipinos did not enjoy automatically all the rights or assume all the duties of citizens.⁹ These cases consisted of a group of fourteen decisions that involved the application of the Constitution and Bill of Rights to overseas territories. The cases arose after the United States acquired island territories from Spain. The *Insular Cases* presented three questions of constitutional

law and statutory construction: (1) whether the national government had the power to acquire territories by treaty; (2) whether certain statutes applied to territories; and (3) whether the Bill of Rights applied automatically to any territory upon acquisition by the United States. In *De Lima v. Bidwell* (1901) the Court confirmed that the nation had the power to acquire territory, pointing for support to the long history of acquisitions. In *Dorr v. United States* (1904), Justice William R. Day noted that the natives of the Philippines were not fit for jury trials and that Congress need not accord them that right until it chose to incorporate the islands.¹⁰

1901

- January 7 Apolinario Mabini is exiled to Guam.
- January 14 Presentation of a petition calling for independence is signed by 2,000 middle-class Manila residents and presented to the U.S. Senate. Among the Americans opposing U.S. annexation of the Philippines are Mark Twain and industrialist Andrew Carnegie.
- January 21 The Philippine Commission passes a law creating the Department of Public Instruction, laying the basis for a primary school system.
- March 2 An amendment by Senator John C. Spooner of Wisconsin, to the U.S. army appropriation bill authorized the president of the United States to establish a civil government of the Philippines, thereby replacing military administration and ending the prerogative of the president of the United States to administer the Philippines by virtue of his war powers.
- March 23 Aguinaldo captured by Colonel (later General) Frederick Funston aided by a force of Philippine scouts loyal to the United States. Capture causes speculation that he would be put on display in the Philippine Village at the Pan-American Exposition.¹¹ After three weeks as a prisoner, he took an oath of allegiance to the United States on April 11, 1901, and issued a proclamation urging the surrender of all Filipino forces.¹² He died on February 6, 1964, having lived to see the Philippines become independent in 1947.
- May 27 The U.S. Supreme Court decision in the *Insular Cases* rules that the former Spanish possessions are neither foreign countries nor integral parts of the United States; their inhabitants are American nationals but not American citizens; tariffs may be imposed on goods exported to the United States; their form of government will be whatever Congress decides. A dissenting justice noted that the ruling put Puerto Rico and the Philippines “in an indeterminate state of ambiguous existence for an indefinite period.” As of May 23, the Federalist Party membership is estimated at 200,000.
- July 1 The Philippine Constabulary is organized as an archipelago-wide police force.

- July 4 MacArthur transfers his responsibility as governor to William Howard Taft, who is inaugurated as the first civil governor of the Philippines. This brings to an end military rule on most of the islands. Taft, who served as president of the U.S. Philippine Commission this year, indicates that he favors independence for the Filipinos, whom he calls his “little brown brothers.”
- July 18 Passing of Philippine Commission Act No. 175 providing for an “armed, equipped and disciplined force” of 150 men per province under supervision of American officers.
- July 21 The USS *Thomas* carrying the first group of American teachers, the Thomasites, arrives in the Philippines.
- September 1 Upon his recommendation, Pardo de Tavera,¹³ and two other Filipinos (Benito Legarda and Jose Ruiz De Luzuriaga) are appointed “the native members of the United States Philippine Commission” by Governor Taft. This is the sole legislative body permitted until the inauguration of the Philippine Assembly on October 16, 1907.
- November The Sedition/Treason Law passed by the U.S. Philippine Commission discourages the organization of all political parties advocating independence.
- December Creation of the Board of Public Health.
- December 27 Senator John Tyler Morgan (D-Alabama), suggested in a letter to Secretary of War Elihu Root, the possibility of inducing Negro veterans to settle in paramilitary colonies in the Philippines as a prelude to U.S. government-sponsored immigration of American Negroes to the islands.¹⁴
- 1902**
- February 22 Fist fight in the U.S. Senate; Senator Benjamin Tillman suffers a bloody nose for accusing Senator John McLaurin of bias on Philippine tariff issue.
- May 4 United States launches attack against Sultan Bayan, principle leader of Moro revolt in Mindanao.
- July 1 The U.S. Congress passes the Philippine Organic Act (aka Cooper Bill) for colonial administration of the Philippines. The Philippine bill of 1902, authored by the House Committee on Insular Affairs chair Congressman Henry Allen Cooper becomes the first Organic Act. Congressional passage of the Cooper Bill/First Organic Act is: “An Act temporarily to provide for the administration of the affairs of civil government in the Philippine Islands,” which remains in force until the passage of the Jones Law in 1916. The act provides for a popular assembly with the establishment of a lower house, the Philippine Assembly, which is elected popularly, and an upper house

consisting of the Philippine Commission, which is to be appointed by the president of the United States. The two houses share legislative powers, although the upper house passes laws relating to the Moros and other non-Christian peoples. The act also extends the U.S. Bill of Rights to Filipinos and sends two nonvoting Filipino resident commissioners to Washington to attend sessions of the U.S. Congress. The Organic Act disestablishes the Catholic Church as the state religion.

July 4 Peace Proclamation and Amnesty Grant issued by President Theodore Roosevelt officially closing the Philippine “Insurrection.” United States Army officially “pacified” the Philippines.

War officially ends. The three-and-a-half year Filipino-American War cost the United States 7,000 combat dead and wounded, a cash payment of \$170 million (variously cited as high as \$600 million), and a billion dollars in soldiers’ pensions. It is estimated that about 20,000 Filipino soldiers died. The civilian dead was close to a quarter of a million from disease, pestilence, and brutality.¹⁵

Passage of the Philippine Organic Act confirmed the acts of the president as Commander-in-Chief of the armed forces in providing for the government of the Philippines, and gave the existing Philippine Commission permanence and legitimacy. The Organic Act also confirmed the commission’s organizations and functions and conferred upon it the status of a civil government.

August 1 The Vatican agrees to U.S. demands to remove Spanish friars from the Philippines. Philippine Government Act establishes Filipinos as citizens of their own country, and not as citizens of the United States.

September 8 The Philippine Commission falsely certifies to the U.S. president that the “insurrection” has ceased except in Muslim territory and that complete peace prevails in the rest of the colony. Many areas of Filipino resistance to American rule remains and is carried out by the “New Katipunan” initially in Rizal and Bulacan and later operating in the towns of Taytay, Antipolo, Cainta, and Montalban, Caloocan, and Marikina.

November 12 The Brigandage Act, passed by the Philippine Commission labels former guerrillas and resistance fighters as bandits, *tulisanes* (highway men), and *ladrones*. (thieves).

1903–1914 *Pensionado* Program sends Filipino government scholars to study in the United States.

1903

July 3 Passage of the Reconcentration Act by the Taft Commission. The law allows the provincial governor to move into reconcentration zones all

residents of outlying villages suspected of aiding the *ladrones* or *brigands*.

December Governor Taft negotiates an agreement with the Vatican to purchase 410 million acres of land for a sum of \$7 million. The land was to be sold to tenant farmers on an installment basis. At the end of the century, the land issue in the Philippines is such that 75 percent of farmers who till the land do not own the land, while 20 percent of the rural population controls 80 percent of the total arable land. A landed elite owns the majority of rural land.¹⁶

1904

March 21 “Bates Treaty” is abrogated.

December 16 American troops suffer heavy losses to Filipinos at Samar, Philippines.

1905

May 14 Moros attack U.S. troops; 7 Americans and 300 Filipinos are killed.

1906 Passing of Philippine Commission Act No. 1123 making English the official language of the Philippines.

March 9 Fifteen Americans and 600 Moros are killed in two days of fighting.

1907 An elective legislative body, the Philippine Assembly, is established, the first in Southeast Asia.

March The Nationalista Party established under the leadership of Manuel Quezon and Sergio Osmeña. The party calls for “immediate independence.”

July 30 First elections for the Philippine Assembly are held. The Nationalista Party wins a resounding victory.

October 16 Inaugural Session of the Philippine Assembly attended by Secretary of War William Howard Taft, under the administration of President Theodore Roosevelt. Taft declares to Philippine Assembly that independence must wait.

The elections of 1907 established the predominance of the proindependence Nacionalista Party, whose two political leaders are Sergio Osmeña and Manuel Quezon.

1908

June 18 The University of the Philippines is established.

1909 The Payne-Aldrich Act of 1909 provides free trade between the Philippines and the United States, severely retarding industrial growth in the islands. Sugar plantation and mill owners profited greatly from their access to the protected U.S. market, thus reinforcing the economic base of the landed aristocracy.

1910

May 14 Manuel L. Quezon, majority floor leader, Philippine Assembly, delivers his first speech to the U.S. Congress in Washington, D.C.

1913

Passage of the Underwood Tariff Act removes restrictions imposed by the Payne Aldrich Tariff Act. The principal result of both acts was to make the Philippines increasingly dependent on American markets; between 1914 and 1920, the portion of Philippine exports going to the United States rises from 50 to 70 percent. By 1939 it reaches 85 percent and 65 percent of imports come from the United States.

Muslim affairs were integrated into the central government under the Department of Interior through the Bureau of Non-Christian Tribes.

October 16 President Woodrow Wilson sends Francis Burton Harrison as governor-general of the Philippines. Harrison, a firm believer in the Filipino capacity for self-government, begins a program of Filipinization of the civil service, which results in the reduction of Americans occupying government positions from 2,623 to 614.

1914

Pensionado program ends.

1916

February 2 U.S. Senate votes independence for the Philippines, to become effective in 1921. The measure fails in the House.

August 29 U.S. Congress passes a second organic act, the Jones Act, which replaces the 1902 law, and brings “Filipinization” of the legislature. The preamble states the intention of the United States to grant Philippine independence “as soon as a stable government” is established. The Philippine Senate replaces the Philippine Commission as the upper house of the legislature; the newly named House of Representatives are popularly elected. The legislature’s actions are subject to the governor’s veto. The executive remains under the control of an appointed governor-general and the U.S. president appoints most of the white Philippine Supreme Court justices. The extension of voting rights is given to males who are at least 23 years of age, literate in either Spanish or English, own property valued at at least \$250 or pay an annual tax of \$15.

