

philippine studies

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

Recent Perspectives on the Revolution

John N. Schumacher, S.J.

Philippine Studies vol. 30, no. 4 (1982): 445–492

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 27 13:30:20 2008

Recent Perspectives on the Revolution

JOHN N. SCHUMACHER, S.J.

Some writers consider the history of the Revolution to have overly dominated the attention of historians of the Philippines, to the detriment of more important subjects or of ones more relevant to contemporary concerns with the effects of American colonialism and ongoing neocolonialism. Rather than overworked, however, it would seem more accurate to say that the study of the Revolution has until recently scarcely been touched, because of the narrowness of the frameworks within which it has been studied, and the monolithic explanations of the course of events which have been advanced. As a matter of fact, it is arguable, as this essay will attempt to show, that some of the new approaches to Revolutionary historiography are indeed very relevant to our contemporary problems of neocolonialism, agrarian unrest, unjust distribution of the nation's resources and military repression.

Two different types of studies have appeared in the past few years which have opened new perspectives on the Revolution, some of them published, others unfortunately still languishing in microfilm or xerox form and hence known only to university-based scholars. One class of such studies is the numerous dissertations and books devoted to the social history of a particular province or region, which, though not addressing themselves specifically to the Revolution, overlap that period and provide ample evidence that the Revolution had different causes, different effects, and a different character in different regions of the Philippines, thus effectively undercutting monolithic generalizations such as have frequently been made. The other class of studies is comprised of a few works which have directly addressed themselves to the Revolution, but from points of view hitherto unexplored.

A second factor bedeviling Revolutionary historiography has been the looseness of class terminology employed in those works which have tried to explain the Revolution, its successes and failures, in terms of class conflict. Such words as elite, *ilustrados*, *caciques*, *principales* or *principalía*, bourgeoisie, proletarian, plebeian, middle, upper-middle, lower-middle classes, class strata of uneven consciousness, etc., which abound in the literature, cry out for accurate definitions. Even such terms as "the people," *masa*, or the masses are employed by different authors in different senses.

Among the works of the second group, the book which has been the most innovative in its approach, at least as far as Philippine historiography is concerned, is Reynaldo Ileto's *Pasyon and Revolution*.¹ As readers of this quarterly know, it has been the subject of intense discussion between Milagros Guerrero and the author in the pages of this journal during the past year.² To this I would like to add Guerrero's own unpublished doctoral dissertation, "Luzon at War: Contradictions in Philippine Society, 1898-1902," the main substance of which, with the addition of further research into the subject, has recently appeared in the collection on Philippine social history edited by Alfred W. McCoy and Ed. C. de Jesus.³ A third contribution is the section on the Katipunan in the brief study by Fast and Richardson, *Roots of Dependency*.⁴ Finally, without wishing to review my own book,⁵ I would like to indicate how this work complements and supplements the different approaches in the other three works. The assessment of the positive contributions made by each of these works, will

1. Reynaldo Clemeña Ileto, *Pasyon and Revolution: Popular Movements in the Philippines, 1840-1910* (Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1979).

2. Milagros C. Guerrero, "Understanding Philippine Revolutionary Mentality," *Philippine Studies* 29 (1981): 240-56; Reynaldo C. Ileto, "Critical Issues in 'Understanding Philippine Revolutionary Mentality,'" *ibid.* 30 (1982): 92-119.

3. Milagros Guerrero, "Luzon at War: Contradictions in Philippine Society, 1898-1902," (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1977); *idem*, "The Provincial and Municipal Elites of Luzon during the Revolution, 1898-1902," in Alfred W. McCoy & Ed. C. de Jesus, eds., *Philippine Social History: Global Trade and Local Transformations* (Quezon City, Metro Manila: Ateneo de Manila University Press; and Sydney: George Allen & Unwin, 1982), pp. 155-90.

4. Jonathan Fast and Jim Richardson, *Roots of Dependency: Political and Economic Revolution in 19th Century Philippines* (Quezon City: Foundation for Nationalist Studies, 1979), especially pp. 67-112.

5. John N. Schumacher, S.J., *Revolutionary Clergy: The Filipino Clergy and the Nationalist Movement, 1850-1903* (Quezon City, Metro Manila: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1981).

hopefully make clear how complex a phenomenon the Revolution was, and how much remains to be done to give a comprehensive picture of it, not to speak of relating it to contemporary problems.

OVERVIEW OF SOME EARLIER APPROACHES

The earliest accounts of the Revolution, some of them written while the fighting was still going on or shortly thereafter, were largely based on the writings of participants or victims. On the one hand were the accounts of anticlerical or anti-Catholic Filipinos, some of them already holding positions under the American colonial regime, which saw the Revolution principally as a struggle of the Filipinos to free themselves from friar oppression.⁶ Not a few antifriar Spaniards took advantage of such a one-sided approach to place the blame for the Filipino antipathy toward Spain on the friars alone. These accounts provided the basis for American anti-Catholic accounts in English, some of which have kept alive to the present the antifriar stereotypes which fill popular accounts and even some coming from professional historians. The converse of this one-sided approach was the accounts written by a number of friars who had suffered from the Revolution, which with equal myopia attributed the Revolution and its antifriar character solely to an imagined international Masonic conspiracy.⁷ What makes the two different approaches similar was that for all who propounded them, nationalism had scarcely been a factor in the genesis of the Revolution, a conclusion convenient to Americans, Americanistas, and friars alike.

A second major trend in revolutionary historiography is characteristic of the colonial period under American rule, and in some cases persisted even after independence in historians of a traditional cast of mind. The Filipinos who were carrying on the peaceful campaign for eventual independence, intent on building a sense of nationhood and disproving American contentions that further preparation was necessary before independence could be beneficial

6. This was especially true of *Americanistas*, who wanted to downplay the notion of nationalism; e.g., Trinidad H. Pardo de Tavera, *Reseña histórica de Filipinas desde su descubrimiento hasta 1903* (Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1906).

7. E.g., Graciano Martínez, O.S.A., *Memorias del cautiverio* (Manila: Imp. del Colegio de Sto. Tomás, 1900).

to Filipinos, tended to take an exclusively nationalist view, denying or passing over in silence any regional or class conflicts within the revolutionary movement.⁸ All the Filipino protagonists, from Hispanophile reformists to radical revolutionaries became heroes in these accounts, and even the deaths of Bonifacio and Antonio Luna remain shrouded in obscurity.

Under the influence of the peasant revolts of the late 1920s and the 1930s, and of the Communist-led Huk rebellion of the 1940s, the growth of class conflict in Philippine society became an undeniable fact, and there was a move to look back to the Revolution for the roots of that conflict. Mabini himself had long before spoken of the oppression of the poor by the rich under cover of the Revolution, and denounced the landgrabbing in Batangas and other provinces by revolutionary leaders, who abused their new power.⁹ The hint had been almost completely ignored in the years since. The most notable revisionist was Teodoro Agoncillo in his *Revolt of the Masses*, which saw the pre-1896 nationalist movement as merely an ineffective ilustrado reform movement.¹⁰ The Revolution itself emerged from the masses led by the proletarian ideals of Bonifacio, whose leadership was wrested from him by Aguinaldo. In Agoncillo's sequel, *Malolos*, the theme was continued. The American assault of 1898 on Spain offered an opportunity to renew the struggle with more hope of success, and this time the upper-class ilustrados who had held back in 1896 took charge over Aguinaldo. But once conflict with the United States became imminent, the "haves" rapidly went over to the enemy, betraying the revolution of the "have-nots" who were shedding their blood in unequal fight against the new colonialists.¹¹

The theme of class struggle was more recently taken up in more sophisticated and systematic form by Renato Constantino, who recognized that Bonifacio was not of the proletariat but of the

8. E.g., Teodoro M. Kalaw, *The Philippine Revolution* (Manila: The Manila Book Co., 1925). Reprinted in 1969.

9. "Cuestiones en relación con las corporaciones religiosas," in *La Revolución Filipina (con otros documentos de la época)* (Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1931), 2:147-48.

10. Teodoro A. Agoncillo, *The Revolt of the Masses: the Story of Bonifacio and the Katipunan* (Quezon City: University of the Philippines, 1956).

11. Teodoro A. Agoncillo, *Malolos: the Crisis of the Republic* (Quezon City: University of the Philippines, 1960).

lower middle class.¹² He saw the Revolution of 1896 as a people's revolt, the culmination of a long series of revolts down through the centuries, each raising the people's revolutionary consciousness until finally their anger erupted into the Revolution. The quantitative series of rebellions produced a qualitative leap – the revolution of a nation.¹³ However, though Constantino acknowledges Bonifacio to have been of lower middle class origins, he qualifies the term to such an extent that it scarcely differs from proletarian – “lower echelons of the middle class,” “instinctively identified with the masses,” “almost plebeian in status,” “class differentiation was not very marked at the lower levels,” etc. Thus, in the end for Constantino, the Revolution has only an inchoate ideology, the inchoate desires of the people being responsible for the inchoate declarations of Bonifacio. Hence it took the ilustrados to give these desires a more explicit form. At the same time they took care that the resulting creation would carry their imprint, and the Revolution became “a people's war under elite leadership.”¹⁴

NEWER PERSPECTIVES

More recently, Richardson and Fast, though not giving any extended treatment to the war against the Americans, take up Constantino's characterization of the Katipunan and show, conclusively to my mind, that its membership was essentially middle-class. Indeed it was to a large extent ilustrado, if one is to understand that term in its primary sense of an educated man. Emilio Jacinto was a law student; Pio Valenzuela was a fourth year medical student at the time of his initiation into the Katipunan. So too, other original members of the Katipunan had a university education (in Manila) and held positions within the Spanish bureaucracy which demanded at least a certain level of Spanish education, such as that of court clerk.¹⁵ Bonifacio himself, I would add, can be considered ilustrado, even if a self-made one, in spite of his lack of higher formal education. Anyone who was

12. Renato Constantino, *The Philippines: A Past Revisited* (Quezon City: Tala Publishing Services, 1975), p. 162.

13. *Ibid.*, p. 385.

14. *Ibid.*, pp. 163, 165, 166.

15. Fast and Richardson, pp. 70-71.

reading Victor Hugo's *Les misérables*, Carlyle's *History of the French Revolution*, and the *Lives of the American Presidents* in Spanish, among other books, was clearly an educated man by the standards of Manila in the 1890s, undoubtedly much better read in modern thought than many of the more affluent students who frequented the colleges and university in Manila for social prestige rather than out of interest in education.¹⁶

Obviously, as the authors point out, Bonifacio and his educated associates were not ilustrados in the same sense as those who had been educated in the universities of Spain, France, Belgium, and Germany. On the other hand, being an employee of a foreign firm, in Bonifacio's case, gave him opportunities for advancement, and was a position from which many men of later high position and standing in Manila society had begun their careers. It also provided an opportunity to view from the inside the economic protectionism and other obstacles to foreign trade caused by Spain's exploitative economic policy with its harmful effects on the economic well-being of the ordinary Manileño. Similarly the positions of his companions in the Katipunan gave them an insight into the workings of the Spanish administrative bureaucracy with its corruption and inefficiency and put them in a position to analyze the burdens of colonial rule.¹⁷

Richardson and Fast also emphasize the homogeneity between the middle-class urban Katipuneros and the provincial elite — landowners like Aguinaldo and Makabulos, or schoolteachers like Ricarte — who also joined the Katipunan. However, the significant difference was that Bonifacio and his urban comrades were “by the nature of their jobs precluded from senior responsibility, while Aguinaldo, the landowner, [and one might add, Malvar, Mariano Alvarez, Makabulos and other provincial elite] had no social superior in his own milieu. Simply put, the advancement of Bonifacio's career depended largely on his willingness to carry out orders. Aguinaldo's class matrix demanded that he give them.”¹⁸

16. Aguinaldo, though coming from a well-to-do landowning family, spent three years unsuccessfully at San Juan de Letran college and with private tutors, yet never really learned Spanish well. See Carlos Quirino, *The Young Aguinaldo* (Manila: Aguinaldo Centennial Year, 1969), p. 26; Emilio Aguinaldo, *Mga Gunita ng Himagsikan* (N.p., 1964), pp. 14-15.

17. Fast and Richardson, p. 70-71.

18. *Ibid.* pp. 71-74. The quotation is on p. 74.

