

philippine studies

Ateneo de Manila University · Loyola Heights, Quezon City · 1108 Philippines

Editor's Introduction

Filomeno V. Aguilar Jr.

Philippine Studies vol. 54, no. 2 (2006): 151–152

Copyright © Ateneo de Manila University

Philippine Studies is published by the Ateneo de Manila University. Contents may not be copied or sent via email or other means to multiple sites and posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's written permission. Users may download and print articles for individual, noncommercial use only. However, unless prior permission has been obtained, you may not download an entire issue of a journal, or download multiple copies of articles.

Please contact the publisher for any further use of this work at philstudies@admu.edu.ph.

<http://www.philippinestudies.net>
Fri June 30 13:30:20 2008

Editor's Introduction

Because of the outstanding contribution this two-part article of Fr. John N. Schumacher, S.J., makes to the understanding of the Philippine past, *Philippine Studies* is pleased to waive its usual specifications for the submission of articles and devote the whole issue to it. This landmark work comes from the historian who gifted Philippine historiography with the term "Propaganda Movement," the title of his book that has become an undisputed classic.

In this article Father Schumacher seeks to determine the factual basis for the common assumption that Fr. José Burgos authored the 1864 manifesto, which was signed by "Los Filipinos." Schumacher painstakingly and carefully weighs the evidence, and deploys his vast knowledge of the complex issues that surrounded the struggle for control of parishes between the secular clergy and the regular clergy (the friar orders). The manifesto was a single episode in this protracted struggle, but because of its reverberating influence it became the tangible thread that tied, as Schumacher shows, José Rizal to his brother Paciano; the latter to his mentor, Father Burgos; and Father Burgos to his mentor, Fr. Pedro Peláez. However, the campaign for the secular clergy's right to parishes is transformed with each successive generation, Burgos "racializing" and Rizal "nationalizing" the issue.

In his *Father Jose Burgos: A Documentary History* (1999), Schumacher published a version of the 1864 manifesto based on what had been printed in Hong Kong in 1889. He had not seen the original text that appeared in Madrid, but knew that the 1889 version suffered from interpolations the extent of which he could not fully grasp at that time. Despite physical limitations in doing archival research, he sought ways to identify the original text. As Schumacher recounts, the allusion to an article in *La América* made by Fr. Antolin V. Uy, S.V.D., back in 1984 came back to him, prompting a request to Fernando Palanco Aguado

to locate and copy the article in Madrid's Biblioteca Nacional. A new line of questioning was brought forth by Roberto Blanco Andrés in his doctoral thesis in 2004, and he and Schumacher have since carried on a scholarly debate and exchange of information via electronic mail. This article epitomizes intergenerational collegiality and fulfills the promise of transnational scholarly cooperation. It also embodies Schumacher's scholarly spirit as, given the 1864 text, he is able to admit where he had erred in the past.

The criollos, including Burgos, who crafted the 1864 manifesto were, legally speaking, "Filipinos" in the sense in which the Spanish colonial state used the term to refer to Spaniards born specifically in Las Islas Filipinas. However, as Schumacher emphasizes, the everyday discourse of a *cura indigena*—and of a broader *hijos el pais*—was inclusive of an elite stratum of criollos, Chinese mestizos, and indios. That the 1864 manifesto was a defense of this "native priesthood"—despite the avowals of loyalty to Spain that the later generation of *ilustrados* would also resort to—revealed the stirrings of a creole nationalism, as pointed out by Vicente Rafael in his incisive commentary on Schumacher's article. Played out on a global stage, such stirrings were the offspring of creole nationalism in the Americas: with criollo priests deeply implicated in the revolutions there, their counterparts in the Philippines became politically suspect. But friar hegemony would persist, with the defense of empire, rather than the Church, being the friars' paramount concern. In a textbook case of the law of unintended consequences, by the century's end, Spanish friar nationalism had bred Filipino nationalism, the latter seeking to stand the former on its head.

As Schumacher points out, Rizal was most likely responsible for the interpolations in the manifesto's 1889 version. We know Rizal as a gifted novelist, essayist, and the "scientific" annotator of the Morga. If Schumacher's inference is correct, the 1889 antifriar manifesto gives us Rizal the pamphleteer. As such, absent is the scholarly concern for textual integrity. The presumption might even have existed that Burgos would have approved the corruption of the 1864 text, all for a seemingly unchanging antifriar agenda. A just riposte to friar oppression and underhanded tactics? Pure expediency or a streak of anarchism? What then of the virtuous life that Padre Florentino extolled in the *Fili*?