1919

November Beginning of a series of independence missions to Washington for the purpose of “discussing . . . the independence question.”¹⁷ The president of the Senate, Manuel L. Quezon, headed the commission.

1924

The Fairfield Bill, providing for independence in twenty years, failed to pass.

- 1930** Start of peasant rebellions, such as the Sakdals in central Luzon.
- 1933** Founding of the Sakdalistas, by Benigno Ramos, a former Nacionalista Party member. The Sakdal Party (Sakdal means to accuse) ran candidates in the 1934 election on a platform of complete independence by the end of 1935, redistribution of land, and an end to *caciquism*. The party won a number of seats in the legislature as well as posts in the provinces, and by early 1935, the membership was estimated at 200,000 members.
- January 17 The Philippine independence bill (Hare-Hawes-Cutting) becomes law after the U.S. Senate votes 66 to 26 to override President Herbert Hoover's veto. The bill calls for conditional independence in ten years, but offers the Filipinos two chances to nullify it. The bill becomes operative when ratified by the island legislature and irrevocable when a popular vote ratifies a constitution for the new island government. The bill sets quotas for Filipino immigration to the United States, stops free entry of island imports into the United States, sets tariff rates on imported sugar, and permits the United States to maintain island military bases. Manuel Quezon, president of the Philippine Senate, denounces the act as "shameful and unfriendly" and "not an independence bill at all," describing it as a tariff and immigration bill aimed at Philippine products and labor with "the element of independence being merely a sugar coating."
- May 2–3 The Sakdal Party takes up arms and seizes government buildings in a number of locations. The insurrection was suppressed by the Philippine Constabulary, resulting in approximately 100 deaths and Benigno Ramos's flight into exile in Japan.
- 1934** American sugar beet, tobacco, and dairy farmers fear the competition of low-tariff insular products from the Philippines and seek protection through ending the colonial relationship. Congress passes a new Philippine Independence bill, the Tydings-McDuffie Act, worked out with Quezon's advice, calling for independence by 1946. The bill sets graduated duties on island imports and does not grant the United States absolute rights to military bases. The bill is a slightly revised version of the Hare-Hawes-Cutting Act of 1933, which was passed by the U.S. Congress over President Herbert Hoover's veto, but was rejected by a plebiscite of Filipino voters. The Tydings-McDuffie Act provides for a ten-year transition period from American colonial rule to complete independence on July 4, 1946. During the transition Filipinos write a constitution and assume numerous self-governing functions, while the United States retains responsibility for defense and foreign affairs. The bill maintains quotas of 50 per year on Filipino immigration to the United States.
- 1935** Over 1 million (1,204,485) Filipino children are enrolled in 7,680 primary schools staffed by 27,120 teachers. Ninety-five thousand stu-

dents were enrolled in private educational institutions. New legislation, replacing the Jones Act, is passed by the U.S. Congress in 1934 and becomes effective in 1935, establishing the Commonwealth of the Philippines. Although the Jones Act did not transfer responsibility for the Moro regions (reorganized in 1914 under the Department of Mindanao and Sulu) from the American governor to the Filipino-controlled legislature, Muslims fear that Christians will dominate an independent Philippines. American policy from 1903 had been to break down the historical autonomy of the Muslim territories. Immigration of Christian settlers from Luzon and the Visayan Islands to the relatively unsettled regions of Mindanao was encouraged, and large numbers of migrants arrived. There was no legal recognition of Muslim customs and institutions. In March 1935, Muslim *datu* petition President Franklin D. Roosevelt, asking that “the American people should not release us until we are educated and become powerful because we are like a calf who, once abandoned by its mother, would be devoured by a merciless lion.”¹⁸ Upon accession to commonwealth status, Christian Filipinos gained virtually complete control over government institutions in Mindanao.

- September 17 Manuel Quezon wins presidency in first elections under Philippine constitution.
- September 18 General Douglas MacArthur named to supervise organization of Filipino army.
- November 15 Inauguration of the commonwealth with Quezon elected president and Osmeña as vice president.
- 1938** Vote is extended to Filipino women.
- 1939** The American community in Manila numbered less than 9,000, very few of who intermarried with Filipinos.
- The Bureau of Insular Affairs in the War Department is abolished and succeeded by the Division of Territories and Island Possessions in the Department of Interior of the U.S. federal government, which administers colonial policy for American overseas territories. A Philippine Section in the Division of Territories and Island Possessions is established.
- 1941**
- December 8 Japan launches a surprise attack on the Philippines ten hours after the attack on Pearl Harbor. The defending Philippine and American troops are under the command of General Douglas MacArthur.
- 1942** Hukbalahap (Huks) or the People’s Anti-Japanese Army is founded under the leadership of Luis Taruc, a Communist Party member since 1939, early in the year.
- January 2 The Japanese occupy Manila.

April	The surrender of United States–Philippine forces on the Bataan Peninsula. Eighty thousand prisoners of war captured by the Japanese at Bataan are forced to undertake the infamous “Death March” to a prison camp 105 kilometers to the north. It is estimated that as many as 10,000 men, weakened by disease and malnutrition and harsh treatment, die before reaching their destination.
May	The surrender of United States–Philippine forces on Corregidor. Quezon and Osmeña accompany the troops and later leave for the United States, where they set up a government-in-exile. The Japanese military authorities organize a Council of State through which they direct civil affairs until October 1943.
October	The Japanese declare the Philippines an independent republic.
1944	
August 1	Manuel Quezon, president of the commonwealth, dies.
October 20	Landing of MacArthur’s Allied Forces, accompanied by Osmeña, who succeeded to the Commonwealth presidency upon the death of Quezon.
1946	
July 4	The Commonwealth ends, and the independent Republic of the Philippines is established.

NOTES

1. The sources for the time line are: William L. Langer, *An Encyclopedia of World History*, 5th ed. (1940; Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1972); Alejandro M. Fernandez, *The Philippines and the United States: The Forging of New Relations* (Quezon City: NSDB-UP Integrated Research Program, 1977); Teodoro A. Agoncillo, *A Short History of the Philippines* (New York: Mentor Books, 1969); Bonifacio S. Salamanca, *The Filipino Reaction to American Rule 1901–1913*, (Quezon City: New Day Publishers, 1984; reprint Quezon City: The Shoe String Press, Inc., 1986) Websites include <www.phil-am-war.org/chrono.htm>; <www.bondocksnet.com/centennial/uscolony.html>; <www.geocities.com/Athens/Crete/9782/events.htm>.

2. A secret society established in 1892 by Andres Bonifacio in Tondo, opposing Spanish rule and seeking independence from Spain through revolution. Aguinaldo and Bonifacio come into conflict and the former gained control of the society; Bonifacio is arrested for treason and executed in 1896. The official name of the Katipunan is “*Kataastaasang Kagalangalangang Katipunan ng mga anak ng Bayan*” (KKK), which translates into “Highest and Most Respectable Association of the Sons of the People. Fernandez, *The Philippines and the United States*, p. 20.

3. An excellent video depicting the role of race in American imperialism and related attitudes toward Filipinos is VHS video, *Savage Acts: Wars, Fairs and Empire* (New York: *American Social History Project*, 1995), 30 minutes, Jim Zwick for H-Am Study, \$75.00. For a review of the film see “Savage Acts: Wars, Fairs and Empire” November 7, 1995, <www.boondocksnet.com/expos/wfe/savacts.html>. Also see Benito

M. Vergara Jr., *Displaying Filipinos: Photography and Colonialism in Early 20th Century Philippines* (Diliman: University of the Philippines Press, 1995). Also see *A World on Display*, written, directed, and produced by Eric Breitbart and Manny Lance, New Deal Films, Inc., VHS video, 1996; and *Bontoc Eulogy*, produced, written, directed, and narrated by Marlon Fuentes, a Filipino, VHS video, 1995. Two video documentaries released by the Cinema Guild, present contrasting views of the 1904 St. Louis World's Fair. For a review of these videos see Jim Zwick, "Remembering St. Louis, 1904: A World on Display and Bontoc Eulogy," <www.bonocksnet.com/expos/wfe_bontoc.html>.

4. Also see *Our Islands And Their People As Seen With Camera and Pencil*. 2 vols. Introduced by Major-General Joseph Wheeler, United States Army, With Special Descriptive Matter and Narratives by Jose De Olivares (New York: N. D. Thompson Publishing Co., 1899). A recent and more accurate depiction is *The World of 1896* (Makati City: Bookmark, 1998).

5. The treaty ceded the Philippines, Guam, and Puerto Rico to the United States (Cuba was granted its independence); in return the United States agreed to pay Spain the sum of U.S. \$20 million. The nature of the payment is difficult to define; it was paid neither to purchase Spanish territories nor as a war indemnity. Historian Leonard Wolff describes it as: "a gift. Spain accepted it. Quite irrelevantly she handed us the Philippines. No question of honor or conquest was involved. The Filipino people had nothing to say about it, although their rebellion was thrown in (so to speak) free of charge." Cf. Wolff, *Little Brown Brothers* (New York: Doubleday and Co., 1961). Also see U.S. Department of the Army, *Army Area Handbooks*, Chapter 1.05 Spanish-American War and Philippine Resistance, 1993. <www.gopher.umsl.edu/00/library/govdocs/armyahbs/aahb0247>.