In conclusion, Richardson and Fast conclude that despite the assertions of some elitist ilustrados at the turn of the century or of subsequent historians, the Katipunan had no socialistic aspirations.¹⁹ They sum up by citing Leon Ma. Guerrero in his biography of Rizal on the lack of social radicalism common alike to Katipunan and Propagandist philosophy, indeed "their basic identity." As Guerrero had put it:

There is nothing in Bonifacio's "Decalogue" or in Jacinto's *Kartilla* that hints at the expropriation and distribution among the workers of the great landed estates, at the seizure of mines, banks, corporations and other private enterprises, at the equalization of wealth or even of opportunity, or even at the organization of labor unions to protect the workers from sweatshop wages and hours.²⁰

The identity of the philosophy of the Propaganda Movement and of the Katipunan had earlier been stressed both by Cesar Majul in his study, *The Political and Constitutional Ideas of the Philippine Revolution*²¹ and by myself in *The Propaganda Movement*.²² The merit of Richardson and Fast is to have analyzed not only the writings of the leaders of the Katipunan, but to have examined the membership itself. Moreover, they draw the further conclusion, implicit in the earlier works of myself and of Majul but not drawn out, of it being essentially a bourgeois ideology, socially conservative, and, as the title of the chapter on Katipunan ideology puts it: "A Product of the Times."²³

19. Isabelo de los Reyes, who was already dabbling in socialist and anarchist writings, and who would later introduce them to the Philippines, spoke of the Katipunan as intended to introduce into the Philippines a "communistic republic," a conclusion supporting his ideological leanings at that particular moment. Florentino Torres, about to be appointed by the Americans attorney-general of the Philippines testified before the Taft Commission that the Katipunan was "socialistic." To one like Torres who had found the Propaganda Movement too radical, and who was among the first to go over to the Americans, the Katipunan no doubt seemed "socialistic."

20. Leon Ma. Guerrero, *The First Filipino*, p. 431, cited in Fast and Richardson, p. 84.

21. Cesar A. Majul, *The Political and Constitutional Ideas of the Philippine Revolution* (Quezon City: University of the Philippines, 1957), p. 15 and passim.

22. John N. Schumacher, *The Propaganda Movement: 1880-1895. The Creators of a Filipino Consciousness, the Makers of Revolution* (Manila: Solidaridad, 1973), pp. 207-8, 272; also "The Propagandists' Reconstruction of the Philippine Past," in Anthony Reid and David Marr, eds., *Perceptions of the Past in Southeast Asia* (Singapore: Heinemann Educational Books [Asia] Ltd., 1979), pp. 269-78.

23. Fast and Richardson, pp. 75-84.

In the extensive and incisive survey of revolutionary historiography which forms the first chapter of Milagros Guerrero's unpublished doctoral dissertation, she pointed out that in spite of the concern for the role of the masses expressed by major historians from Agoncillo onward, all (with the exception of Iletto's then unpublished dissertation) had in fact examined the Revolution from the point of view of the elite rather than that of the masses, from above rather than from below.²⁴ Richardson and Fast emphasize this fact likewise, in accordance with their analysis of the Katipunan. In one chapter they treat briefly of some of the economic causes of unrest, and point out those which would have affected the poor, so as to make them receptive to the call for revolution, particularly the growing importation of rice and the protectionist policy of Spain against the cheap British textiles used by the poor.²⁵ Thus the poor would have seen Spain as responsible not only for the unjust laws and the abuses of the Guardia Civil, but also for the "economic tensions created within native society by the transition from subsistence to cash-crop agriculture."²⁶ However, other aspects of the economic pressures on the poor are not pursued at any length,²⁷ and to what extent they put there the primary responsibility for mass unrest is not fully clear.

24. Guerrero, "Luzon at War," pp. 24-28.

25. Fast and Richardson, pp. 94-95.

26. *Ibid.*, p. 96.

27. The statement that the hatred against the friars was not confined to an educated minority but extended to all levels of society, especially in Laguna and Cavite, where most of the friar haciendas were located, is supported only by a self-serving statement of Primo de Rivera. This certainly cannot be sustained in any way for the non-Tagalog provinces, as I have shown, among other places in my *Revolutionary Clergy*, for all the dioceses outside Manila. Even in the Tagalog provinces it was largely confined to the elite — and those of the little people whom they dominated or terrorized. As far as unrest on the friar haciendas is concerned, I have never encountered any evidence for it among the *kasamá*, except in the well-known statement of Isabelo de los Reyes in his antifriar tract, *La sensacional memoria. De los Reyes' credibility on such subjects is almost nil. There was discontent on the friar haciendas, but it was among the middle and upper-middle class inquilinos, or other local and provincial elite who were anxious to get their hands on these lands, not among the kasamá.* See my "Church Lands and Philippine Socio-economic Development," *Philippine Studies* 25 (1977):466-67; and Jose N. Endriga, "The Friar Lands Settlement: Promise and Performance," *Philippine Journal of Public Administration* 14 (1970): 397-413, especially p. 410, where Emilio Aguinaldo is shown in 1907 to have been leasing 1,050 hectares of the former Recoleta hacienda of Imus at 20 centavos per hectare yearly! Others of his class had equally profited by the agitation against the friar haciendas, as did a number of American corporations. As will be seen below, there was more widespread antifriar agitation after 1900, but it did not come from all classes, nor from all provinces; quite the contrary. But as far as the Filipino

THE "REVOLUTION FROM BELOW"

As has already been pointed out, the attempts to portray the Revolution as a "people's war" fail to take account of the class character of the Katipunan. Other historians, apart from those who gratuitously suppose that the circulation of nationalist ideas by the Propagandists and the Katipuneros, written in Spanish and Tagalog, could have reached the Filipino people as a whole, have generally explained the adherence of the masses to the Revolution in terms of patron-client relationships existing between landlords and their tenants as well as of principales and caciques with their subjects or followers.²⁸ Thus the abandonment of the Revolution by the elite would likewise lead to its abandonment by the ordinary people who were their followers. Yet in fact we know that the transfer of allegiance by an important element of the elite of the Malolos government did not bring about a cessation of resistance; the Filipino-American war was indeed just beginning.²⁹

peasant masses were concerned, the friar lands sale achieved only a change of ultimate masters, and, as was to appear later, worse working conditions.

An economic effect of the transition to the commercial crop economy which was indeed affecting the peasants and driving them to violence was what was happening in Nueva Ecija, Tarlac, and eastern Pangasinan (the territory of the Guardia de Honor) in the formation of haciendas, as treated in detail in Marshall S. McLennan, *The Central Luzon Plain: Land and Society on the Inland Frontier* (Manila: Alemar-Phoenix, 1980), and more succinctly in his "Changing Human Ecology on the Central Luzon Plain: Nueva Ecija, 1705-1939," in McCoy and de Jesus, eds., *Philippine Social History*, pp. 57-90; and Brian Fegan, "The Social History of a Central Luzon Barrio," *ibid.*, pp. 91-130, for northern Bulacan (Santa Iglesia territory).

28. 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. I would think that the term caciques is roughly equivalent to Norman Owen's "super-principales" as he defines them in "The Principalía in Philippine History: Kabikolan, 1790-1898," *Philippine Studies* 22 (1974): 319-20, though Owen himself does not make this identification.

29. Here again distinctions must be made as to what kind of "elite" deserted the Malolos government by early 1899. Men like Cayetano Arellano, Gregorio Araneta, Florentino Torres, Benito Legarda, T.H. Pardo de Tavera were an upper class even among the cosmopolitan or national elite, by their wealth and intellectual distinction. Other European-educated ilustrados who should also because of wealth and education be termed cosmopolitan or national elite, like Antonio Luna, Jose Alejandrino, Fernando Canon, Teodoro Sandiko — all generals — to speak only of the military, did not defect. Perhaps significantly, most of these were younger men, the Propagandists of the 1880s and 1890s.

Nor did the abject surrender, and even welcome, given by the Negros hacenderos to the Americans stop Papa Isio's band of Babaylanes from carrying on the struggle against the Americans under the banner of the Malolos Republic.³⁰ Even the capture of Aguinaldo and the surrender of other major generals in the first half of 1901 did not bring an immediate end to the fighting, as the campaigns in Samar and Batangas of 1902 make clear.

ILETO'S *PASYON AND REVOLUTION*

A closer examination of the revolution from below has long been overdue. The first and most creative such attempt was that of Iletto's *Pasyon and Revolution*, a book which has aroused much interest and at the same time considerable controversy, as exemplified in the pages of this journal and elsewhere. The object of much enthusiastic attention and uncritical acceptance when it was still in unpublished dissertation form, it has subsequently been seriously questioned.³¹ In large part this has been due, in my own opinion as well as that of Iletto, to such over-facile misrepresentations of the thesis of his book as the notion that the *Pasyon produced* the Revolution, or that the *Pasyon* became the ideology of the "Little Tradition."³² As I understand his position, however, the *Pasyon* is to be considered a Filipino folk epic embodying different levels of meaning.

To be sure, the core of the *Pasyon* was the Gospel story of Jesus and the whole cosmic history of salvation contained in the Scriptures and handed on to the Filipino people by the Spanish missionaries. It was not, however, formed simply by repeating the biblical story; nor was the *Pasyon Pilapil* of the nineteenth century merely an expanded version of the *Pasyon* written in 1703 by

30. For the Babaylanes, see Evelyn Cullamar, "Babaylanism in Negros, 1896-1907," (M.A. thesis, Ateneo de Manila University, 1975); also Ma. Fe Hernaez Romero, *Negros Occidental between Two Powers (1888-1909)* ([Bacolod]: Negros Occidental Historical Commission, 1974), pp. 168-88.

31. The original title of the dissertation was "Pasion and the Interpretation of Change in Tagalog Society (ca. 1840-1912)," Cornell University, 1975. As may be seen, the original title applied the thesis only to Tagalog society. The book extends it to Filipino society in general, which, as will be seen below, is much more dubious.

32. Iletto, "Critical Issues," pp. 95-97.

Gaspar Aquino de Belen,³³ but contained numerous accretions and alterations proceeding from folk sensibilities.³⁴ Martínez de Zúñiga had lamented this very fact at the beginning of the nineteenth century, and it was perhaps in response to such complaints that Fr. Mariano Pilapil was commissioned to correct the heterodox ideas which the clergy felt had infiltrated the text.³⁵ If Pilapil's text has been judged inferior from a literary point of view to that of Aquino de Belen's, it certainly proved more popular, and it seems hard to deny Iletto's emphasis on it as the folk epic of the Tagalogs par excellence. As he remarks, the question of authorship is irrelevant; it had become part of Tagalog folk sensibility.³⁶ What the author(s) intended, or what Fr. Pilapil had found sufficiently orthodox to receive the ecclesiastical stamp of approval, was not the only level of meaning possible, nor the meaning which all the hearers of its chanting might take. Here, it seems to me, Iletto is surely correct in saying that "a text is capable of generating multiple meanings in relation to audience or context . . ." ³⁷

The problem raised by Guerrero in her review article, alluding to a statement of my own in regard to the necessity of taking into account the Catholic character of Filipino nineteenth-century society in order to "explain the responses of the people, ilustrado and tao alike, to colonial rule," is that, as she says, "a linguistic unity among divergent groups of Filipinos insofar as the Catholic character of nationalist expression is concerned," existed.³⁸ This

33. The Aquino de Belen Pasyon limited itself (apart from certain prayers added) to the Passion story itself; the Pasyon Pilapil contained the whole history of salvation from creation to the end of the world. Iletto speaks of it being "to a large extent based upon De Belen's earlier pasyon," (*Pasyon*, p. 16). However, Lumbera, whom he cites, actually speaks of only three passages which were plagiarized; hence it would seem to be an essentially new work, twice as long as its predecessor, as Lumbera notes (*Bienvenido Lumbera, "Consolidation of Tradition in Nineteenth-Century Tagalog Poetry," Philippine Studies* 17 (1969): 389-91).

34. These would no doubt be the effect of the people's preference for their own pasyon, decried by Fr. Martínez de Zúñiga in note 35.

35. Joaquín Martínez de Zúñiga, *Estadismo de las Islas Filipinas*, ed. W.E. Retana (Madrid: Minuesa de los Ríos, 1893), 1:291 in his discussion of the province of Tondo, speaks of a printed Tagalog version of the Pasyon by a Franciscan, of which nothing else appears to be known. He goes on to say that the people preferred "other *Pasiones* which they themselves have composed. . . ." These he claimed to be full of fables and marvels. It is evident that these other Pasyons must have been handwritten copies.

36. Iletto, "Critical Issues," pp. 106-7.

37. *Ibid.*, p. 94.

38. Guerrero, "Understanding Philippine Revolutionary Mentality," p. 243.

same point has been put more graphically in another review of Iletto's book by Richardson, in which he illustrates his point by citing Rizal's well-known letter, "To the Young Women of Malolos," in Tagalog.³⁹ Here he points out the use by Rizal of such key words of Iletto's thesis as *loob*, *matuid*, *ginhawa*, *liwanag*; and comments that a sequel could be written to Iletto's book entitled *Pasyon and Bourgeois Reform*. To this sally, I believe Iletto would reply, as he does to Guerrero, that "distinctions between elite and mass thinking can be delineated only in the popular interpretation (using units of meaning in the Pasyon) of concrete historical events" Only the analysis of both text and context can make this clear in the concrete.⁴⁰

ILETO'S STRUCTURAL METHODOLOGY

I believe that the real issue between Iletto and Guerrero in these two articles is over methodology, specifically the so-called structural method, which takes its origin from the anthropological theory of Claude Levi-Strauss, and has subsequently found application in philosophy, literature, and biblical studies, as well as history. As Iletto remarks, numerous historians have made use of Levi-Strauss' insights, citing the well-known Fernand Braudel of the famous French "*Annales* school" as an example. What should be added is that though historians generally recognize the value of Braudel's contributions, by no means are all fully in agreement with him on the question of methodology.⁴¹ The same can be said of the other fields to which the structural method has been applied.