6. The encounter is described: "[Grayson] yelled 'Halt.'" The [Filipino soldier] moved, I challenged with another "Halt!" Then he immediately shouted "Halto" to me. Well, I thought the best thing to do was to shoot him. He dropped. Then two Filipinos sprang out of the gateway about fifteen feet from us. I called "Halt!" and Miller fired and dropped one. I saw that another was left. Well, I think I got my second Filipino that time. We retreated to where six other fellows were and I said, 'Line up, fellows; the niggers are in here all through these yards.' Cf. Teodoro A. Agoncillo, *A Short History of the Philippines* (New York: Mentor Books, 1969), p. 136, whose version omits the last sentence, which is presented in "Events of the War: February 4, 1899" <www.geocities.com/Athens/Crete/9782/events.htm>. It is not certain that the Filipino soldiers understood English. Filipino soldiers were constantly referred to in derogatory racist terms. On February 4, 1899, following a battle with the 1st Nebraska regiment, it was reported that "Hundreds of Filipinos were killed trying to swim across the Pasig River to safety—as one American soldier explained, 'picking off niggers in the water' was 'more fun than a turkey shoot.'" "Events of the War: February 4, 1899."

7. In 1899 and 1900 Filipino seamen serving on board British merchant vessels asked for their discharge upon arrival in Boston, claiming to be U.S. citizens. The British consul general refused to sanction their discharge. In *De Lima v. Bidwell* the Court held that the cession of Puerto Rico and the Philippines "definitely transferred the allegiance of the native inhabitants from Spain to the United States." It also held that for purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws of the United States, Filipinos were not aliens but American nationals. On July 1, 1902, Congress formalized the right of Filipinos to American diplomatic protection when "abroad."

8. Teodoro A. Agoncillo writes "Pardo de Tavera may have been naïve in proposing

that the Philippines be Americanized—an idea which the Americans themselves, from Taft to the obese American policeman on a street corner, laughed off as a well-intentioned joke—but he was at least sincere in his protestations of ‘oneness’ with the Americans, for, in the first place, he had light skin and a high, thin nose on which a pince-nez sat delicately; in the second place, he had learning which no American could dismiss with contempt and as such he could qualify for American citizenship. And finally, he was wealthy enough to measure up to an American standard of living. He had, it is true, some Filipino friends, but he was contemptuous of Filipinos as a people” (Agoncillo, *Short History of the Philippines*, p. 35). He and his family had received a title of nobility from the Spanish colonials before the arrival of the Americans.

9. In other cases, the Court ruled that as regards the Constitution and the tariff acts of the United States, the Philippines was a foreign country, and that the Treaty of Paris did not change that status—or make the inhabitants of the Philippines citizens of the United States (see appendix 2). The U.S. Congress granted full citizenship to all Puerto Ricans in 1917, to Virgin Islanders in 1927, and to Guamanians in 1950. For a discussion of the relationship between U.S. citizenship of territorial inhabitants and the political status of the territories, see Hazel M. McFerson, *The Racial Dimension of American Overseas Colonial Policy* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Publishing Group, 1997), chapter 4.

10. Cf. James E. Kerr, *The Insular Cases: The Role of the Judiciary in American Expansionism* (Port Washington, N.Y.: Kennikat Press, 1982).

11. See Charles L. Bartholomew, “Carrying Water for the Elephant,” *Minneapolis Journal*, reprinted in *American Monthly Review* (June 1901) and <<http://www.boondocksnet.com/gallery/panama02.html>>.

12. The date of the oath of allegiance to the United States is variously reported from April 11 to April 19 in different sources.

13. Writing in *The North American Review*, “Letter from Pardo de Tavera,” the author expressed his views thusly: “We supporters of the Federal Party aspire to see the Filipinos constitute themselves some day into a State like those which form the Union. Until we are in a condition to obtain this final desire, we hope that, gradually and in accordance with the capacity and situation of our people, the government of the Philippines may go on acquiring a state of autonomy more and more nearly complete, approaching the definite form of its final development. If we not had so prolonged a war, there is no doubt that it would have been necessary to organize a government like that, which has been given to Porto Rico and to Hawaii. We understand that the war has created for us a different situation.” (“Aguinaldo’s Case Against the United States,” *North American Review* 169, no. 514 [September 1899]: 425–26.)

14. Morgan to Elihu Root, December 27, 1901 and January 5, 1902, Elihu Root Papers, The Library of Congress; also see Joseph O. Baylen and John Hammond Moore, “Senator John Tyler Morgan and Negro Colonization in the Philippines, 1901 to 1902,” *Phylon* (June 1982).

15. Cf. congressional hearings on American brutality to Filipinos during the war; also see Stanley Karnow, *In Our Image: America’s Empire in the Philippines* (New York: Random House, 1989); Stuart C. Miller, “Our My Lai of 1900: Americans in the Philippines Insurrection,” *Transaction* 7, no. 19 (1970); Luzviminda Francisco, “The First Vietnam: The U.S. Philippine War of 1899,” *Bulletin of Concerned Asian Scholars* 5 (1993).

16. See for a report on the purchase of Vatican land, John Freeman, “Friarland Pur-

chased by the U.S. from Vatican,” *Philippine Islands*, <www.phil-am-war.org/annexation.htm>; also see, Senate Document No. 112, 56th Congress (December 4, 1899–March 3, 1901), 2nd Session; and Senate Document No. 331, Part I, 57th Congress (December 2, 1901–March 3, 1903), 1st Session (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1903). Also see for the current land tenure situation, Jimmy R. Escano, “Land Tilting and Tenure: The Philippines Experience” <www.fao.org/DOCREP/x0269e/x0269e03.htm>.

17. For a comprehensive discussion of the goals of the Mission, see Honesto A. Villanueva, “The Independence Mission 1919: Independence Lies Ahead,” *Asian Studies* 9, no. 3 (December 1971).

18. Theodore Friend, *Between Two Empires: The Ordeal of Philippines, 1929–1946* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1965); Joseph R. Hayden, *The Philippines: A Study in National Development* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1945).

Appendix 2: Treaty of Peace Between the United States and Spain, December 10, 1898

The United States of America and Her Majesty the Queen Regent of Spain, in the name of her august son Don Alfonso XIII, desiring to end the state of war now existing between the two countries, have for that purpose appointed as plenipotentiaries:

The President of the United States,

William R. Day, Cushman K. Davis, William P. Frye, George Gray, and Whitelaw Reid, citizens of the United States;

And Her Majesty the Queen Regent of Spain,

Don Eugenio Montero Rios, president of the senate, Don Buenaventura de Abarzuza, senator of the Kingdom and ex-minister of the Crown; Don Jose de Garnica, deputy of the Cortes and associate justice of the supreme court; Don Wenceslao Ramirez de Villa-Urrutia, envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary at Brussels, and Don Rafael Cerero, general of division;

Who, having assembled in Paris, and having exchanged their full powers, which were found to be in due and proper form, have, after discussion of the matters before them, agreed upon the following articles:

Article I.

Spain relinquishes all claim of sovereignty over and title to Cuba.

And as the island is, upon its evacuation by Spain, to be occupied by the United States, the United States will, so long as such occupation shall last, assume and discharge the obligations that may under international law result from the fact of its occupation, for the protection of life and property.

Article II.

Spain cedes to the United States the island of Porto Rico and other islands now under Spanish sovereignty in the West Indies, and the island of Guam in the Marianas or Ladrones.

Article III.

Spain cedes to the United States the archipelago known as the Philippine Islands, and comprehending the islands lying within the following line:

A line running from west to east along or near the twentieth parallel of north latitude, and through the middle of the navigable channel of Bachi, from the one hundred and eighteenth (118th) to the one hundred and twenty-seventh (127th) degree meridian of longitude east of Greenwich, thence along the one hundred and twenty seventh (127th) degree meridian of longitude east of Greenwich to the parallel of four degrees and forty five minutes ($4^{\circ} 45'$) north latitude, thence along the parallel of four degrees and forty five minutes ($4^{\circ} 45'$) north latitude to its intersection with the meridian of longitude one hundred and nineteen degrees and thirty five minutes ($119^{\circ} 35'$) east of Greenwich, thence along the meridian of longitude one hundred and nineteen degrees and thirty five minutes ($119^{\circ} 35'$) east of Greenwich to the parallel of latitude seven degrees and forty minutes ($7^{\circ} 40'$) north, thence along the parallel of latitude of seven degrees and forty minutes ($7^{\circ} 40'$) north to its intersection with the one hundred and sixteenth (116th) degree meridian of longitude east of Greenwich, thence by a direct line to the intersection of the tenth (10th) degree parallel of north latitude with the one hundred and eighteenth (118th) degree meridian of longitude east of Greenwich, and thence along the one hundred and eighteenth (118th) degree meridian of longitude east of Greenwich to the point of beginning.

The United States will pay to Spain the sum of twenty million dollars (\$20,000,000) within three months after the exchange of the ratifications of the present treaty.

Article IV.

The United States will, for the term of ten years from the date of the exchange of the ratifications of the present treaty, admit Spanish ships and merchandise to the ports of the Philippine Islands on the same terms as ships and merchandise of the United States.

Article V.

The United States will, upon the signature of the present treaty, send back to Spain, at its own cost, the Spanish soldiers taken as prisoners of war on the capture of Manila by the American forces. The arms of the soldiers in question shall be restored to them.

Spain will, upon the exchange of the ratifications of the present treaty, proceed to evacuate the Philippines, as well as the island of Guam, on terms similar to those agreed upon by the Commissioners appointed to arrange for the evacuation of Porto Rico and other islands in the West Indies, under the Protocol of August 12, 1898, which is to continue in force until its provisions are completely executed.

The time within which the evacuation of the Philippine Islands and Guam shall be completed shall be fixed by the two Governments. Stands of colors, uncaptured war vessels, small arms, guns of all calibres, with their carriages and accessories, powder, ammunition, livestock, and materials and supplies of all kinds, belonging to the land and naval forces of Spain in the Philippines and Guam, remain the property of Spain. Pieces of heavy ordnance, exclusive of field artillery, in the fortifications and coast defences, shall remain in their emplacements for the term of six months, to be reckoned from the exchange of ratifications of the treaty; and the United States may, in the meantime, purchase such material from Spain, if a satisfactory agreement between the two Governments on the subject shall be reached.

Article VI.

Spain will, upon the signature of the present treaty, release all prisoners of war, and all persons detained or imprisoned for political offences, in connection with the insurrections in Cuba and the Philippines and the war with the United States.