39. Jim Richardson, "Revolution or Religious Experience?," *Journal of Contemporary Asia* 10 (1980): 317-18.

40. Iletto, "Critical Issues," p. 95. However, Iletto does not explain why only the masses could be moved by a certain level of understanding or interpretation. This appears to be economic class determinism in another form. Moreover, he objects to Guerrero's and my use of the term "Catholic" or even "religious" to describe the images in appeals made by the elite deriving from the Pasyon, because "the term 'Catholic' . . . seems to presuppose certain institutionalized meanings in mass religious behavior and in the Pasyon. . . ." (p. 94). This statement seems to presuppose a univocity in the understanding of what is "Catholic" which few but ultraconservative modern theologians would accept. There is no reason to say that different levels of meaning in the Pasyon could not be equally Catholic, and they were so in fact.

41. "Critical Issues," p. 97, n. 9. For a recent critique of Braudel, see Bernard Bailyn, "The Challenge of Modern Historiography," *American Historical Review* 87 (1982): 4-5, and the references cited in n. 8.

For myself, I have no doubt that the methodology is a fruitful one, or at least can be if properly used. And indeed, it seems clear to me that Iletto has made good use of the method to give us a new perspective on the Revolution and its antecedents, an insight into the "revolution from below" which the use of traditional patron-client relationships and of Marxist categories has failed to provide. Most convincing to me is Iletto's analysis of the *Cofradía de San José* of Apolinario de la Cruz, and of the so-called "colorum" sects which sprang from its remnants on Mount Banahaw and exist to the present day.⁴² That the group led by Sebastian Caneo in 1896 to aid the Katipunan-initiated Revolution belongs to the same strain is also convincingly demonstrated.⁴³ But when the same categories are applied to the Katipunan, the evidence is to me much less convincing. If with Richardson and Fast, Guerrero, and myself, one accepts an essential continuity between the philosophy of the Propaganda Movement and of the Katipunan, alternate explanations impose themselves, or at least become more plausible, with regard to various incidents interpreted by Iletto as manifestations of peasant perceptions of events in terms of the *Pasyon*.

One such instance is the support initially given by the colorum followers of Sebastian Caneo to the Revolution and the subsequent efforts of Aguinaldo's government to suppress them in 1898 because they were urging "the *gente proletaria* to abandon

42. Iletto, *Pasyon*, chapter 2. Iletto remarks that it was by his observation of the Watawat ng Lahi peasant society that he was confirmed in the direction of his thinking. Having recently read the lengthy Tagalog account of the life of Agapito Ilustrísimo, founder of the Samahan Tatlong Persona Solo Dios, who are centered in barrio Kinabuhayan on Mt. Banahaw, as reconstructed by Fr. Vicente Marasigan, S.J., who spent several months with them, I could not miss the close relationship to the descendants of Hermano Pule. But I would not call either the Watawat group or the Samahan *typical* peasants.

43. Iletto, *Pasyon*, pp. 93-97. But that they were "just like the Katipunan of the Sons of the People at the time brotherly love had not been dissolved," as Santiago Alvarez was to say at the time he wrote his account in 1927 does not square at all with Telesforo Canseco's 1897 account of the two groups, to neither of which was Canseco sympathetic. It is possible that Alvarez' recollections of the early days of the Katipunan had become excessively romanticized, since Canseco notes that in 1897 "Santiago Alvarez, a revolutionary general, was deposed from his position and degraded for the abuses he had committed, . . . especially with women. . . ." ("Historia de la insurrección filipina en Cavite," cited in my *Readings in Philippine Church History* [Quezon City: Loyola School of Theology, Ateneo de Manila University, 1979], p. 273). Since it was Alvarez who had introduced Aguinaldo to the Katipunan in 1895, it is understandable that he should have found more brotherhood then than later.

their fields, to the detriment of the landlords.”⁴⁴ Since by this time the followers of Caneo were calling themselves the “Katipunán ni San Cristóbal” (from Mt. San Cristóbal where they had their origin), Iletó suggests that as a result of the general dislocation following on the war with Spain, Caneo interpreted the war as “tantamount to a cataclysm leading to a total reordering of the universe,” a theme of the Pasyon. As a result,

the Colorums were mobilized by Caneo to support it wholeheartedly, inspired by the promise of a perfect society in which the faithful of the earth would be united in a community of brotherhood and equality. The style of Bonifacio’s Katipunán, its use of traditional imagery and its ethos of brotherhood, encouraged this fusion of popular “religious” aspirations and new patriotic goals. Caneo’s use of the Katipunán name in late 1898, at a time when the original secret society was proscribed by the government, suggests that the Katipunán ethos lived on and gave form to hopes that the revolution would still run its course.⁴⁵

That Caneo’s followers interpreted the Revolution as the cataclysm leading to the millenium as found in the Pasyon is indeed probable. However, the fact that they used the name “Katipunán” to designate their association or brotherhood need not connect them with Bonifacio’s Katipunán. The word, it is true, has acquired since the Revolution a connotation of Bonifacio’s revolutionary organization. But its obvious meaning of “association” had existed in Tagalog long before Bonifacio appropriated the name, and it seems rash to say that anyone using the word in 1898 had Bonifacio’s organization in mind.⁴⁶ Hence the idea that the ethos of Caneo’s association was that of Bonifacio rests on the supposition that the Katipunán of Bonifacio had been inspired by such an ethos of brotherhood and equality of all men, something which the analyses of the class composition of the original Katipunán cited above belie.

44. Iletó, *Pasyon*, p. 148.

45. *Ibid.*, pp. 148-49.

46. Iletó, *Pasyon*, p. 101, enumerates a number of religious *katipunans* existing before the Katipunán of Bonifacio, but implies that all were popular organizations with a “common language.” But there seems to me to be no reason why there could not be and were not *katipunans* which had no “common language” and/or were not popular organizations, just as there were many peasant *cofradías* quite different in spirit and perceptions from that of Apolinario.

Analysis of Katipunan Documents. This continuity between the Propagandist philosophy and that of the Katipunan likewise impels the reader to look elsewhere than to the Pasyon for two other key documents of the Katipunan to which Iletto applies his structural analysis in some detail. One is Bonifacio's manifesto in the Katipunan newspaper *Kalayaan*, "Ang Dapat Mabatid ng mga Tagalog" (What the Tagalogs should know);⁴⁷ the other is the Katipunan initiation rite.⁴⁸ In both of them Iletto finds a Lost Eden/Fall/Redemption sequence, which he notes, is a structural feature of the Pasyon.

Rizal is acknowledged by Iletto to have been the source of the historical content of Bonifacio's manifesto. In his annotations to the *Sucesos de las Islas Filipinas* of Morga, and in his major essay "Sobre la indolencia del Filipino," Rizal sketches the pre-Hispanic past of the Filipinos, contrasting their happy state with the present degradation to which they have been submitted in the name of Spain and Catholicism. The content of Bonifacio's manifesto in its picture of the past and of the present has scarcely a phrase which cannot be found in Spanish in Rizal's writings, and the literary dependence of this part — the major portion — on Rizal is, I think, undeniable.⁴⁹ Iletto, however, makes the point of his analysis not the content but the structure, which indeed is that of the Pasyon, as shown by "the temporal ordering of the speech in a Lost Eden/Fall/Redemption sequence."⁵⁰ What he fails to notice, however, is that the temporal sequence is precisely that of Rizal in his introduction to the *Sucesos* of Morga.⁵¹ The second source of his analysis is the language used. But here again, one would have to raise the point made by Richardson — that when Rizal is translated into Tagalog, the terms characteristic of a Pasyon mentality are often precisely the ones used. These facts

47. Iletto, *Pasyon*, pp. 102-9.

48. *Ibid.*, pp. 114-22.

49. Iletto (*Pasyon*, p. 103) acknowledges that Rizal had written about a flourishing pre-Hispanic civilization in his annotations to the book of Morga. However, it is not merely a general similarity of concept which we are speaking about, but strict literary dependence in specific ideas and phrases.

50. Iletto, "Critical Issues," p. 104.

51. See Rizal's programmatic presentation of his work in the preface to his edition of Morga, quoted in Schumacher, "Propagandists' Reconstruction," in Reid and Marr, *Perceptions*, p. 272. For the details of Rizal's reconstruction of the past in the Morga edition and in his essays "Filipinas dentro de cien años," and "Sobre la indolencia del Filipino," see *ibid.*, pp. 272-77.

do not disprove the contention of Iletto that Bonifacio is using the *pasyon* form, but they provide an adequate alternative explanation — that Rizal is the source not only of Bonifacio's content, but also of the form and language.

The dependence of the Katipunan initiation ritual on Masonic formulas is likewise acknowledged by Iletto, who says: "outwardly, they appear to be Masonic. But if they were truly so, could unlettered peasants have embraced the Katipunan as truly their own? . . ." ⁵² In support of the answer implied in this rhetorical question, he cites Isabelo de los Reyes (who was not a member of the Katipunan and who was imprisoned in Spain from shortly after the outbreak of the 1896 Revolution until late 1901) to the effect that "at first, [Katipunan leaders] adopted the Masonic formulas, but later simplified them to the cultural level of the members, who belonged to the workman and peasant classes." ⁵³ De los Reyes was, of course, an *ilustrado* who later introduced socialist and anarchist writings into the Philippines for the nascent labor movement he would organize in 1902, and was in any case a far from reliable source of facts, even if he had access to them. ⁵⁴ On the other hand, even if we were to ignore the evidence given previously of the middle-class character of the Katipunan, as well as De los Reyes' absence from the events, what is presented here is not the initiation ritual of Bonifacio, but one used in 1900. ⁵⁵ Moreover its Masonic character is very clear, however much it may have been simplified — "to take parts in the work of the temple," "profane man," the form of questioning the valor of the aspirant, the reference to "the true light," and the penalties which the initiate calls down on himself if he should

52. Iletto, *Pasyon*, p. 114.

53. *La religión del Katipunan*, p. 202, cited in Iletto, *ibid.*

54. For de los Reyes, see the biographical sketch in Gregorio F. Zaide, *Great Filipinos in History* (Manila: Verde Book Store, 1970), pp. 457-63. De los Reyes was not a member of the Katipunan, was imprisoned in January 1897, and afterwards deported to Spain, from which he did not return until October 1901. Undoubtedly he knew something about the Katipunan, but if he is correct about the simplification of the initiation ritual, he must be referring to Aguinaldo's practice of initiating members in broad daylight in the Kawit tribunal, simply by their inscribing their names in blood (Aguinaldo, *Mga Gunita*, pp. 45-46). Moreover, his interpretation of the Katipunan as socialist or plebeian, besides having been already refuted, is to be seen in the context of his interest in socialism after being released from prison in Barcelona in 1898.

55. Iletto, *Pasyon*, p. 115. Many katipunans were being organized by 1900, without any connection with that of Bonifacio.

violate his oath.⁵⁶ Though one might possibly interpret the ritual in terms of “an experience analogous to Christ’s redemptive act,”⁵⁷ in the absence of other compelling evidence, and in the light of the acknowledged Masonic origin of the initiation ritual, it is more convincing to interpret it in the light of the known facts about the middle-class character of the Katipunan.

The two instances just analyzed, that of the manifesto of Bonifacio and that of the initiation ritual, indicate the fundamental criticism which many historians will make of the use of the structural method — what are its limits? The method has certainly been fruitful as a heuristic device, but as acknowledged by Iletto, the structural parallelism and the different levels of meaning which a “master text” like the *Pasyon* is capable of, do not appear from the content of the text itself but from the “contextual signification of the words and imagery” which determines the level of meaning here.⁵⁸ But this will be determined by the historian’s evaluation of that context, which he will achieve by an analysis of the evidence for such a context, an “analysis of the concrete struggles” of the Revolution, as Iletto puts it elsewhere.⁵⁹ This analysis is also the work of the pejoratively termed “traditional historian,” but which I believe Iletto has himself done in connection with the followers of Hermano Pule and the Colorums of Mt. San Cristobal.⁶⁰

ASSESSMENT OF ILETO’S BOOK

To conclude this perhaps over-lengthy section, my own view is that Iletto’s book has shown the existence of a strain of thought and of perception, dependent to a large extent on the *Pasyon*,

56. Not all of these elements appear in Iletto’s quotation, but they are found in John R.M. Taylor, *The Philippine Insurrection against the United States: A Compilation of Documents with Notes and an Introduction* (Pasay City: Eugenio Lopez Foundation, 1971) 1:219, in English translation only, as is also true of the document in the Philippine Revolutionary Records from which Taylor copied. No Tagalog original has been found.