Reciprocally, the United States will release all persons made prisoners of war by the American forces, and will undertake to obtain the release of all Spanish prisoners in the hands of the insurgents in Cuba and the Philippines.

The Government of the United States will at its own cost return to Spain and the Government of Spain will at its own cost return to the United States, Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Philippines, according to the situation of their respective homes, prisoners released or caused to be released by them, respectively, under this article.

Article VII.

The United States and Spain mutually relinquish all claims for indemnity, national and individual, of every kind, of either Government, or of its citizens or subjects, against the other Government, that may have arisen since the beginning of the late insurrection in Cuba and prior to the exchange of ratifications of the present treaty, including all claims for indemnity for the cost of the war.

The United States will adjudicate and settle the claims of its citizens against Spain relinquished in this article.

Article VIII.

In conformity with the provisions of Articles I, II, and III of this treaty, Spain relinquishes in Cuba, and cedes in Porto Rico and other islands in the West Indies, in the island of Guam, and in the Philippine Archipelago, all the buildings, wharves, barracks, forts, structures, public highways and other immovable property which, in conformity with law, belong to the public domain, and as such belong to the Crown of Spain.

And it is hereby declared that the relinquishment or cession, as the case may be, to which the preceding paragraph refers, can not in any respect impair the property or rights which by law belong to the peaceful possession of property of all kinds, of provinces, municipalities, public or private establishments, ecclesiastical or civic bodies, or any other associations having legal capacity to acquire and possess property in the aforesaid territories renounced or ceded, or of private individuals, of whatsoever nationality such individuals may be.

The aforesaid relinquishment or cession, as the case may be, includes all documents exclusively referring to the sovereignty relinquished or ceded that may exist in the archives of the Peninsula. Where any document in such archives only in part relates to said sovereignty, a copy of such part will be furnished whenever it shall be requested. Like rules shall be reciprocally observed in favor of Spain in respect of documents in the archives of the islands above referred to.

In the aforesaid relinquishment or cession, as the case may be, are also included such rights as the Crown of Spain and its authorities possess in respect of the official archives and records, executive as well as judicial, in the islands above referred to, which relate to said islands or the rights and property of their inhabitants. Such archives and records shall be carefully preserved, and private persons shall without distinction have the right to require, in accordance with law, authenticated copies of the contracts, wills and other instruments forming part of notarial protocols or files, or which may be contained in the executive or judicial archives, be the latter in Spain or in the islands aforesaid.

Article IX.

Spanish subjects, natives of the Peninsula, residing in the territory over which Spain

by the present treaty relinquishes or cedes her sovereignty, may remain in such territory or may remove therefrom, retaining in either event all their rights of property, including the right to sell or dispose of such property or of its proceeds; and they shall also have the right to carry on their industry, commerce and professions, being subject in respect thereof to such laws as are applicable to other foreigners. In case they remain in the territory they may preserve their allegiance to the Crown of Spain by making, before a court of record, within a year from the date of the exchange of ratifications of this treaty, a declaration of their decision to preserve such allegiance; in default of which declaration they shall be held to have renounced it and to have adopted the nationality of the territory in which they may reside.

The civil rights and political status of the native inhabitants of the territories hereby ceded to the United States shall be determined by the Congress.

Article X.

The inhabitants of the territories over which Spain relinquishes or cedes her sovereignty shall be secured in the free exercise of their religion.

Article XI.

The Spaniards residing in the territories over which Spain by this treaty cedes or relinquishes her sovereignty shall be subject in matters civil as well as criminal to the jurisdiction of the courts of the country wherein they reside, pursuant to the ordinary laws governing the same; and they shall have the right to appear before such courts, and to pursue the same course as citizens of the country to which the courts belong.

Article XII.

Judicial proceedings pending at the time of the exchange of ratifications of this treaty in the territories over which Spain relinquishes or cedes her sovereignty shall be determined according to the following rules:

1. Judgments rendered either in civil suits between private individuals, or in criminal matters, before the date mentioned, and with respect to which there is no recourse or right of review under the Spanish law, shall be deemed to be final, and shall be executed in due form by competent authority in the territory within which such judgments should be carried out.

2. Civil suits between private individuals which may on the date mentioned be undetermined shall be prosecuted to judgment before the court in which they may then be pending or in the court that may be substituted therefor.

3. Criminal actions pending on the date mentioned before the Supreme Court of Spain against citizens of the territory which by this treaty ceases to be Spanish shall continue under its jurisdiction until final judgment; but, such judgment having been rendered, the execution thereof shall be committed to the competent authority of the place in which the case arose.

Article XIII.

The rights of property secured by copyrights and patents acquired by Spaniards in the Island of Cuba and in Porto Rico, the Philippines and other ceded territories, at the time of the exchange of the ratifications of this treaty, shall continue to be respected. Spanish scientific, literary and artistic works, not subversive of public order in the territories in question, shall continue to be admitted free of duty into such territories, for the period of ten years, to be reckoned from the date of the exchange of the ratifications of this treaty.

Article XIV.

Spain will have the power to establish consular officers in the ports and places of the

territories, the sovereignty over which has been either relinquished or ceded by the present treaty.

Article XV.

The Government of each country will, for the term of ten years, accord to the merchant vessels of the other country the same treatment in respect of all port charges, including entrance and clearance dues, light dues, and tonnage duties, as it accords to its own merchant vessels, not engaged in the coastwise trade.

Article XVI.

It is understood that any obligations assumed in this treaty by the United States with respect to Cuba are limited to the time of its occupancy thereof; but it will upon termination of such occupancy, advise any Government established in the island to assume the same obligations.

Article XVII.

The present treaty shall be ratified by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate thereof, and by Her Majesty the Queen Regent of Spain; and the ratifications shall be exchanged at Washington within six months from the date hereof, or earlier if possible.

In faith whereof, we, the respective Plenipotentiaries, have signed this treaty and have hereunto affixed our seals.

Done in duplicate at Paris, the tenth day of December, in the year of Our Lord one thousand eight hundred and ninety-eight.

William R. Day	Eugenio Montero Rios
Cushman K. Davis	B. de Abarzuza
William P. Frye	J. de Garnica
Geo. Gray	W. R. de Villa Urrutia
Whitelaw Reid	Rafael Cerero

Appendix 3: Benevolent Assimilation Proclamation by President William McKinley, December 21, 1898

The destruction of the Spanish fleet in the harbor of Manila by the United States naval squadron commanded by Rear-Admiral Dewey, followed by the reduction of the city and the surrender of the Spanish forces, practically effected the conquest of the Philippine Islands and the suspension of the Spanish sovereignty therein. With the signature of the Treaty of Peace between the United States and Spain by their respective plenipotentiaries at Paris on the 10th instant, and as a result of the victories of American arms, the future control, disposition, and government of the Philippine Islands are ceded to the United States. In the fulfillment of the rights of sovereignty thus acquired and the responsible obligations of government thus assumed, the actual occupation and administration of the entire group of the Philippine Islands becomes immediately necessary, and the military government heretofore maintained by the United States in the city, harbor, and bay of Manila is to be extended with all possible despatch to the whole of the ceded territory.

In performing this duty the military commander of the United States is enjoined to make known to the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands that in succeeding to the sovereignty of Spain, in severing the former political relations, and in establishing a new political power, the authority of the United States is to be exerted for the securing of the persons and property of the people of the islands and for the confirmation of all their private rights and relations. It will be the duty of the commander of the forces of occupation to announce and proclaim in the most public manner that we come, not as invaders or conquerors, but as friends, to protect the natives in their homes, in their employments, and in their personal and religious rights. All persons who, either by active aid or by honest submission, co-operate with the Government of the United States to give effect to these beneficent purposes will receive the reward of its support and protection. All others will be brought within the lawful rule we have assumed, with firmness if need be, but without severity, so far as possible. Within the absolute domain of military authority, which necessarily is and must remain supreme in the ceded territory until the

legislation of the United States shall otherwise provide, the municipal laws of the territory in respect to private rights and property and the repression of crime are to be considered as continuing in force, and to be administered by the ordinary tribunals, so far as practicable. The operations of civil and municipal government are to be performed by such officers as may accept the supremacy of the United States by taking the oath of allegiance, or by officers chosen, as far as practicable, from the inhabitants of the Islands. While the control of all the public property and the revenues of the state passes with the cession, and while the use and management of all public means of transportation are necessarily reserved to the authority of the United States, private property, whether belonging to individuals or corporations, is to be respected except for cause duly established. The taxes and duties heretofore payable by the inhabitants to the late government become payable to the authorities of the United States unless it be seen fit to substitute for them other reasonable rates or modes of contribution to the expenses of government, whether general or local. If private property be taken for military use, it shall be paid for when possible in cash, at a fair valuation, and when payment in cash is not practicable, receipts are to be given. All ports and places in the Philippine Islands in the actual possession of the land and naval forces of the United States will be opened to the commerce of all friendly nations. All goods and wares not prohibited for military reasons by due announcement of the military authority will be admitted upon payment of such duties and other charges as shall be in force at the time of their importation. Finally, it should be the earnest wish and paramount aim of the military administration to win the confidence, respect, and affection of the inhabitants of the Philippines by assuring them in every possible way that full measure of individual rights and liberties which is the heritage of free peoples, and by proving to them that the mission of the United States is one of

BENEVOLENT ASSIMILATION

substituting the mild sway of justice and right for arbitrary rule. In the fulfillment of this high mission, supporting the temperate administration of affairs for the greatest good of the governed, there must be sedulously maintained the strong arm of authority, to repress disturbance and to overcome all obstacles to the bestowal of the blessings of good and stable government upon the people of the Philippine Islands under the free flag of the United States.