57. Iletto, *Pasyon*, p. 115.

58. Iletto, “Critical Issues,” pp. 95, 104.

59. *Ibid.*, p. 95.

60. It is because the verification of the meaning of the language in the context is done much more thoroughly and with more available factual evidence in the treatment of Hermano Pule and his followers, I find myself convinced of the level of understanding to be given to it in a way which I do not find concerning the Katipunan, where too many inferences are made on dubious or incorrect evidence. It is not the method, but the possibility of its application in a particular case which seems insufficiently justified.

which was present in nineteenth and early twentieth century Philippine society and operative in, but not controlled by, the Revolution against Spain. What I am not convinced of is that this was the *dominant* mode of perception of Bonifacio or of the Katipunan as an organization. That it existed among the masses of the Tagalog region who joined in the Revolution, at times in ways quite disturbing to the elite leaders, such as the Pensacola brothers with their doctrine that "it was already time for the rich to be poor and for the poor to become rich"⁶¹ is also convincing, though individual incidents or groups are in need of further research to determine precisely what the context of their perceptions of a new world was. As I have experienced myself in a series of seminars on twentieth-century social unrest in the Philippines, it is possible to re-read many of the movements studied by Sturtevant in the light of the methodology used by Iletto and to gain much new insight into them, even up to the present, not only in such groups as the Iglesia Watawat ng Lahi and other sects of a similar nature clustered around Mt. Banahaw,⁶² but also in remnants of the followers of Apong Ipe in Candaba, Pampanga, studied in the latter part of Iletto's book up to the death of the leader of the Santa Iglesia in 1912.⁶³ Iletto has made a valuable contribution to the methodology of Philippine historiography, which is capable of illuminating whole layers of the history of our people "from below" in a way which has scarcely yet been thought of. What is needed is further refinement of the method, and the establishment of controls as to the extent of its applicability.

With regard to the historiography of the Revolution, it should be clear that I do not regard the Pasyon perception of reality as

61. Iletto, *Pasyon*, p. 147; Guerrero, "Luzon at War," pp. 170-75.

62. Fr. Vicente Marasigan, S.J., has spent several months living among the Samahan Tatlong Persona Solo Dios, and assembled the account preserved among them of Ama - Agapito Ilustrisimo - who, interestingly enough, had originally been a *pulahan* in the Visayas. The account of their history, over 100 pages in Tagalog, is replete with symbolic actions, and there are definite strains of imagery and thought which have affinity with the language of Apolinario de la Cruz. Other scholars are engaged in studying some of the other sects, though their methodological presuppositions vary. Professor Prospero Covar has pioneered with his studies on the Iglesia Watawat ng Lahi.

63. Iletto, *Pasyon*, pp. 259-313. Fr. Cesar Vergara, a former student of mine, has done an initial unpublished study of the contemporary followers of Felipe Salvador. Interestingly, they are almost all tenants of well-to-do Roman Catholic landlords of Baliwag, Bulacan. Further research is needed on the relation between religious affiliation and socioeconomic status in the area.

the key to the Revolution or even to the Katipunan. It was *one* of the strains of mass participation, but not the only one, and probably not the most important one, but clearly demonstrated thus far only for the people's movements stemming from Hermano Pule and his Cofradía de San José, and possibly also that of Felipe Salvador. The larger part of mass participation in the Revolution has to be explained on other grounds.

The principal reasons, apart from the discussion of the Katipunan above, which lead me to this conclusion are two. First, the Pasyon tradition as described by Iletto can only be shown to have existed in the Tagalog provinces.⁶⁴ Second, the religious tradition which was evidently behind many of these movements from below was wider than that of the Pasyon, even in the Tagalog region. Both of these statements need proof.

The Pasyon Tradition. The Pasyon Pilapil, on whose analysis the thesis has been based, inasmuch as it replaced that of Aquino de Belen, is the only Philippine pasyon of sufficient antiquity to have created the tradition presupposed in the method of analysis used here.⁶⁵ For, with the exception of Ilokano, the first published pasyon in any of the other principal Philippine languages dates from the second half of the nineteenth century. The earliest listed by Retana is an anonymous one from Pangasinan reprinted in 1855. Neither Retana nor Pardo de Tavera are aware of the first edition, but since it is merely a reprint, and not a new edition with corrections or additions such as are found in the Tagalog and Ilokano pasyons, it may be legitimately supposed to have been printed for the first time shortly before.⁶⁶ Moreover there is another Pangasinan pasyon from 1861, of quite different character and length, which would seem to indicate that there was no long pasyon tradition in Pangasinan.⁶⁷

64. Iletto, "Critical Issues," p. 104, disputes this objection of Guerrero ("Understanding Philippine Revolutionary Mentality," p. 245) and maintains that "a region with friars and churches that did not have some version of the Pasyon has yet to be shown." The burden of proof rather seems to me to rest on Iletto.

65. Retana, *Aparato bibliográfico de la historia general de Filipinas* (Madrid: Minuesa de los Ríos, 1906), no. 845, 2:635, considers that no pasyon was published before that of Aquino de Belen, and, secondly, the 1814 Pilapil pasyon, except for the Ilokano one by Megia. With regard to Megia, he is mistaken, as will be seen below in the text to note 72.

66. Retana, *Aparato*, no. 882, 2:646; T.H. Pardo de Tavera, *Biblioteca Filipina* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1903), no. 1934, p. 301.

67. Retana, *Aparato*, no. 987, 2:682-83.

In Bikolano, the first *pasyon*, recorded in a second edition, was apparently written by Tranquilino Hernandez, but edited by Bishop Gaínza in 1868. Since the dedication by Hernandez to Gaínza is dated 1866, Retana concludes with good reason that the first edition must have been from 1866 or early 1867.⁶⁸ In Kapampangan the first published *pasyon* was that by the diocesan priest, Fr. Dionisio Macapinlac, which appeared in 1876.⁶⁹

The first *pasyon* to be published in Hiligaynon was the work of the popular religious writer, Mariano Perfecto, and appeared only in 1884. The censor specifically recommends it as a remedy for the multitude of manuscript *pasyons* in circulation, "filled with errors and astonishing barbarisms."⁷⁰ Though it is clear therefore that there were manuscript *pasyons* in Hiligaynon, and probably in other languages, before the second half of the nineteenth century, the lack of any standardized printed text over a long period, such as existed with the Pilapil *pasyon* (which was reprinted, according to Retana, "multitud de veces")⁷¹ would make difficult the formation of a pattern of *pasyon*-based perceptions common to a whole linguistic group. Moreover, it does not appear that any of the other *pasyons* listed above dealt with the whole history of salvation in apocalyptic fashion as the *Pasyon Pilapil* does, and hence would not lead to an integrated world-view in the way that the *Pasyon Pilapil* could.

The only *pasyon* which at first sight could hold the distinction of antiquity and widespread use is the Ilokano *pasyon* by Megía. However, its most thorough investigator has shown that although it was probably *written* before 1627 it was *published* only in 1845, hitherto having existed only in manuscript copies.⁷² Moreover, the text was originally written by St. Vincent Ferrer in the fifteenth century, and only translated by Megía into Ilokano. Finally, it was meant to be read from the pulpit, not chanted by the people.⁷³

68. *Id.*, no. 1179, 2:743.

69. *Ibid.*, no. 1528, 2:841.

70. *Ibid.*, no. 3209, 3:1244.

71. *Ibid.*, no. 845, 2:635.

72. "Megía's *Pasion*: a Historico-Critical Study," in Marcelino A. Foronda, Jr., and Juan A. Foronda, *Samtoy: Essays on Iloko History and Culture* (Manila: United Publishing Co., 1972), pp. 122, 125-27.

73. *Ibid.*, pp. 122-25.

The Wider Religious Tradition. The second point concerning the existence and influence of a wider religious traditional idiom in which people conceptualized the meaning of major events in life does not invalidate Iletto's methodology, though it calls for more caution in the way it is applied. More important, it would help to explain the existence of a religious tradition elsewhere which at least partly served the function the Pasyon Pilapil did in the Tagalog provinces. The chief vehicle of this tradition was the hundreds of different novenas and *devocionarios* which are to be found in every major Philippine language. Many of them, of course, are in large part or even completely, translations of novenas from other languages, mostly Spanish. But just as the Spanish legendary hero Bernardo Carpio, was appropriated by a Tagalog *awit*-writer and in the course of time became a vehicle for mediating the ordinary Tagalog's consciousness of his past, as Iletto has elsewhere elaborated,⁷⁴ so too did these novenas of European origin become transmuted into indigenous forms of popular prayer and religious thought. It is arguable, I believe, that it was the novenas which did more to form folk religious perceptions, for better or worse, than did the catechisms memorized by rote in the primary schools.⁷⁵

It would appear that only a fraction of these novenas have been recorded by bibliographers, yet they have been reprinted over and over again since the eighteenth century right up to the present day, not to speak of the numerous handwritten copies which must have circulated even earlier, and continued to circulate after printed ones became common.⁷⁶ All of this literature, which eventually

74. R.C. Iletto, "Tagalog Poetry and Image of the Past during the War against Spain," in Reid and Marr, *Perceptions*, pp. 379-400.

75. For the ineffectiveness of the catechism in the nineteenth century, see Schumacher, *Readings*, pp. 237, 238. On the other hand, this was the period of great flourishing of the novenas and *devocionarios*.

76. Such bibliographies as Retana, Pardo de Tavera, Isagani Medina's *Filipiniana Materials in the National Library*, the *Catalogue of Filipiniana Materials in the Lopez Memorial Museum*, etc. all list numerous such publications, yet my own experience with students analyzing the considerable number to be found in the Special Collections of the Rizal Library of the Ateneo de Manila University, is that there is relatively little overlapping among the various collections, so that the total production must have been far greater. Moreover, since these novenas continue to be reprinted year after year, one may find that a particular novena goes back to the time of Archbishop Basilio Sancho de Sta. Justa y Rufina (1767-87), who grants the indulgence which prefaces the novena, even though the publication date on the title page may be of the twentieth century. To judge from the novenas I have examined in Tagalog, Archbishop Sancho must have been a great promoter of novenas.

assumed a stylized structure, may prove to have been of greater formative influence on folk-consciousness than even the Pasyon among the Tagalogs, and to have supplied for the lack of an extensive pasyon tradition among other linguistic groups of Filipinos. Obviously these novenas were religious in purpose, but as Iletto has observed, the distinction between religious and secular was not part of folk consciousness in the period before the end of the nineteenth century at least.⁷⁷

One illustration of the role these novenas played in people's thought is that Diego Mojica, Minister of Finance in the Magdiwang government, was a writer of popular religious literature, and early in the Revolution of 1896 composed a novena in the traditional style "to ask God for the triumph of the independence of the country." But, the novena went on to beg, "if that were not fitting for God our Lord and for the Blessed Virgin and for our Mother the Church . . . [we ask] that Spain might not punish with all rigor those who had risen in arms against her."⁷⁸ Following the traditional novena structure, there were a series of *Gozos* (Joys). These were ordinarily Petitions made through the "joys" of the life of the Blessed Virgin or of the saint to whom the novena was addressed. One of the *gozos* of Mojica's novena asked: "May [the Spaniards'] bullets become mud, and their powder turn into water."⁷⁹ The narrator of this incident notes that the novena was prayed widely, not only in the capital of San Francisco de Malabon, but also in other towns. These brief phrases which we have from the novena tell us a great deal about the perceptions of the Revolution common among the ordinary people of Cavite as well as of leaders like Diego Mojica himself. They seem far from the secular outlook of Bonifacio or of the ilustrado leaders of Malolos.

To illustrate the importance of this type of devotional literature being included with the Pasyon as a source of the ordinary Filipino's perception of events, one can point to the term *liwanag*, one to which a great deal of attention is given by Iletto, and rightly so. But its source is far wider than its connotations in the Pasyon. Light, of course, is a common theme in Christian literature, to

77. Iletto, "Critical Issues," pp. 98-99.

78. Canseco, "Historia," quoted in Schumacher, *Readings*, p. 273.

79. *Ibid.*

cite only the Fourth Gospel, and such early Christian writers as Justin Martyr in the mid-second century, as well as the heretical Gnostics.⁸⁰ Indeed it is a common theme in the history of religions. But as far as the eighteenth and nineteenth century Filipino was concerned, it was probably the novena more than the Pasyon which gave the religious content to this term. Over a period of years I have had theology students analyze a hundred or more of these novenas in several Philippine languages, all having their origin in the eighteenth or nineteenth century. In a very large number of these the theme of liwanag occurs prominently in such contexts as that analyzed by Iletto for Apolinario de la Cruz. I offer this as one illustration of the folk-religious background beyond the Pasyon which still awaits study along the lines Iletto has pioneered. Moreover, it offers an answer to the difficulty commented on earlier of the apparent lack of any comparable pasyon-tradition among the non-Tagalogs, among whom, nonetheless, there are indications of similar folk-religious perceptions to those put forth in Iletto's book.