William McKinley

Appendix 4: Philippine Exhibitions at U.S. World's Fairs and Expositions

1898–1909

Filipinos are exhibited at various World's Fairs and Expositions in the United States, as described in the following accounts. Reactions to the exhibit are contained in the following:

Charles B. Spahr, "The Philippine Educational Exhibit" (at the Pan-American Exposition), *The Outlook* 69 (September 7, 1901) <www.boondocksnet.com/expos/wfe_edexhib.html>.

Marietta Holley, *Samantha at the St. Louis Exposition*, by Josiah Allen's Wife. New York: G. W. Dillingham Co., 1904, chapter 14, "Samantha at the Philippine Reservation." <www.boondocksnet.com/expos/wfe-samantha_pv.html>.

Monday, September 19, 1904 and Tuesday, September 20, 1904, which is an account of a visit to the St. Louis World's Fair and the Philippine Village, in *Pilgrimage of Mary Commandery no. 36, Knights Templar of Pennsylvania to the Twenty-ninth Triennial Conclave of the Grand Encampment U.S. at San Francisco, Cal.* (1904), at the Library of Congress.¹

L. Vernon Briggs, *California As I Saw It: First-Person Narratives of California's Early Years, 1849–1900*. Part 6. <[http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/quer...lbk@field9DOCID+@lit\(CO30Dd0006\)](http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/quer...lbk@field9DOCID+@lit(CO30Dd0006))>.²

"The Philippine Reservation at the Jamestown Exposition," the *Ledger-Dispatch* (Norfolk, Virginia), May 1907, described the Philippine exhibit: "Weird sounds, intermingled with strains of sweet music, tell the visitor to the Jamestown Exposition that he is near the Philippine reservation. A high barricade of logs, covering five and a half acres of ground, encloses this reservation, which is under the protection of the United States government."³

“The Philippines at the Panama Exposition: Remarkable Insular Exhibit,” *The Filipino People*, March 3, 1915.⁴

The Filipino reaction is reported in “Mr. Quezon’s Remarks at San Francisco,” *The Filipino People*, March 3, 1915. Then Commissioner Quezon, who later became president of the Philippines, rebutted the images created at the fairs: “The Filipinos are an enterprising and progressive people; they are fully aware that the only way by which they can occupy a place in international affairs such as they are entitled to, is that of mingling with other peoples and of showing them what they themselves are. . . . Strange as it may seem, after fifteen years of American occupation in the Islands, they are hardly known even to the American people at large.”⁵

NOTES

1. It is noted on p. 178 of the account: “The Filipino exhibition was one that attracted a great deal of attention and gave much satisfaction. The concert that the civilized residents or Visayans gave drew fine audiences all day long. They gave exhibitions of their national dances, sang their native songs, accompanied by their own orchestra. Filipinos from the Cordilleras region were displayed at World’s Fairs in very good time, and acted little pantomime plays. When they wound up their show by playing and singing the Star-Spangled Banner in very good English and perfect time, they aroused their audiences to an enthusiastic pitch. When you were informed that the performers knew no English six months previously their present attempts seemed really remarkable.” This contrasts with the observation: “The Negrottes [Negritos/Aetas] and Igorotes [Cordillerans] were, of course, of a much lower intelligence. They could ascend a lofty tree in their grounds with the agility of a monkey and slide down again as quickly as a snake. The naked little rats who shot at nickets with bow and arrow had learned to bid the people who got in the line of their shots to ‘stand back’ and to exclaim ‘pretty, good’ when their aim at a nickel proved true. Jake Haines adopted a little wild scion of the Igorots for a couple of days and had his picture taken as protector of the infant.” Filipino views about the exhibition were presented in “How the Filipinos Feel about the Exhibition of the Igorottes in the United States,” *The Public* 8, March 3, 1906, which noted: “As Americans may have no better sources of information, they believe that the majority of the Filipinos are like them [Irogottes]. There are many of our students and countrymen who have been asked the following questions from badly informed Americans: ‘Since when have you used coats?’, etc., etc. And as the United States government maintains that its mission is one of education, the belief grows that we Filipinos are savages whom the nephews of Uncle Sam are here to civilize” <www.boondocksnet.com/expos/wfe_public0603.html>. Another point of view was expressed in “The Filipinos do not want the ‘Wild Tribes’ Exhibited,” *El Renacimiento*, January 3, 1907 <www.boondocksnet.com/expos/wfe_jamestown_er.html>.

2. Brigg’s narratives included the following: “A very interesting exhibit was the Igorot village which occupied six acres of the most picturesque part of the Philippine Reservation. These 114 natives, from three tribes,—the Bontogs, the Suyocs and the Tingui-anese,—lived in nipa huts built by their own hands. They are among the most conspicuous races of northern Luzon, their hair is straight and black, their chests strong, muscles well developed. The women are generally well formed, erect and graceful; their clothing consists of a woven breech clout [*sic*] of gaudy color for the men, and not much

more for the women. There is much tattooing, especially on their breasts, which tells of their head-hunting raids, and some wore strung around their necks the red beak of a bird, signifying that the wearer has taken at least twenty heads. Headhunting among the Bontog Igorots is not only a means of self-defence, but also a pastime. After a member of the pueblo has taken home a human head, a month is given to celebration. All Igorot men eat dogs. It is a tribal dish, and twenty dogs were furnished these men each week by the United States government." An accompanying "image" was captioned "The Igorot preparing and cooking a dog for their daily meal at the World's Fair, St. Louis, 1904."

3. The invidious nature of the commentary is captured in the following: "From the Moros, the most warlike and uncivilized of the inhabitants of the island, to the Tagalos [*sic*] the tribe to which Aguinaldo belongs, and which is the most enlightened of them all, almost every phase of life in the Philippines is shown." Of the latter it was written "the Tagalos represent the most advanced civilization in the Philippines. They dress more like Americans and devote most of their time to their household duties. They look with contempt on their neighbors and do not like to have them referred to as Filipinos. The food of the Tagalos is like that of any civilized people."

4. See http://www.boondocksnet.com/expos/wfe_fp_150300b.html

5. Quezon also called for "The granting of independence [which] would in itself create so strong a sentiment of gratitude on the part of the Filipino people toward the United States that you would have created in the heart of the Pacific a nation true in its allegiance and friendship to you both in peace and in war." See <www.boondocksnet.com/expos/wfe_fp_150300c.html>.

Appendix 5: The Land Tenancy Issue

A major problem, which began under the Spanish, was the land ownership of the friars and the tenancy problem, which developed during the American period. The economic position of the religious orders (the Dominicans, Franciscans, and Augustinians, known collectively as the friars),¹ was secured by their extensive landholdings, which generally had been donated to them for the support of their churches, schools, and other establishments. In addition, *estancias* or large ranches, which developed from land grants made by the Spanish Crown to *conquistadors* and early settlers, soon passed to the friar orders.² They were the first to establish *haciendas* or large landed estates. Because of the general lack of interest on the part of Spanish colonials in land, and their dependence on the galleon trade from their base in Manila, by the eighteenth century the religious orders became the largest landholders in the Philippines. Their estates were concentrated in the Central Luzon region, and significant rents accrued from land leased to Chinese mestizo *inquilinos* (lessees of these lands, who planted cash crops for export)—the income provided them with enough income so that the friars lived in palatial surroundings.

Thus, by the end of the Spanish colonial period, the Church and many Chinese *mestizos* owned most of the best land in the country. Among the latter is the family of former President Corazon Cojuangco Aquino who acquired extensive landholdings in Tarlac in the 1800s, which the family still retains. Three hundred years of Spanish colonial rule gave rise to a landed oligarchy whose fortunes were largely tied to export agriculture. The oligarchy was composed of highly educated Chinese and Spanish *mestizos* (*illustrados*) and the *caciques* descended from the *principalia* (principal ones).

The Taft Commission viewed land reform as the key to economic development, along with education and the establishment of representative institutions, as one of the most important of the three pillars of the policy of pragmatic materialism. The first Organic Act in 1902 declared that all lands owned by religious orders belonged henceforth to the Philippine government to sell or lease, preferably to the actual occupants. However, there

were no serious attempts at agrarian reform, even though Taft successfully negotiated with the Vatican for the sale of friar lands. In 1903 the Taft administration bought for \$7 million the major part of the friars' holdings, amounting to some 166,000 hectares, of which one-half was in the vicinity of Manila. The land was eventually resold to Filipinos, some of them tenants but the majority of them estate owners.

The first Organic Act passed in 1902 by the U.S. Congress and the Philippine Commission limited the size of public lands that could be owned by individuals to 16 hectares, and this was later amended to 100 hectares, and corporations were limited to 1,024 hectares.³ Originally, Governor Taft and the U.S. business lobby in Manila sought to limit corporate ownership of land to 20,000 acres. But the American farm lobby through its congressional allies defeated this proposal. The Public Lands Act passed in October 1903 was designed to allow the landless and land-poor peasants to acquire their own farms. Modeled on legislation used to settle the American west, it allowed acquisition of 16 hectares of public land by establishing a homestead and cultivating it for five consecutive years with payment of a nominal fee. The program was partly undermined by the cultural tradition of living in village neighbors (*barrios*) rather than on isolated homesteads. In addition, few had the financial resources to participate in the program.⁴

The political dominance of the elite Nacionalista Party (beginning in 1907) ensured that the status quo in landlord and tenant relationships would be maintained, even if certain of its traditional aspects changed. A government attempt to establish homesteads modeled on those of the American West as early as 1903 did little to alter landholding arrangements. Although different regions of the archipelago had their own specific arrangements and different proportions of tenants and small proprietors, the *kasama* (sharecropper) system was the most prevalent, particularly in the rice-growing areas of Central Luzon and the Visayan Islands, and remains so.

Under this arrangement, the landowners supplied the seed and cash necessary to tide cultivators over during the planting season, whereas the cultivators provided tools and work animals and were responsible for one-half the expense of crop production. Usually, owner and sharecropper each took one-half of the harvest, although only after the former deducted a portion for expenses. Cultivators customarily are deep in debt, for they are dependent on advances made by the landowner and have to pay steep interest rates. It was estimated in 1924 that the average tenant family would have to labor uninterruptedly for 163 years to pay off debts and acquire title to the land they work.⁵ The *kasama* system has created a class of peons or serfs; children inherit the debts of their parents and over generations families were tied in bondage to estate owners.