The criticisms and reserves I have expressed notwithstanding, I believe Iletto's work is a major contribution to Philippine historiography, and not only of the Revolution. It has directed attention to the role of religion in any serious study of Philippine society, and in particular of any mass movement. That religious sensibility was Catholic to the end of the nineteenth century, and has remained rooted in traditional Catholicism well into the twentieth century.⁸¹

80. See John, cc. 1, 3, 8, 9; Justin, *Apologia*, c. 61; Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971), 1:89-91.

81. Iletto's reluctance to use the word "Catholic" to describe elite appeals to the masses "framed in traditional terms" ("Critical Issues," p. 95; also p. 94) seems to stem from a rather narrow and highly institutionalized notion of establishment Catholic orthodoxy. Just as the sixteenth-century friars drew on a hitherto little-exploited part of the Catholic tradition to condemn the encomenderos and conquistadores who conceived themselves as bearers of Catholicism to the unenlightened pagan Filipinos, so too there are many strains of thought within Catholicism which have their roots in Catholic tradition, though they may deviate considerably from the thinking of contemporary prominent members of the "Catholic" elite establishment. Though Rizal would not have considered himself a Catholic any longer when he wrote his *El Filibusterismo* in 1891, his concept of national redemption in the words of Padre Florentino in the closing chapter bears deep marks of the Pasyon tradition, not only much more than did the thinking of Bonifacio, but even than that of many of the masses, although it was in contradiction with a far less legitimate "Catholic" tradition of the Spanish clergy who could see the

PROVINCIAL AND LOCAL ELITE

Though Milagros Guerrero has done the most extensive criticism of Iletto's work, expressing reserves with which in part I have concurred in my evaluation above, her own writing on the Revolution appears to me to complement rather than contradict Iletto's approach.⁸² Guerrero's contribution is to be found both in her conclusions as to the role of local and provincial elite in the Revolution, a role which she sees as contributing to the disillusionment of the masses with the Revolution, and in the indications she has given as to inadequately studied topics still in need of research.

The conclusion which I consider of most importance in Guerrero's research is her demonstration of the essential continuity of power in the Spanish and the Revolutionary periods, not only on the part of the cosmopolitan national elite but most especially on the part of the provincial and local elite.⁸³ These principales and super-principales in Luzon, who for the most part supported the Aguinaldo government, at least once the Revolution was underway, generally retained their power and influence in the new order, even to being re-elected to the same positions that they had held under the Spaniards. Dependent as he was on these provincial and local elite for support, there was generally little that Aguinaldo could do, even if he wanted to, to restrain abuses committed by them against the ordinary Filipino. The conflict between the civil and military officials in the same territory only exacerbated the situation. Given the heightened expectations among peasants in many places, as documented by both Iletto and Guerrero,⁸⁴ when the peasants found themselves continuing to

Revolution only as little less than an apostasy from Catholicism, like the Jesuit Fr. Francisco Foradada (quoted in Schumacher, *Readings*, pp. 268-69) in his book *La soberanía de España en Filipinas*. There was more in Rizal's use of such language than the mere unconscious use of religious terminology embedded in a culture, as suggested by Richardson ("Revolution or Religious Experience?", p. 317), as his personal writings show. Just as there were many ways of thinking among the Katipuneros — Aguinaldo vs. Bonifacio — so there were also among the Propagandists — Rizal vs. Marcelo del Pilar vs. Lopez Jaena, etc. — a point I made but did not make sufficiently explicit in my *Propaganda Movement* ten years ago.

82. Iletto himself agrees with this assessment, though it seems to me only partly, because of his extension of the Pasyon categories of perception to all those "from below." (See his "Critical Issues," p. 103, note 20, and *Pasyon*, p. 146).

83. Guerrero, "The Provincial and Municipal Elites of Luzon during the Revolution, 1898-1902," in McCoy and de Jesus, *Philippine Social History*, especially pp. 169-73.

84. Iletto, *Pasyon*, pp. 146-53; Guerrero, "Provincial and Municipal Elites," pp. 155-56; and more extensively in "Luzon at War."

suffer from the same tax burdens, the forced labor, and abuses they had endured under the Spanish regime, riots and millennial revolts broke out among those who now found themselves oppressed by Filipino rather than Spanish masters. Moreover, just as the Americans would, after the war, use the cosmopolitan national elite as their junior partners in governing the country, so too on the provincial and municipal levels a monopoly of power on the part of the pre-revolutionary elite would for the most part continue, or even consolidate itself on higher levels.⁸⁵

Here, I believe, we find a major point of intersection between the studies of Iletto and of Guerrero. As Iletto had pointed out in a somewhat different context, the *kalayaan* longed for by the peasants was vastly different in content from the *independencia* proclaimed by the elite, be they national or provincial.⁸⁶ This was to show itself not only during the Revolution but all through the American period in the peasant revolts from the Guardia de Honor to the Sakdalistas which sought to overthrow not only the American colonialists but also their Filipino collaborators, whose authority and abuses touched them most directly.⁸⁷ Indeed, though manipulated by the Communists for their own ends, the search for *kalayaan* in the sense of their predecessors can be seen as forming a large stream within the Huk movement itself.

POST-REVOLUTIONARY PEASANT RESISTANCE TO THE ELITE

Brian Fegan in his study of Central Luzon peasant movements has distinguished two strands in the early history of Central Luzon peasant unions — that of the Colorums, the Santa Iglesia, the Sakdalistas, the Tanggulan, and the Kapatiran Magsasaka founded by Jacinto Manahan around 1918; and that of socialist and eventually Communist inspiration, chiefly represented by the Kalipunang Pambansa ng mga Magbubukid sa Pilipinas (KPMP) under Manahan, now a Communist, which after World War II became the Communist-controlled Pambansang Kaisahan ng mga Magbubukid

85. Guerrero, "Provincial and Municipal Elites," pp. 175-79.

86. *Pasyon*, pp. 107-8; also p. 5. Whether or not one accepts Iletto's relating the word to *layaw*, a point on which I am not competent to comment myself, the difference in the content of the expectations of elite and peasants is clear.

87. See, for example, the interview with Salud Algabe in David R. Sturtevant, *Popular Uprisings in the Philippines, 1840-1940*, pp. 286-99. Sturtevant, however, sees Sakdalism in a more "secular" light than earlier protest movements.

(PKM), the peasant arm of the Huk movement. It was not only Manahan who moved from the first strand to the second, but also many peasants belonged to groups from both strands, or moved, e.g. from the Sakdalistas, after their abortive revolt, to the KPMP, while other former Sakdalistas turned to the pro-Japanese Ganap.⁸⁸

The important point that Fegan has made is that the communist (or non-communist) leadership by no means determined the ideological stance of the peasant membership. Just as the peasants were often influenced by traditional folk-Catholic ideas in the first strand, they also held "syncretic folk-Marxist ideas, adapted through the earlier idiom of folk-Catholic ideas."⁸⁹ Fegan disagrees, rightly to my mind, with Kerkvliet, who argues that the peasants organized more spontaneously and that it was only in the later stages that Communist participation became significant, with the Communist leaders only taking over the movement when it went into rebellion in 1948 as the Hukbong Mapagpalaya ng Bayan (HMB).⁹⁰ Even if one accepts Kerkvliet's thesis, however, much of the mass base of the Huks, perhaps even more than Fegan estimates, came from the non-Communist strand of peasant movements, as Kerkvliet does demonstrate.⁹¹

This continuity between the Revolutionary period and the American colonial period should also be extended backward into the latter half of the nineteenth century. If we do so, we find peasant religious and millennial movements of resistance beginning a decade or two after the implantation of commercial agriculture, often paralleling, even temporarily joining, the Revolution but essentially independent of it, and resurfacing under different forms in twentieth century agrarian protest. Iletto has spoken of a few of these and so has Guerrero, but they were by no means confined to Luzon or the Tagalog region. Many of these need further

88. Brian Fegan, "The Social History of a Central Luzon Barrio," in McCoy and de Jesus, *Philippine Social History*, pp. 91-129, especially pp. 106-11.

89. *Ibid.*, p. 107.

90. Benedict J. Kerkvliet, *The Huk Rebellion: A Study of Peasant Revolt in the Philippines* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977); Fegan, p. 128, n. 47.

91. Fegan also includes the Katipunan in the first strand of organizations, citing Iletto and an unpublished paper of his own, "Light in the East: Pasion, Vigil, and the Idiom of Central Luzon Peasant Movements, 1896-1970," (1978). Not having seen the paper, I cannot comment on his inclusion of the Katipunan, except to the extent I have argued against Iletto's including it in the Pasyon tradition.

research, but some obvious *prima facie* continuities may be mentioned to illustrate the point.⁹²

Pre-Revolutionary Roots. The Leyte-Samar Pulahanes of the post-revolutionary period were a continuation of the Dios-Dios movements of the 1880s and 1890s, and appear to have been at least one current within the Surigao Colorum movement of the 1920s.⁹³ Though it appears that some of the Pulahanes may earlier have aided Lukban's guerilla army in the interior of Samar, their primary targets were the coastal Filipino abaca buyers and the governmental establishment behind them.⁹⁴

The Babaylanes of Papa Isio fought under the banner of the Malolos Republic against the ephemeral hacendero-sponsored Negros Republic in 1899 and its American successor, but had existed in the 1890s, attacking haciendas and calling for the abolition of sugar.⁹⁵ They themselves appear to have been a continuation of the movement of Dios Buhawi from the 1880s, which was itself related to an earlier Babaylan movement in Panay.⁹⁶

The Guardia de Honor, which came to center itself in Cabaruan in eastern Pangasinan, had existed since the 1880s. At the time of the 1896 revolution, it began to attack Spanish outposts, but soon turned its wrath against the landlords of Tarlac and Nueva Ecija as well, and likewise resisted the forces of the Malolos government. After many months of futile activity, the Americans apparently brought an end to the movement with the execution of its leaders

92. Relevant here is the suggestion made by Norman Owen that "in economic history we may yet conclude that 1898 is less significant than 1869, when the Suez Canal opened." ("Philippine Society and American Colonialism," in Norman G. Owen, ed., *Compadre Colonialism: Studies on the Philippines Under American Rule* (Ann Arbor: Center for South and Southeast Asian Studies, University of Michigan, 1971), p. 6. To the extent that these movements were often set under way by economic factors of dislocation, a similar judgment could be made.

93. For the Dios-Dios movements and the pulahanes, see Robert Bruce Cruikshank, "A History of Samar Island, the Philippines, 1768-1898," (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1976), pp. 180-200, 212-16. For the entrance among the Surigao Colorums of former Samar and Leyte Pulahanes, see Sturtevant, *Popular Uprisings*, pp. 142-43.

94. Dean C. Worcester, *The Philippines, Past and Present*, ed. by J. Ralston Hayden (New York: Macmillan, 1930), pp. 317-18; Richard Arens, S.V.D., "The Early Pulahan Movement in Samar and Leyte," *Journal of History* 7 (1959): 303-71. Arens notes a revival of pulahanes during World War II.

95. Cullamar, "Babaylanism," pp. 32-64.

96. Donn V. Hart, "Buhawi of the Bisayas: The Revitalization Process and Legend Making in the Philippines," in Mario D. Zamora, ed. *Studies in Philippine Anthropology*. (Quezon City: Alemar-Phoenix, 1967), pp. 370-92.

in 1901. But significantly, the *colorum* revolt of Pedro Kabola in 1925 in San Jose, Nueva Ecija, and that of Pedro Calosa in Tayug, Pangasinan in 1931, were in the same vicinity. Tayug is a mere 25 km. northeast of Cabaruan and San Jose about 40 km. east of Tayug. Again, although directed against the American-officered constabulary, both were religious in form and both looked to the extermination of the landed elite and the redistribution of land.⁹⁷

Nature of the Revolt of the Masses. Putting together these movements, stretching out over a half-century or more, and other lesser ones not mentioned here, one can say that there *was* a revolt of the masses, a people's revolt, which extended far beyond the narrow limits of the Katipunan, both in time and in space. The movement as a whole did have nationalist elements to it, but they seem always to have been secondary, as the ire of the people turned from the American or Spanish overlords to the Filipino elite of various levels who, at least in their perception, were the immediate oppressors. In most, if not all of these movements there were socioeconomic factors involved, even a dimension of class struggle. In all of them there was a religious dimension, whether this is to be explained as motivation, as the idiom in which they expressed themselves, or as their respective universes of meaning.

When taken together, however, all these movements, no matter how numerous they have been and how durably they reappeared under new forms, formed a small part of the Filipino masses. They were marginal – or marginalized – groups, most of them, if not all, living in areas where for diverse reasons the burdens of the transition from a semifeudal society to one dominated by the increasing commercialization of the agricultural economy weighed especially heavy on the little people, or at the least, were so perceived by them.