The Comprehensive Agrarian Reform Program (CARP), established in 1988 is charged with leading agrarian reform in the Philippines. By 2000, CARP had accomplished the following: (1) redistribution of 4.8 million hectares of both private and public lands, comprising 47 percent of the country's total farmland and representing 60 percent of total CARP scope and (2) directly benefiting about 2.1 million rural poor households, that constitute roughly 41 percent of the total peasant population.⁶ CARP has expropriation powers and, in theory, covers all agricultural lands in the Philippines, private and public, regardless of tenurial relations. About 80 percent of the peasant population are landless and land-poor households.

Land under the domain of CARP includes Idle and Abandoned Land (private estates), Voluntary-Offer-to-Sell (VOS), Sequestered "Marcos Crony" (PCGG) Lands, Government-Owned Lands, Public Alienable and Disposable Lands, Integrated Social

Forestry, Settlements, Private Lands Above 50 Hectares, Private Lands 24–50 Hectares and Private Lands 5–25 Hectares.⁷

NOTES

1. The Jesuits have also been in the Philippines since Spanish times.
2. Garel A. Brunder and William E. Livezey, *The Philippines and the United States* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1951).
3. Amendment on individual limit in Public Act No. 2874 (1919), cited in Bonifacio Salamanica, *The Filipino Reaction to American Rule, 1901–1913* (Hamden, Conn.: Shoe String Press, 1968).
4. *Ibid.*, pp. 130–31.
5. David R. Sturtevant, *Agrarian Unrest in the Philippines: Contemporary Revitalization Movements* (Athens, Ohio: University Center for International Studies, 1969); and *idem*, *Popular Uprisings in the Philippines, 1840–1940* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1975).
6. Saturnino M. Borrás Jr., “CARP in its 12th Year: A Closer Examination of the Agrarian Reform Performance,” June 2000 <www.philsol.n/AOOb/CARP-Borrás-junoo.htm>.
7. Presidential Agrarian Reform Council, *Comprehensive Agrarian Reform Program of the Philippines*, vols. 1 and 2 (Manila, 1988), as cited in Jeffrey Riedlinger, *Agrarian Reform in the Philippines: Democratic Transitions and Redistributive Reform* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995). Quoted in Borrás, “CARP in its 12th Year.” Also see Republic Act no. 6657.

Index

- Abad, Juan, 106
Abella, Domingo, 45, 52
Abellana, Martino, 29
Academia de Dibujo y Pintura, 23
Advocacy groups, failure of, 233–34;
 scope for study, 236–38
Aetas folklore, 16–18
Agoncillo, Teodoro A., 214
Agrarian society, 226–29
Aguinaldo, Emilio, 22, 26, 78, 85, 101,
 193, 223–24
Aldaba, Estefania, 170
Alegre, Edilberto, 99
Alzina, Francisco Ignacio, 100
Alzona, Encarnacion, 170, 176–77
Americanistas vs. *independistas*, 80–81
Americanization, 2, 93, 108, 114
American movie industry, *mestiza* beauty
 ideal and, 31, 114–15
American racial tradition, 23–25
American rule: agrarian unrest under, 226–
 27; “benevolent assimilation” policy,
 75; civilizing mission of, 193;
 economic growth under, 226–27; edu-
 cation during, 89; expansionism, 225–
 26; Filipino options and, 78–79; force
 and kindness of, 76–77; in hinterlands,
 193; imperialism of, 102, 192; inde-
 pendistas vs. *Americanistas*, 80–81;
 leadership of, 81–82; logic of, 77–78;
 modernizing aspect of, 84–86; in Mo-
 roland, 197–98; occupation of Philip-
 pines, 223–25; political support and
 foreign policy, 227–28; reactions to, 79–
 80; social development organizations,
 150–51; wartime amnesty, 83
Amorsolo, Fernando, 28
Anderson, Benedict, 138
An Lim, Jaime, 123
Annexation, 79, 108
Anti-Imperialist League, 192
Apolinario Mabini-Revolutionary (Majul),
 223
Apostol, Cecilio, 101
Apostol, Gina, 123
Aquinas, St. Thomas, 146
Aquino, Benigno, Jr., 5, 153, 230
Aquino, Corazon, 4–5, 140, 154, 212,
 230
Arcellana, Francisco, 122
Arceo, Juan, 23
Art: contemporary Filipino art, 28–29;

- proletarian art, 28. *See also* Religious art
- Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC), 122, 125
- Asociación Feminista Filipina, 174–75
- Asociación Feminista Ilonga, 173–75
- Assimilation, 109–12
- Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), 122
- Asuncion, Justinano, 23
- Atkinson, Fred W., 108
- Authoritarianism, 136
- Autonomistas*, 81
- Avelino, Librada, 171
- Barangays*, 147–48; pre-Hispanic period, 211–13
- Barbour scholarships and scholars, 169–70
- Baron, Barnett F., 145
- Barrows, David, 193–94
- Basic Ecclesial Communities (BEC), 231
- Bates, John C., 197
- Bates Agreement, 198–99
- Battle of Bud Bagsak, 197
- Beauty pageants, carnival queen, 171–73; Miss Philippines, 171–73
- Beauty queens, 160–61; political activism of, 174–79
- Becerra, Manuel, 58
- Belleza, Norma, 29
- Benevolent assimilation policy, 4, 65, 75–79, 126, 267–68
- Benigno, Teodora, 99
- Benitez, Francisca Tirona, 169–71
- Benitez, Helen, 170
- Benitez, Paz Marquez, 171
- Beyer, H. Otley, 147
- Black Nazarene of Quiapo, 22
- Blair, William, 228
- Blood purity, concept of, 51
- Blumentritt, Ferdinand, 57–60, 65, 84–85, 194
- Bonifacio, Amelia Lapeña, 106
- Bonifacio, Andres, 63–64, 149, 167, 193, 219, 225
- Bowring, John, 53
- Bracken, Josephine, 27
- Brigandage Law, 76
- The Brown Brothers' Burden* (Larawan), 29
- Brown Madonna* (Ocampo), 28
- “The Brown Race” (Ramos), 105
- Buencamino, Felipe, 79, 82
- Bureau of Non-Christian Tribes, 193
- Burgos, Fr. Jose, 56, 59, 219
- Cacique*, 5, 136–37, 227; defined, 209; rise of, 49
- Cacique* democracy, 209–11
- Cailles, Juan, 86
- Cajipe-Endaya, Imelda, 29
- Calata, Alexander A., 4
- Calderon, Antonio Ramos, 58
- Camacho, Marya Svetlana T., 4
- Carnegie, Andrew, 90
- Carnival queen, 171–73
- Carpio, Maria C. Lanzar, 170
- Castilas* (Castilians), 48, 51, 53
- Catholic Bishops Conference of the Philippines (CBCP), 230
- Catholic Church, 7; European religious images, 22–23, 27; Marcos dictatorship and, 229–30
- Catt, Carrie Chapman, 161, 175
- Cavite Mutiny of 1872, 63, 219
- Cédula personal* (head tax), 47–48, 56, 200
- Charity Organization Society (COS), 150
- Chavez, Jose, 106
- Child Welfare League, 151
- Chinese mestizo class, 21–25, 54–56, 65–66, 107
- Christian Filipino migration, 201–2
- Civil rights, 139
- Civil society: defined, 145; values of, 166
- Civil society organizations, 145
- Class system, 1, 3
- Colin, Francisco, 147
- Colonialism, 4–5; 75; female image in, 25–27. *See also* American rule; Spanish colonial period
- “The Color of the Filipino” (Hernandez), 103–4
- Commentaries* (Aquinas), 146

- Commonwealth literature (1935–1939), 112–17
- Community Chest Fund, 152
- Concubinage, 19
- Constantino, Renato, 94
- Constitution, democratic principles of, 4, 140–42; supremacy of, 139
- Contemporary culture: beauty pageants for upward mobility, 31–32; contrasts of, 1–2; cosmetic pathology of, 32–33; Filipino art, Malay female ideal in, 28–29; mestiza ideal in, 29–32
- Co-operatives, 147
- Corpuz, Onofre D., 164, 211, 221
- Cosmetic pathology, 32–33
- Country maiden, 28
- Creation myths, 15–16
- Creoles, 53
- Criollos*, 148
- Cruz-Araneta, Gemma, 31–32
- Culion Leper Colony, 203–5
- “Cult of the white woman,” 99–101, 122
- Daguio, Amador T., 120
- Dalagang bukid* (country maiden), 28
- Dalipay, Jose, 124
- Datus* (village chieftain), 147, 212
- De Alvero, Rosa Sevilla, 171
- De Castro, Don Modesto, 165–66
- De Jesus, Angel, 116, 126
- De Jesus, Gregoria, 167
- De Legazpi, Miguel López, 19, 43
- De Leon, Trining, 173
- De Loarca, Miguel, 147
- De los Reyes, Isabelo, 80
- De Los Reyes, J. P., 124
- Del Pilar, Marcelo H., 58, 60, 63, 149
- Del Rosario, General “Yayang” Hilaria, 26
- Democracy in America* (Tocqueville), 150
- Democratic ideals: American contributions to, 139–40; elitist democracy, roots of, 135–37; Filipino style of, 211, 221–23; Philippine constitution, 140–42; public education and, 138–39; tests of, 142; Western democracy/non-Western societies, 135–37
- De Morga, Antonio, 59
- De Olivares, Jose, 13, 21, 25
- De Quiros, Conrado, 6
- Deriada, Leoncio P., 123, 126
- De Veyra, Sofia, 168, 174
- Dewey, Commodore George, 101, 224
- De Zuñiga, Fray Joaquín Martínez, 50
- Diokno, Maria Serena I., 4
- Dizon, Marina, 167
- Doctrina*, 216–17
- Domingo, Damian, 23
- Economic nationalism, 232
- EDSA People Power revolution, 153, 211–12, 230; post-EDSA literature, 121–24
- Educational system, 4, 56; democratic training and, 138–39; English language instruction, 89, 94–96; Friars and Pueblo schools, 216–18; *pensionado* program, 89, 91–94; Spanish system, 89; Thomasites, 4, 89–91, 108, 209; women and, 168–71
- Elitism, 3, 6, 76
- Elitist democracy, 136–37
- Encomienda* system, 215
- English language instruction, 89, 94–96; loss of identity and, 95
- Enriquez, Antonio, 122
- Equality, 64
- Esconda, Josefa Llanes, 174
- Estrada, Joseph Ejercito, 5–8, 155
- Ethnicity, locality and, 194–96; Zamora case study, 194–95
- Evasco, Marjorie, 124
- Expansionism, 225–26
- Face of Empire* (Golay), 226
- Fansler, Dean S., 110
- Fansler, Harriet, 110
- Faustino, Salvador, 117, 125
- Federal Party, 77
- Felipe, Julian, 22
- Female image: in colonial perspective, 25–27; in contemporary Filipino art, 28–29; Maria Clara myth, 27, 30, 163, 166. *See also* Women
- “Feminine mystique,” mestiza ideal, 30
- Feminista* (women’s organization), 175
- Fer, Anna, 29

- Fernandez, Doreen G., 31
 Fernandez, Trining, 173
 Feudal system, 137
 Filipinization, 76, 219
 Filipino-American War, 4, 22
 Filipino culture: classification of, 194; local vs. ethnic cultures, 196; traditional values, 212
 "Filipino First" policy, 227
 Filipino folklore, "Agta" ("Black Man"), 16–18; creation myths, 15–16; race in, 15–19
 Fiske, John, 226
 Flores, Simon, 23
 Forbes, General William Cameron, 106
 Foreign policy, political support as, 227–28
 "For Rizal" (Chavez), 106
 Freedom of expression, 139
 Free trade, 225
 "From Indio to Filipino" (Abella), 45
- Galleon trade, 215
 Garcia, Carlos P., 227
 Gayo, Jose Rene C., 4
 Gillam, Victor, 26
 Gironiere, Paul de la, 50
 Globalization, 125, 232
 Golay, Frank H., 226
 Gomez, Fr. Mariano, 219
 Goncharov, Ivan, 52–53
 Gonzalez, N.V.M., 122
 Gowing, Peter, 198
 Greene, Major General Francis, 224
 Guerrero-Nakpil, Carmen, 27
 Gulf War, 232
- Hacenderos*, 136–37, 209
 Hamada, Sinai C., 120, 125
 Harrison, Francis Burton, 175
 Hawaii, 110
 Hernandez, Amado V., 103–5
 Hernando Bill, 177
 Hidalgo, Julio Rey B., 5
Hidalguía, 51
Hispanistas, 161, 165
 Hispanization, 44
 Hughes, General, 81
- Hukbalahap, 152
 Hukbong Mapagpalaya ng Bayan (HMB) (National Liberation Army), 152
 Huk movement, 228
 Huntington, Samuel, 137
- Identity: beauty and, 13–15; color aesthetics of, 99; "cult of the white woman," 99–101; negrification of Filipinos, 13–14; white phenotypes, 14
 Ifugaos cooperatives, 147
 Igorots, 19, 196
 Illegal gambling, 7
Ilustrados, 23, 55, 148–49, 165–66, 210
 Imperialism, racial issues and, 102
 Independence era, 78; hinterlands and, 202–4; racial attitudes and, 57–58; social development organizations, 151–52
 Independistas vs. *Americanistas*, 80–81
 Indigenous people, 5, 15
Indios, 103, 148, 214
 Indonesians, 194
Insulares, 148, 214
 Internet, current internationalism and, 122
 Interracial marriage, 19
- Jacinto, Emilio, 64, 164
 Jaena, Graciano López, 48
 Jagor, F., 52
 James, Henry, 108
 Joaquin, Nick, 170
Job Was Also Man (Abellana), 29
- Kabataang Makabayan (KM) (National Youth), 152
 Kalaw, Maria, 170, 173
 Kalingas cooperatives, 147
 Katipunan revolution, 26, 85, 149, 164, 166–67, 219, 225
Katulong, 164–67
Kayumanggi (brown-skinned), 99, 112, 124–25
 Kilusang Bagong Lipunan (New Society Movement), 229
 Kilusang Magsasak (KM), 153
 Kilusang Mayo UNO (KMU), 153
 Kin-group, 211
 Kinship groups, 160, 161, 162, 167

- Kipling, Rudyard, 26, 29, 108–9
 Kolko, Gabriel, 227
 Korean War, 232
- Lacson, Rose, 30
Lady of Edsa, 29
 Laguio, Perfecto E., 175
 Land tenancy issue/distribution, 5, 136, 273–75
 Larawan, Benedicto Cabrera, 29
 Laya, Juan C., 118
 League of Filipino Students (LFS), 153
 Legarda, Trining Fernandez, 174
 Leper colony, 203–4
 Liberal Party, 152
Life with the Early American Teachers (Marquardt), 90
Limpieza de sangre, 51
 Lluch, Julie, 29
 Lopez, Angelica Rizal, 167
Loving v. Virginia, 24
- Mabanglo, Ruth, 123
 Mabini, Apolinario, 76, 80–82, 191, 204, 218–23, 231
 Macapagal-Arroyo, Gloria, 7
 Macapagal, Diosdado, 7, 227–28
 MacArthur, General Douglas, 83–84
 McFerson, Hazel M., 209
 McGloin, Linda Acupanda, 29
 McKinley, William, 65, 75, 90, 108, 197, 225
Madonna of the Slums (Manasala), 28
Maganda, 172
 Magsaysay-Ho, Anita, 29
 Majul, Cesar Adib, 222–23
The Making of a Nation (Schumacher), 209
 Malantic, Antonio, 23
 Malayans, 28–29, 124, 194
 Mallat, Jean, 53
 Malolos Congress, 237
 Malvar, Gen. Jose, 150
 Manasala, Vincente, 28
 Manifest destiny, 65, 192, 226
 Manila-Acapulo galleon trade, 215–16
Maputi (fair-skinned), 99–101, 122, 125
 Marcos, Ferdinand E., 5–8, 29, 140, 212
 Marcos, Imelda, 30
 Marcos dictatorship, 121, 228–29; social development organizations, 152–53
 Maria Clara myth, 27, 30, 163, 166
 Marquardt, Frederic S., 90
 Marquez, Paz, 173
 Martial Law years (1972–1980), 152–53, 155
 Mendez, Paz Policarpio, 177
 Mercado, Leonard, 172
 Merritt, General Wesley, 224
 Mestiza ideal, 13, 21, 52, 112; American movie industry and, 31, 117; contemporary culture and, 29–32; “feminine mystique,” 30; Maria Clara prototype, 27, 30, 163, 166; Rizal and, 27–28; white bias of, 28
Mestizaje (persons of mixed races), 102–3, 125
 Mestizo class, 4, 20, 51, 82, 148; Chinese mestizos (*Chinoy*), 22, 23; social dominance of, 26–27; Spanish mestizos (*tisoy*), 23
 Military forces, 191
 Millard, Thomas, 198
 Miscegenation, 20, 100, 119
 Modernism, 167–68, 170, 174
Modernistas, 161, 168
 Montelibano, Miguela, 107
 Montes, Timothy R., 122, 125
Morena (brown-skinned), 101–5
 Moroland, American rule in, 197–98; Christian Filipino migration, 201–2
 Moro Province, 196, 198–200; responses of, 200–201
 Municipal and Provincial Codes (1901), 76
 Muslim Filipinos, 197–98
 “My Dream” (Montelibano), 107
 Myths, creation myths, 15–16; Maria Clara beauty myth, 27. *See also* Filipino folklore
- Nash, Frederick, 108
 National Association of Manufacturers (NAM), 225
 National Federation of Women’s Clubs (NFWC), 173–74

- National identity, 221; race and, 45, 64
 Nationalism, 44–45, 54, 58, 62–63, 76, 149; economic nationalism, 232
 Nacionalista Party, 152
 National leadership, 235–36
 National Youth Administration, 151
 Nation-building, 221–23, 231
 Natural resources, 192
 Negritos, 194
 Negrophobia, 26
 “A Negro Slave” myth, 17
 New People’s Army (NPA), 152
 Nicanor, Precioso, 118–19, 125
 Nongovernment organizations (NGOs), 145, 212
 Novalles (Andres) mutiny, 54
 Nuestra Senora del Carmen, 22
- Ocampo, Galo B., 28
 Ocampo, Pablo, 76
 “Ordenanzas de las Revolución” (Structures of the Revolution), 222
- Palma, Rafael, 102–3, 107, 125, 177
 Pardo de Tavera, Trinidad, 84–86
 Parker, Maud Neal, 173
 Partido Komunista ng Pilipinas (PKP) (Communist Party of the Philippines), 152
 Paternalism, 49
 Paterno, Pedro, 79–82
 Pedroche, Conrado, 116, 125
 Pelaez, Emmanuel, 124
Peninsulares, 53, 148, 213
Pensionados programs, 89, 91–94, 109–10, 138, 168–69
 People Power Revolution, 3, 5, 29, 153–54, 211–12, 230
 People’s organizations (POs), 212
 Pertierra, Raul, 5
 Phelan, John L., 46, 49
 Philippine-American relations, chronology of, 241–56
 Philippine-American War, 65, 192, 197
 Philippine Association of University Women (PAUW), 175, 177
 Philippine Ethnological Survey, 194
 Philippine literature: American annexation (1920s–1934), 108–12; banned plays, 106; commonwealth literature (1935–1939), 112–17; “cult of the white woman,” 99–101; English language and, 110–11; *kayumanggi vs. maputi*, 103, 112; literary journals of, 111; *moreno* (brown-skinned), 105; *pensionados*’ experience, 109; post-EDSA era (1986–1999), 121–24; revolutionary literature (1899–1920s), 101–8; romanticization of Philippine Spanish revolution, 107; Sedition Law and, 105–6; war literature (1940–1985), 117–21
 Philippine Women’s University (PWU), 170
 Physical beauty, 15–16
Plessy v. Ferguson, 24
 Politics: the church as political force, 228–31; current developments (2001), 3, 5–8; foreign policy and, 227–28; national civic consciousness, 231–33; women in, 174–79
 Popular government, 221–23
 Pragmatic materialism, 76
 Pre-Hispanic period: *Barangay* in, 211–13; social development organizations, 147–55; social organization of, 212; sociopolitical arrangements in, 211–13; women in, 163
 Presidential government, 139
Principales, 209
Principaliá, 49
 Private charity organizations, 151
Programa constitucional de la república Filipina (The Constitution of the Philippine Republic), 223
 Proletarian art, 28
 Proletariat movement, 149
 Protectorate, 79
 Public education. *See* Educational system
 Public service organizations, 146. *See also* Social development organizations (SDOs)
 Public Welfare Board, 151
 Pueblo schools, 216–18
 Pye, Lucien, 137–38
 Quezon, Manuel L., 113, 139