Hence it seems to me that the Pasyon-perception of events, or even the perception influenced by the wider religious tradition I have pointed to, is not sufficient to explain mass participation in Revolution. Moreover, much of that mass adhesion – even most of it – was quite independent of the Katipunan, even if one were to admit that the Pasyon perception of events was an integral part of the Katipunan. Only a very small proportion of those who fought

97. Sturtevant, *Popular Uprisings*, pp. 96-114, 175-92.

under Aguinaldo's banner in 1896 were Katipuneros, and the proportion in 1898 was infinitesimal in comparison with the total Revolutionary army. In some sections of the country, like the Bikol provinces, Panay, and other parts of the Visayas, there was mass participation in the war against the Americans, even though the Katipunan had never existed in those places in any significant way. Even in the Tagalog provinces not only must such fantastic figures as the 100,000 to 400,000 of LeRoy be rejected, but also the 30,000 given — in one of his several contradictory versions of the Katipunan — by Pio Valenzuela.⁹⁸ Aguinaldo's memoirs cite his cousin Baldomero as speaking of 300 members in Cavite at the time of the outbreak of the Revolution in 1896, and this after mass initiations by Aguinaldo in the *tribunal* of Kawit.⁹⁹ If this be so in Cavite, and if outside Manila membership was generally confined to the provincial and municipal elite, a few thousands would probably be closer to the actual number of members. Therefore, it is necessary to look for another explanation for the mass participation in the Revolution in its second phase, and Guerrero's assertion of "the essentially pluralistic and clientist nature of the Revolution"¹⁰⁰ is surely correct, as Iletto himself has agreed. He adds, however, that "it appears that the masses also had a vision of the future that they were fighting for,"¹⁰¹ a point which can surely be accepted of Caneo's group, but also, at least as a working hypothesis deserving of further investigation for those who cannot be explained totally in terms of a Pasyon vision.

INSUFFICIENCY OF THE CLIENTIST EXPLANATION

At this point, however, one must also assert that neither were patron-client ties sufficient to explain the mass participation in the war against the Americans. One reason of great weight is provided by Guerrero's own detailed analysis of the abuses of local and provincial elite and the reactions of those affected by them, at least in Luzon. The existence of widespread civil and military abuses on the ordinary people is undeniable; only their extent needs to be determined.

98. James A. LeRoy, *The Americans in the Philippines*, reprint edition (New York: AMS Press, 1970), p. 85; Valenzuela, "Memoirs," cited in Agoncillo, *Revolt*, p. 97.

99. Aguinaldo, *Mga Gunita*, p. 154.

100. Guerrero, "Understanding Philippine Revolutionary Mentality," p. 244.

101. Iletto, "Critical Issues," p. 101.

That the ordinary people continued to support the war in spite of these abuses, if it needed further confirmation, can find it in a source surely without any bias in favor of the Revolution. That source is the Dominican, Fr. Ulpiano Herrero, parish priest of Orion, Bataan, until he was imprisoned – to the great distress of his people incidentally, who begged Aguinaldo to allow him to remain with them as parish priest under the new government.¹⁰² In Herrero's account of the cruel odyssey which the imprisoned friars of Luzon suffered in their transferral to the mountains of the north, he makes the following reflections as the collective opinion of most of the friar prisoners, and as his own observation on what he had perceived in the various Tagalog and Ilokano provinces through which he had passed:

The native masses welcomed with wild enthusiasm the victories of the Revolution, attracted by the idea that in the future none but Indios would be in command, and that they would constitute a nation, *although the majority did not really understand the meaning of nation*. But they did understand their being in charge and being the ones to govern . . . We do not believe that in the first months of their victories there would have been a single Indio who was not overwhelmed with joy and pride on considering themselves independent. . . .¹⁰³

After recounting the abuses by officials, military and civil, of the Revolutionary Government, and exploitation of Filipino by Filipino, especially those committed by Tagalog troops in the Ilokano provinces, he nonetheless concluded:

In spite of these bitter complaints about these and other abuses, let the reader not think that the *ideal* of independence lost its following, even in the northern provinces of Luzon. The people complained of the numberless forms of oppression and exploitation, of the favoritism of Tagalogs and the intrigues of scoundrels with no other merits than their own boldness and the pack of rogues with them; they poured out words of anger against the government. But in their souls the burning love of being self-governing still blazed. . . . The heart of the people is still for the defenders of independence, and we think it will continue to be so even though in the face of reality the peaceful citizen will wait for and receive the Americans

102. Ulpiano Herrero, O.P., *Nuestra prisión en poder de los revolucionarios* (Manila: Imp. del Colegio de Sto. Tomás, 1900), p. 23.

103. *Ibid.*, p. 813; italics mine.

as the defenders of his interests, and as the only possible government after the stupid and infamous behavior of his own government.¹⁰⁴

The value of that testimony lies precisely in the fact that earlier it was the Spanish friars – as the Americans would do later – who insisted that the whole revolutionary and resistance movement was the work of handful of elite leaders who did not represent the people. Under pretext of independence they had exploited and terrorized the ordinary people into joining a revolution for which they had no desire. If, however, as the above-quoted passage indicates, the case is that the ordinary Filipino peasant stood behind the Revolution, even when it was exploited by those in power for personal gain, we must ask what it was that kept alive their nationalism, their willingness to measure their bolos against American Kraggs for another two or three years. This is the main question which I have tried to answer in my book *Revolutionary Clergy*, which I believe supplies the missing piece to complete the works of Guerrero and Iletto in giving new perspectives to the Revolution.

ROLE OF THE FILIPINO CLERGY

This is not the place nor am I the one to give a review of my own book, which in any case covers a wider topic than the point under discussion here – a history of the role of the clergy in the development of nationalism and their participation in the nationalist struggles within and outside the Church. The question here is the relation of the clergy's attitude toward the Revolution to the support or non-support given it by the masses. This influence can be briefly delineated at several points in the Revolution.

COUNTERWEIGHT TO FRIAR INFLUENCE

Iletto has raised the question of how it was possible to undermine the sentiment of *utang na loob*, which still bound the Filipino masses to Spain in the 1890s and hence was an obstacle to stirring up mass revolutionary feeling.¹⁰⁵ That such a sentiment of

104. *Ibid.*, p. 817.

105. Iletto, "Tagalog Poetry and Image of the Past during the War against Spain," in Reid and Marr, *Perceptions*, pp. 379-80, 396 and passim; also, less pointedly, in *Pasyon*, passim.

utang na loob existed in many parts of the country is a fact, but its chief cause was the religious sanction exerted by the friars. It was for that reason that the most anticlerical governments in nineteenth century Spain, even if grudgingly, gave their support to the great influence and authority exercised by the friar parish priests, and marked out as inimical to Spanish sovereignty any attack on the friars.¹⁰⁶ Moreover, contrary to the myth so common in superficial historiography, and excepting the cases of individual causes for resentment, antifriar feeling existed at the beginning of the Revolution among only two classes in Filipino society — a large part of the Filipino clergy, for obvious reasons, on the one hand, and the cosmopolitan elite of Manila, Iloilo, and Negros on the other.

In the Tagalog provinces and some of the Ilokano region the resentment extended to lower levels of the elite in some places, but of mass antifriar sentiment there is no trace.¹⁰⁷ After 1901 under the influence of anticlerical and anti-Catholic Filipino elite, of Protestant Americans, and later of Aglipayans, there would be a more widespread, though still by no means general, antifriar sentiment. But at the time of the Revolution such sentiment was extremely limited, though strong among those most influential in a semifeudal society. This the Propagandists saw, and it was for this reason that they aimed their attacks on the friars, with limited success.¹⁰⁸

A religious sanction such as the friars exercised in favor of Spanish sovereignty over Filipino consciences could only be undermined by a countervailing religious force. Iletto has seen this force in the Pasyon, a position we have accepted with regard to a certain segment of the peasant masses, but which cannot account for the non-Tagalog regions, nor even for the larger part of the Tagalogs. Nowhere were the friars imprisoned except in the Tagalog provinces and Negros or those provinces reached by Tagalog troops, such as Camarines and in northern Luzon. Even then there were many

106. Schumacher, *Readings*, pp. 253-54, 224-25, 226-27, etc.

107. Taylor, *Philippine Insurrection*, 2:92; Schumacher, *Propaganda Movement*, pp. 271-72; idem, *Revolutionary Clergy*, passim, especially pp. 137-38, 157, 178.

108. Schumacher, *Propaganda Movement*, 273-76; Marcelo del Pilar to "Pinakamahal kong Kaibigan," 25 March 1889, *Epistolario de Marcelo H. del Pilar*, Manila: Imprenta del Gobierno, 1955-1958), 1:73; Schumacher, *Readings*, p. 266. For the identification of Del Pilar's addressee as Rizal, see Schumacher, *Propaganda Movement*, p. 152.

exceptions as the case of Fr. Ulpiano Herrero indicates.¹⁰⁹ Even where the townspeople submitted unwillingly to having their friar parish priest taken prisoner, they were urgent in demanding that Filipino priests, or if there were not enough, even Spanish friars, be sent to them, as not only friar accounts, but the records of the Malolos government in the Philippine Revolutionary Records show abundantly.¹¹⁰

In this situation, it was the adherence of the Filipino priests which provided the countervailing religious sanction for the Cavite Revolution in 1896, where two of the more prominent figures were the nephew of the martyr Fr. Mariano Gomez, Fr. Manuel Trias, who took part in all the revolutionary junta meetings, and Fr. Cornelio Ignacio, coadjutor in Bacoor since the time of Gomez, who was elected "Presidente eclesiástico."¹¹¹ As I have indicated elsewhere, other priests played important roles, most especially Fr. Pedro Dandan, an exile of 1872, who died in the mountains with the remnants of Aguinaldo's army.¹¹²

INSPIRATION OF RESISTANCE TO AMERICANS

This religious sanction was even more effective in 1898, at least potentially so. For though the Revolution met with the general adherence of the Filipino priests, all the more so now that the enemy was Protestant America, the lines of demarcation between those who supported the Revolution to the end and those who withdrew their support by the end of 1899 can to a large extent be traced out along regional lines. Milagros Guerrero pointed out the lack of a Pasyon tradition in the non-Tagalog provinces and suggested that at least there one must look to the ties that bound the ordinary folk to their ilustrado-cacique patrons. There is something to be

109. See the books of Herrero and of other prisoners, such as Graciano Martínez, *Memorias del cautiverio*, etc.; Apolinar Pastrana Riol, O.F.M. ed., (*A Friar's Account of the Revolution in Bicol* (Quezon City: Franciscan Friary of St. Gregory the Great, 1980); Romero, *Negros Occidental*, pp. 111-14; Angel Martínez Cuesta, O.A.R., *History of Negros*, tr. Alfonso Felix, Jr., and Sor Caritas Sevilla (Manila: Historical Conservation Society, 1980), pp. 447-56.

110. Philippine Revolutionary Records (National Library), I-13, Ecclesiastical Records 1898-1899, Petitions for Clergy; also Herrero, *Nuestra prisión*, p. 809, also 387, 720, 820, and passim.

111. Schumacher, *Revolutionary Clergy*, pp. 53-56.

112. Ibid. pp. 54-56; Schumacher, "The Religious Character of the Revolution in Cavite, 1896-1897," *Philippine Studies* 24 (1976): 410-13.

said for this, but it seems inadequate, both in the light of what Guerrero has said about the abuses of the local and provincial elite alienating the ordinary people and because of the different patterns the resistance took after Aguinaldo's proclamation of guerrilla warfare in November 1899.¹¹³

The answer, at least in large part, I would suggest, is to be found in the religious policy of the Malolos government. In the period from June 1898 to January 1899, two views of religious policy struggled for supremacy: that of Mabini (and to some extent Buencamino), executed largely through Fr. Gregorio Aglipay; and that pursued by Fr. Mariano Sevilla with the aid of Felipe Calderon and other laymen. By January 1899 Mabini had come to power after having won against the Sevilla party in the questions of civil marriage, the appointment of Aglipay as Military Vicar-General and ecclesiastical governor of Nueva Segovia diocese, and the separation of church and state. Through these means Mabini achieved his objective of putting the church at the disposal of the state. A large part of the Tagalog and Pampango clergy were already alienated by these measures, as well as by the continued harsh imprisonment of the friars.¹¹⁴ Nonetheless, in the northern provinces comprising the diocese of Nueva Segovia, Aglipay's putative authority as ecclesiastical governor kept the clergy united in support of the Revolution generally until his excommunication became known at the end of July and the formal revocation of his appointment by the bishop took place in September 1899.¹¹⁵ From that point onward the Ilokano clergy increasingly withdrew their support from Aglipay and from the government. Once the coercion attempted on them to sustain Aglipay's authority was removed by the advance of the Americans, guerrilla warfare was extremely limited in northern Luzon, except in Ilocos Norte, where Aglipay carried on the battle for another year and a half.¹¹⁶

The suggestion implicit in that situation — that it was at least in large part the influence of the clergy which kept guerrilla warfare alive where it had clerical support — Ilocos Norte — and insignificant where it did not — the rest of the northern provinces — indi-

113. "Understanding Philippine Revolutionary Mentality," p. 245; idem, "The Provincial and Municipal Elites," pp. 171, 175-79.

114. Schumacher, *Revolutionary Clergy*, pp. 65-97; 117-21.

115. *Ibid.*, pp. 97-114.

116. *Ibid.*, pp. 106-16.

cates the counterproductive effect of Mabini's policy of creating a national church subject to the state. In all the provinces north of Manila guerrilla warfare was insignificant precisely because the clergy of these provinces had experienced the anticlerical and anti-Church policy of the Malolos government. The other provinces which had never been directly subject to Malolos and where the provincial elite leaders of the Revolution worked in collaboration with the local clergy became the focus of guerrilla resistance. Such was the case of Albay, Sorsogon, Masbate, Burias, where General Vito Belarmino and Colonel Ramon F. Santos, a native of Albay, were assisted by the Bikol clergy with financial and logistic support, with moral support among the people, and in a few cases with military roles like that of Aglipay.¹¹⁷ Similarly in Panay, the provincial leaders – not the cosmopolitan elite of Iloilo City, who went over in a body to the Americans just as their counterparts and relatives did in Negros – were similarly assisted by the clergy, who like their counterparts in the Bikol region, belonged to the same class and had frequently had as their classmates in the local seminary the provincial elite under General Martin Delgado who kept up the resistance.¹¹⁸ The religious attitudes of the Bikol provincial elite and the Ilongo provincial elite must be carefully distinguished from those of cosmopolitan ilustrados from the same regions, like Vicente Lukban among the Bikolanos and the foreign-educated or foreign-influenced hacenderos of Iloilo and Negros. In Negros, where there were almost no Filipino priests, the only guerrilla resistance was that of Papa Isio and his Babaylanes; in

117. *Ibid.*, pp. 156-75. The same was not true in Ambos Camarines, where Lukban arrived before the friars of those provinces, who had confided heretofore in the friendly attitude of the Bikolanos, were able to leave. Lukban imprisoned them and they had to suffer some months of imprisonment with alternating temporary release and return to prison, depending on the character of the Tagalog commanders who succeeded one another until the Americans conquered Camarines. Because of this persecution of the friars, apparently, and because of the absence of a Bikolano leader, there is little evidence of the clergy taking part in the resistance in Camarines, unlike Albay and Sorsogon. See for Camarines, Pastrana Riol, ed., *A Friar's Account*, passim. Though Belarmino, the commander-in-chief in Albay, was a Tagalog from Cavite, whether because he shared the good relations with the clergy that had prevailed in the first stage of the Revolution in 1896-97 (as Aguinaldo had until he came under the control of Mabini), or because of the influence of Santos, or because he was sufficiently close to Aguinaldo to operate freely in spite of the policy of the central government without fear of being countermanded, shared the policy of Santos, who was the most influential Bikolano leader in Albay and Sorsogon.

118. Schumacher, *Revolutionary Clergy*, pp. 176-92.

Panay, though Iloilo city was taken by the Americans in February 1899, the guerrilla resistance only came to an end in March 1901 and one of the last to surrender was Fr. Santiago Pamplona, himself a military officer.¹¹⁹

The other regions of the country where the pattern may seem at first sight to have been distinct, in fact clarify and confirm the above examples. Mindanao was without Filipino priests, being divided between the dioceses of Cebu and Jaro, but in both parts cared for spiritually by Spanish Jesuits and a few Recoletos. The diocese of Cebu likewise comprised the islands of Cebu, Bohol, Leyte, and Samar. In the latter two islands generals sent by the Malolos government were in command, Ambrosio Moxica in Leyte and Vicente Lukban in Samar. Though Lukban alienated the few Samar priests by his efforts to enforce Malolos ecclesiastical policy, and almost all left the island in protest against his harassment, he was able to keep up the resistance in the interior mountains of the island until 1902.¹²⁰ The Americans took the coastal towns without trouble but for long were unable to penetrate the interior and capture Lukban. This, however, seems much more to be attributed to the roadless and even trackless interior of Samar rather than the effectiveness of Lukban in gathering local support for his campaign, except for some of the Pulahanes of the interior, natural enemies of the townspeople on the coast, as has been seen above. Whether or not a few priests did collaborate with Lukban in the end is uncertain, but the Americans believed that they had, and during the "howling wilderness" campaign of General Jacob Smith, tortured several, one of them dying under the torture and another losing his sanity. What seems more likely is that they had knowledge of Lukban's plans, and given the general American conviction that all Filipino priests were collaborators with the guerrillas, were tortured on mere suspicion, without ever having actively

119. Roque Lopez, the first of several presidents of the Federal Council of the Visayas and General Pablo Araneta, as well as a number of other of the original officials and their successors had all returned to American-occupied Iloilo city within six months from the American occupation, and Delgado became politico-military governor of Panay, with nominal relations with the Malolos government. In Negros, all the hacenderos and other prominent men, some of whom were closely related to their counterparts in Iloilo, temporarily established their cantonal government, only to hand over control to the Americans as soon as they arrived. See Taylor, *Philippine Insurrection*, 2:375-410; Romero, *Negros Occidental*, pp. 86-187.

120. Schumacher, *Revolutionary Clergy*, pp. 141-142.

and freely cooperated with the anticlerical Lukban. But the incident goes to show how widespread the cooperation of the clergy with the guerrilla forces was elsewhere, so that the Americans took it for granted in Samar, even though Lukban was able to hold out more because of the geography of the island and his own use of terrorism than through the aid of the Filipino priests.¹²¹

In Leyte the guerrilla warfare does not seem to have been very significant, and Moxica with his Tagalog troops was not well received by the Leyteños. So that if there is little evidence of clerical activity in support of the Leyte guerrillas, it would appear to be because it was not a local movement but one imposed from outside. Hence the ties between local and provincial elite as leaders of the resistance and their counterparts, the clergy, had no place here, any more than they had in Samar.¹²² One may note in this connection that in spite of the widespread support of the Ilongo clergy for Delgado as commander in chief, and for Fullon as commander of Antique, there were considerable conflicts in Capiz between the clergy and General Ananias Diokno and his Tagalog troops. The difference lay principally in the fact that Delgado and Fullon were natives of the provinces where they commanded, while Diokno was an outsider, and hence lacked the common class and educational as well as regional background of the other two.¹²³

In Cebu, on the other hand, there was a local guerrilla movement, which did receive support from some members of the clergy. However, the guerrilla resistance was late and limited. When the American fleet arrived off Cebu city, the provincial leaders, as in Iloilo, had already proclaimed their independence, in at least nominal dependence on Aguinaldo. However, not having any arms with which to resist, they were unable to oppose an American landing. On the other hand, the Americans not having sufficient men to occupy more than the fort and city of Cebu, the provincial leaders, accompanied by two priests, the future bishops Pablo Singzon and Juan Gorordo, negotiated a *modus vivendi* by which the provincial revolutionary council continued to govern the rest of the province, in professed allegiance to the Malolos

121. *Ibid.*, pp. 142-48.

122. *Ibid.*, pp. 148-49.

123. *Ibid.*, pp. 179, 184; Taylor, *Philippine Insurrection*, 5: 477-79, 521-25, 532-39.

government. Though Singzon, as ecclesiastical governor of the diocese, originally accepted the authority of the Aguinaldo government and made use of Aguinaldo's decrees to protest against the usurpation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and funds by Lukban within his diocese, as the religious policy patronized by Mabini became clear in the diocese of Cebu, he accepted American sovereignty as did the rest of the Cebu elite when American reinforcements arrived and began to occupy the rest of the island.¹²⁴ However, when a Cebuano guerrilla movement did emerge under Arcadio Maxilom, police commissioner in the defunct provincial revolutionary council, it did receive widespread support from individual priests, in spite of the lack of provincial elite support from the capital, somewhat as in Panay. That it was not more significant must be attributed to the negative attitude of the leading Cebuano clergy, including the ecclesiastical governor, Fr. Singzon (unlike Panay); the relative weakness of the guerrilla movement itself and its lack of arms; and perhaps most especially the intervention in Cebu of the anticlerical Lukban in an effort to capture the bishop, as well as his harassment of the clergy in Samar, part of the Cebu diocese. Similar reasons, and an even more insignificant and ill-armed guerrilla force, would explain the corresponding dearth of information on any clerical guerrilla activity in Bohol.¹²⁵

Perhaps the most significant participation of the clergy in the resistance movement was in the southern Tagalog provinces under the overall command of General Miguel Malvar. There were no clerical military leaders as in Ilocos Norte, Albay and Sorsogon, and Panay, but the role of the parish priests in raising funds for Malvar, in organizing shadow governments for towns occupied by the Americans, in procuring necessary supplies, including the dangerous task of getting ammunition, and above all in encouraging the ordinary people to support the resistance was so widespread that the American historian LeRoy complained that while caciques in northern Luzon used their influence for peace, in the south "Filipino priests turned their flocks with a mere word into unreasoning opposition to the Americans."¹²⁶ General J. Franklin Bell in his order of 9 December 1901, by which he set in motion

124. Schumacher, *Revolutionary Clergy*, pp. 135-41.

125. *Ibid.*, pp. 148-52, 155-56.

126. LeRoy, *Americans*, 2:231. See also Schumacher, *Revolutionary Clergy*, pp. 124-29.

the infamous reconcentration policy which led to the death of thousands from starvation or disease, addressed the problem of the Filipino priests as follows:

Chief and most important among the class of disloyal persons are the native priests. It may be considered as practically certain that every native priest in the provinces of Batangas and La Laguna is a secret enemy of the Government and is in active sympathy with the insurgents. These are absolutely our most dangerous enemies – more dangerous even than armed insurgents – because of their unequalled influence. They should be given no exemptions whatever on account of their calling.¹²⁷

In the southern Tagalog provinces there was close cooperation between the provincial and local elite on the one hand and the Filipino priests on the other hand. Glenn May has shown that not only the provincial and local elite in Batangas, but also the European-educated cosmopolitan elite, such as Gregorio Aguilera and the Dimayugas were active in the resistance till the end.¹²⁸ On the other hand, the objectionable religious policies of the Malolos government seem not to have been put into effect to any significant extent, since it was only one month after Mabini's access to power that the war with the Americans broke out. From that time onward the southern Tagalog provinces were generally out of contact with the retreating Malolos government, and Malvar operated with almost complete independence for the rest of the war.¹²⁹

127. J.F. Bell, Brigadier General Commanding, "Instructions to All Station Commanders," 9 December 1901, in U.S. Senate Document, no. 331, part 2; 57th Congress, 1st Session, 1902, p. 1610.

128. Glenn A. May, "Filipino Resistance to American Occupation: Batangas, 1899-1902," *Pacific Historical Review* 48 (1979): 531-56; also his "Filipino Revolutionaries in the Making: The Old School Tie in Late Nineteenth-Century Batangas," *Bulletin of the American Historical Collection* 9,3 (July-September 1981): 53-64. In this latter article May shows how many of the military commanders from Batangas – several of them from the wealthy provincial elite who later went on to study in Manila or even in Europe – had been classmates with General Miguel Malvar at the school in Tanawan run by Fr. Valerio Malabanan (from which Mabini had graduated just before Malvar's entrance). The high number of provincial and even cosmopolitan elite, like the Dimayugas and Galicano Apacible, who cooperated with Malvar to the bitter end in 1902, gives a quite different picture from provinces like Iloilo, Negros, etc. Though May gives no data on the point, it is not unlikely that many of the priests who cooperated with Malvar's forces might also have been students in Fr. Malabanan's school or others (Batangas had an extraordinarily large number) where they would have made personal contacts with the military leaders of the Batangas resistance.

129. It is noteworthy that when Aguinaldo in July 1897 had the Departmental Government of Central Luzon set up, of which Fr. Dandan was elected president, the only provinces in revolutionary hands which were excluded from Dandan's jurisdiction were Cavite and Batangas, an indication of Malvar's independent position. See Kalaw, *Philippine Revolution*, pp. 58-59.