- Race: American tradition of, 23–25; in Filipino folklore, 15–19; national identity and, 45; Negrito vs. European stereotypes, 18–19; principal racial types, 15; Spanish colonial iconography and, 22–23; Spanish racial tradition, 19–22; white aesthetic, 23, 118
- Racial tradition, 1–3; concept of, 14; power relations and, 15, 49; social stratification and, 3; Western racism, 110. *See also* Spanish racial tradition
- Ramos, Benigno, 105
- Ramos, General Fidel V., 3–5, 230
- Ramos administration, 154
- Recto, Claro M., 232
- Reform movement, 218–21
- Religious art, 22–23, 27; contemporary images, 28–29
- Revolutionary era, 78, 136, 191, 218–21; causes/premises of, 85; development and independence, 86; political/social transformation of, 85; social development organizations, 149–50
- Revolutionary literature (1899–1920s), 101–8
- Reyes, Severino, 107
- Ricarte, Artemio, 76
- Richmond, Mary, 150
- Rivera, Mercedes, 171
- Rizal, Jose, 22, 55–57, 193, 214, 218–19, 221; mestiza ideal and, 27–28; on Philippine society, 58–61, 63; on women's role, 164
- Rizal, Josefa, 167
- Roces, Mina C., 4
- Romualdez, Alberto, Jr., 32
- Roosevelt, Theodore, 113, 151, 199
- The Roots of the Filipino Nation* (Corpuz), 211
- Rosario, D. A., 109–10
- Sajonistas*, 161, 165, 168
- San Agustin, Fray Gaspar de, 50, 59
- Sancianco, Gregorio, 47, 52, 55–56
- Santiago, Miriam Defensor, 6, 170
- Santillan, Pura, 170
- Santos, Bienvenido, 119, 125
- Schiednagel, Manuel, 51
- Schumacher, John N., 44–45, 59, 62, 209
- Schurman Commission Report, 91
- Schurz, Carl, 192
- Scott, William Henry, 212
- Second People's Power revolution, 7
- Sedition Law, 76, 105
- The Seditious Tagalog Playwrights: Early American Occupation* (Bonifacio), 106
- See, Teresita Ang, 22
- Shalom, Stephen Rosskamm, 229
- Shuster, W. Morgan, 95
- Sibayan, Bonifacio, 95
- Singson, Luis (Chavit), 7
- Skin color, 15–16, “cult of the white woman,” 99–101; in literature, 103; *morena* (brown-skinned), 101–5. *See also* Race
- Social Darwinism, 226
- Social development organizations (SDOs), 145–46; American occupation, 151–52; EDSA period, 153–55; government-SDO partnership, 154; history of, 147–55; important role of, 156; independence and Marcos era, 152–53; pre-American occupation, 150–51; pre-Hispanic times, 147; revolutionary days, 149–50; Spanish occupation, 148–49
- Social justice, 221–23
- Social reform: considerations of, 233; key sectors of, 238
- Social stratification, 4, 213–14
- Sociopolitical groups, 152
- La Solidaridad*, 57–59, 149, 220
- Sotto, Helen, 30
- Sotto, Tito, 30
- Spanish-American War of 1898, 3, 150
- Spanish colonial period: European religious images, 22–23; failures of early rebellions, 216; galleon trade, 215–16; iconography of race and, 22–23; importance of Spanish “blood,” 51; influences of, 43–44; political hierarchy of, 213–14; pueblo schools and public education, 216–18; social development organizations, 148–49; social stratification, 213–14; sociopolitical reordination during, 46–57; taxes, tribute, and

- economic exploitation, 214–15; tributary system, 46–47; white supremacy, 100–101; women in, 162–67
- Spanish nativism (*nativismo*), 58
- Spanish racial tradition, 4, 19–23, 53; civilized vs. uncivilized classifications, 20; color and, 20; culture and class, 20; phenotypic criteria, 19–20; socioracial hierarchy, 20
- Suffragists, 161–62, 174–79
- Summa Theologia* (Aquinas), 146
- Sutherland, William, 92
- Taft, William Howard, 5, 8, 26, 79–80, 200
- Tagalogs, 20–21, 60, 106, 113
- Tangco, Marcelo, 15
- Taruc, Luis, 228
- Tausog of Jolo, 196
- Tax collections, 214
- Thomasites, 4, 89–91, 108, 209
- Tiempo, Edilberto K., 120, 122, 125
- Timberman, David, 137
- Tiongson, Nicanor, 163
- Tocqueville, Alexis de, 150, 155
- Tolentino, Aurelio, 106
- Trade and barter, 147, 215
- Treaty of Paris, 24, 81, 101, 225, 261–65
- Tributary (colonial) system, 46–48
- Twain, Mark, 90, 108
- Tydings McDuffie Law (1934), 112
- Ugarte, Eduardo F., 5, 191
- Value-Added Tax (VAT), 230
- El Verdadero Decalogo* (“The True Decalogue”), 221–23
- Vietnam War, 232
- Villa, Jose Garcia, 111, 116
- Villacorta, Wilfrido V., 4
- Villanueva, Pura, 173–75
- Voluntary associations, 146, 155
- War literature (1940–1985), 117–21
- Western democracy, non-Western societies and, 135–37
- Wheeler, Joseph, 24
- White bias, 3–4, 28, 32–33, 57, 114
- “White Man’s Burden” (Kipling), 26, 29
- White supremacy/aesthetic, 23–25, 125–26; in literature, 99–101; revolutionary literature, 101–8
- Wickberg, Edgar, 55
- Willard, Charles A., 106
- Wilson, Woodrow, 138
- Women: American colonial policy and, 160; beauty pageants, 171–73; as beauty queens, 160–61; civic work and, 160, 173–74; cosmetic pathology of, 32–33; education and, 160, 168–71; as helpers and partners, 164; as *katulong*, 164–67; as *maganda*, 172; modernity and, 167–68; in political life, 160, 174–79; pre-Hispanic period, 163; public sphere and, 160; revolutionary era, 166; rights of, 177; in society, 159–60; in Spanish colonial period, 162–67; suffragettes, 174–79
- Women’s club, 173–74
- Wood, Leonard, 159, 175, 199
- Worcester, Dean C., 103, 192–94
- World’s Fairs and Expositions, 269–71
- World Trade Organization (WTO), 122, 125
- Wurfel, David, 138
- Young Men’s Christian Association (YMCA), 151
- Young Women’s Christian Association (YWCA), 151
- Zaide, Gregorio F., 15, 100
- Zamora, Fr. Jacinto, 219
- Zamora case study, 194–95

About the Editor and Contributors

Alexander A. Calata is Executive Director of the Philippine-American Education Foundation/Fulbright Scholars, Makati, Manila.

Marya Svetlana T. Camacho is Chair, Department of History, University of Asia and the Pacific, Pasig City, Manila.

Maria Serena I. Diokno is Professor of History, University of the Philippines, Diliman, Manila.

Jose Rene C. Gayo is Dean of the School of Management, University of Asia and the Pacific, Pasig City, Manila.

Julio Rey B. Hidalgo is a corporate consultant and publisher.

Hazel M. McFerson is Associate Professor of International Studies, Department of Public and International Affairs, and Associate, Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution, George Mason University, Fairfax, Virginia. She was a Fulbright Scholar, 1998–1999, at the University of Asia and the Pacific, Manila, Philippines. She published *The Racial Dimension of American Overseas Colonial Policy* (Greenwood, 1997) and is currently working on a book on Asian American and African American social and political relations from 1900 to 1967.

Princess Orig is an Assistant Professor and Chair of the Literature Department of the University of Asia and the Pacific. She has published and given lectures on literature, education, women, and society in the Philippines and abroad. She is the editor of *Texts and Contexts of the Filipino Diaspora*, an international

anthology project that gleans on the Filipino overseas experience via literary expression. This book is scheduled for publication in 2002.

Raul Pertierra is Professor of Anthropology, the University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia. His latest book is *Religion, Politics and Rationality in a Philippines Community* (1998).

Hon. Fidel V. Ramos was President of the Republic of the Philippines from 1992 to 1998.

Mina C. Roces teaches in the School of History, the University of New South Wales, Australia. She is the author of *Women, Power and Kinship Politics: Female Power in Post-War Philippines* (Praeger, 1998), and *Kinship Politics in Post-War Philippines: The Lopez Family, 1945–2000* (Forthcoming).

Eduardo F. Ugarte is Associate Professor and Chair of the Department of International Studies, De La Salle University, Manila, Philippines.

Wilfrido V. Villacorta is President, the Yuchengco Center for East Asia, and Professor of Political Science at De La Salle University, Manila. He was recently appointed by Pope Paul II as an Academician of the Pontifical Academy of Social Sciences.