Malvar, like Aguinaldo and the other provincial elite of Cavite in 1896-97, shared none of the anticlericalism of the cosmopolitan elite of the Malolos government; indeed, he made active efforts to cultivate the good-will of the clergy, as may be seen in his circulars directed to them, and as it appears, his efforts and assurances were reciprocated.¹³⁰

A PLURALISTIC APPROACH TO THE REVOLUTION

In the light of the studies which have been reviewed in this article, together with other regional studies being done elsewhere which have not received mention, it seems no longer tenable to advance a monolithic explanation for the adherence to, sympathy for, participation in, or betrayal of the Revolution. In a country as complex as was late nineteenth-century Philippines, with major difficulties of communication between different regions of the same island, like Luzon, not to speak of different islands; with an inter-regional language — Spanish — spoken only by less than 5 percent of the population; with vastly different economic, social, and cultural differences due to a variety of reasons, of which the most obvious is the lack of easy communications; one would apriori expect vast differences in response to a call for revolution. What has happened in fact, up until very recently, is that apriori “explanations” have been put forth, based either on limited data from Manila and Cavite, or on deterministic models borrowed from alien ideologies. Such explanations have achieved wide acceptance among those who are passionately working to deliver our country from oppression, militarization, neocolonialism, and its consequent economic underdevelopment. But to the extent history of the past may provide a key to present and future problems, it must be a history soundly based on facts as well as commitment. Few would argue today that every historian has a point of view from which he examines the facts, and some points of view are more likely to see the implications of the raw data than others. But any point of view, if it is to serve the cause of a sound analysis of the past, must let itself be guided, modified, and revised by the facts.

130. Schumacher, *Revolutionary Clergy*, p. 129.

The new approaches and wider perspectives from which the Revolution has been examined indicate that previously-held generalizations must be radically revised. The two major areas in which this is necessary are statements with regard to class differentiation in response to the Revolution, and generalizations which do not take into account regional variations in response to the Revolution. In addition, as far as such factors are capable of being determined, we must look for the reasons and motives behind differences of behavior between classes or regions, or even within a particular class or region. All this means that a number of distinctions have to be made.

CLASS DISTINCTIONS

Almost all of the works treated here have made clear how ambiguous the terms elite, ilustrado, "the wealthy," "the haves" are. There is indeed some correlation among the four, since wealth made possible an education abroad, and the combination of wealth and education would put one among the political as well as intellectual elite. On the other hand, the educational attainments of several of the original Katipuneros certainly qualified them to be considered educated men, even though from an economic point of view they had to be considered middle class. At the extreme one can find a Mabini, who coming from poverty, through his intelligence and assiduity made himself an ilustrado in a way few of the European-educated could match, and from here moved into the national political elite, in spite of having no power base in his home province. At the other extreme one finds a man like Aguinaldo, a wealthy landowner and key figure among the political elite of Cavite, soon to be catapulted to the national elite, and yet having little more than primary education. The term ilustrado, therefore, seems better banished from any discussions of socioeconomic class.

Wealth and political power were far more likely to be correlated. Yet here too there were exceptions and the level of power might not always correlate with the level of wealth and vice-versa. Milagros Guerrero has distinguished the cosmopolitan elite from the provincial and local elite. Even here it seems necessary to make some further distinctions. One became a member of the cosmo-

politan national elite generally by having studied abroad, which presupposed a certain degree of wealth, and concomitant political power, at least on the provincial level. Yet there were enormous differences in wealth between a Pedro Paterno, with his Madrid mansion where high society of Madrid were entertained, or a Pardo de Tavera, who could live abroad for years devoting himself to scholarship and possessing all kinds of international contacts, on the one hand, with a Rizal, Marcelo del Pilar, or Jose Panganiban, who often were on the verge of destitution in spite of help from other wealthy Filipinos at home.¹³¹ When we look at the examples which are always given as the "ilustrados who betrayed the Revolution," we find Benito Legarda, T.H. Pardo de Tavera, Cayetano Arellano, Gregorio Araneta, Florentino Torres, Jose Luzurriaga and the other Negros hacenderos and their Iloilo counterparts.¹³² Legarda and Pardo de Tavera had large interests in Manila distilleries and cigar factories — almost the only "industry" of the time; Arellano, Torres, and Araneta had large and lucrative law practices; Luzurriaga and the Negros hacenderos had never pretended allegiance to the Malolos government.¹³³

These men were surely of the cosmopolitan elite, even though most had not studied abroad, but derived their status from their wealth and the cosmopolitan world of Manila and Iloilo in which they moved. So were men like the former Propagandists — the Luna brothers, Lauro Dimayuga, Jose Alejandrino, Edilberto Evangelista, Gregorio Aguilera, Teodoro Sandiko, Galicano Apa-

131. For Rizal not having money with which to buy food, see Leon Ma. Guerrero, *The First Filipino*, pp. 169-71; for Del Pilar sick from the cold and having to pick up cigarette butts in order to be able to smoke, see Schumacher, *Propaganda Movement*, p. 256; for Panganiban's lack of funds and his early death from tuberculosis as a result of the poverty in which he lived, see Zaide, *Great Filipinos*, p. 375.

132. Agoncillo, *Malolos*, p. 676 and passim; Constantino, *Past Revisited*, pp. 232-34. Constantino includes Ambrosio Rianzares Bautista, but it appears that he was still with the Malolos government at least till two months before Aguinaldo proclaimed guerrilla warfare. (See Schumacher, *Revolutionary Clergy*, p. 120). According to Zaide, (*Great Filipinos*, pp. 93-97) he would have been 69 (or 59; there is a conflict of dates in Zaide's article) at that time, and it was understandable that he did not join the guerrillas. Constantino also includes Paterno and Buencamino, who were quickly to become ardent Americanistas, to be sure, but who in fact did not surrender, but were captured (Agoncillo, *Malolos*, p. 545; Zaide, *Great Filipinos*, p. 391).

133. Zaide, *Great Filipinos*, p. 68; Bonifacio Salamanca, *The Filipino Reaction to American Rule* (N.p.: Shoestring Press, 1968), pp. 140-41; Peter W. Stanley, *A Nation in the Making* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1974), pp. 72, 120-21; *The World of Felix Roxas*, tr. and ed. by Angel Estrada and Vicente del Carmen (Manila: Filipiniana Book Guild, 1970), pp. 152, 206-7.

cible, and others who supported the Revolution and the war against the Americans until their death, capture, or at least until after the capture of Aguinaldo in 1901, when American superiority became so overwhelming that they had little choice but to surrender unless they were in a uniquely protected situation like Lukban in Samar.¹³⁴ One can therefore, even among the cosmopolitan elite, also distinguish at least two classes — those of the first group, who after some months in the Malolos congress or as cabinet members, left the revolutionary cause and joined in the newly established American government, and those who did not. Though we have no exact measures of their relative wealth, in general we can say that the first group were of the upper stratum, and were older, more established figures, while the second, though also men of means, were less wealthy, and also much younger, just a few years out of European universities, and all belonging to the separatist group among the Propagandists long before the Revolution of 1896. Yet there were also men of considerable wealth among them, like Pedro Paterno, or of the older generation, like Ambrosio Rianzares Bautista, who remained with the Malolos government until captured by the Americans.¹³⁵ Even when one looks at the wealthy figures of the first group, the motivation of all is not that clear, though all had gone over to the Americans before the war broke out in February 1899. In at least two cases, that of Arellano and that of Araneta, the motivation was at least in part religious. Arellano was said to have accepted a position in the cabinet at the urging of Archbishop Nozaleda, so as to be able to effect the release of the friar prisoners.¹³⁶ Araneta took the position of Secretary of Justice, in which he was able to frustrate the policy of Mabini to force the Filipino clergy into a break with the jurisdiction of the Spanish bishops and to form a national church. It was only when Mabini came to power and the government put his anti-Church policy into effect that Araneta left the govern-

134. Schumacher, *Propaganda Movement*, pp. 133, 245-46; Encarnacion Alzona, *Galicano Apacible: Profile of a Filipino Patriot* (N.p., 1970), pp. 45-46; 258-59, 30, 32; Manuel, *Dictionary*, 2: 120, 123.

135. Rianzares Bautista was the last president of the Malolos Congress, succeeding Paterno. The latter was captured in Benguet in April 1900; for Rianzares Bautista's capture, the exact date is uncertain, but to judge from a letter of General MacArthur of 23 November 1899, it had taken place shortly before (see Taylor, *The Philippine Insurrection*, p. 260).

136. LeRoy, *Americans*, 1:323, citing Nozaleda's *Defensa* of 1904.

ment.¹³⁷ These facts do not disprove the contention that these men were at least in part motivated by economic self-interest, but they show that a simplistic economic class determinism is not the only, nor even the most obvious answer as to why some of the cosmopolitan elite abandoned the Republic and why others, perhaps even a majority, continued to be loyal till the inevitable end. No doubt neither the one group of the cosmopolitan elite nor the other envisaged a social revolution, but neither did any of the forerunners, from Rizal and Marcelo del Pilar to Bonifacio and Jacinto, either.

If it is difficult to generalize concerning the cosmopolitan elite, who were, generally speaking, based in or connected with Manila, much less can we generalize about the provincial and municipal elite, where not only personal commitments, but regional differences affected their response to the Revolution. The principales of a wealthy town like Lipa – the Calaos and Catigbacs – or of other wealthy Batangas, or Pampanga, or Iloilo provincial towns – Malvar in Sto. Tomas, Joaquin Arnedo Cruz in Apalit, Martin Delgado in Sta. Barbara – were not only municipal elite, but provincial or even cosmopolitan national elite, members of the military, or participants in the Malolos Congress, or eventually provincial governors under the American regime. On the other hand, the principales of a town in Samar, Cagayan, or Tayabas might have the status of elite only within their own municipality, or like Aguinaldo and Mariano Alvarez in Cavite before the Revolution, rank as provincial elite. Hence the sociopolitical denomination of principales could in fact embrace a number of different economic levels, and is indeed not very useful as an analytical category apart from the region, province, or town to which the individual belonged. Likewise Owen's "super-principales" or the more common term cacique could likewise denote a member of the cosmopolitan elite like Mariano Abella from Camarines, Jose Alejandrino from Pampanga, Gregorio Aguilera and Lauro Dimayuga from Batangas, or of purely provincial status, like Mena Crisologo in Ilocos or Juan Cailles or Paciano Rizal in Laguna.

137. Schumacher, *Revolutionary Clergy*, pp. 74-87; Mabini to Galicano Apacible, 8 December 1898, *The Letters of Apolinario Mabini* (Manila: National Heroes Commission, 1965), p. 79.

In brief, though a distinct class line separated the lower class, the peasants, the laborers, and the tenants, from the principales and their superiors, there was considerable fluidity of class lines on the upper levels. The variables included not only wealth, education, and political power, but the regional context within which these were influential. When serious studies are done on local history, economic class determinism fails to explain the course of the Revolution. Indeed, there is evidence to indicate that the Revolution itself and one's role in it played a significant factor in upward class mobility during the American regime, just as guerrilla leadership during the Japanese war would provide a ladder to enter the national political elite for men earlier unknown outside their own provinces.¹³⁸

REGIONAL VARIATIONS

Besides the diversity of meaning, often based on region, given to elite terminology, which has been outlined above, other generalizations concerning the Revolution need to be subjected to regional and provincial studies. Most of them have been mentioned already in the course of this article, and it will suffice to summarize them.

The variety of attitudes toward the Spanish friars has been seen to depend on regional considerations. Only in the Tagalog provinces — even here not universally — and to an extent in parts of the Ilokano provinces was antifriar feeling at all widespread among the ordinary people. Though it was more general among the different levels of the elite, even here generalizations break down — General Fernando Canon releasing friar prisoners on his own responsibility in Nueva Vizcaya;¹³⁹ Aguinaldo warning his friar parish priest so that he might escape at the outbreak of the Revolution;¹⁴⁰ harsh imprisonment for the majority of the friars in Neg-

138. After the Revolution, Generals Delgado, Fullon, Cailles, Trias, and perhaps others became provincial governors within a few months after their surrender in 1901. The best known examples from World War II are Ramon Magsaysay and Ferdinand Marcos.

139. "Historia de las conquistas de Cagayán por los revolucionarios tagalos, y de la prisión y cautiverios de los Padres Dominicos . . . por . . . Padre Fray Florentino Fernández," in Isacio R. Rodríguez, O.S.A., *Gregorio Aglipay y los orígenes de la Iglesia Filipina Independiente* (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1960), 2:266.

140. Aguinaldo, *Mga Gunita ng Himagsikan*, pp. 70, 85; Isacio R. Rodríguez, *Historia de la provincia agustiniana del Smo. Nombre de Jesús de Filipinas* (Manila: n.p., 1968), 4:392.

ros, but individuals protected, hidden, or even allowed to continue their ministry in Negros;¹⁴¹ Pangasinan delegate to the Malolos Congress Vicente del Prado forging a death certificate for a friar friend so that he might escape to Hongkong, with the knowledge and tacit consent of Makabulos.¹⁴²

There seems to be some correlation between lay hostility to the friars and the degree to which Filipino priests had been excluded from the position of parish priest in a particular diocese. Thus the worst disparity existed in the dioceses of Manila and Nueva Segovia, while quite equitable proportions were to be found in the dioceses of Cebu and Nueva Caceres, and to a lesser degree in Jaro.¹⁴³ In Cebu and Nueva Caceres, antifriar feeling was almost non-existent, even among the elite. In Jaro, apart from Mindanao, there was considerable ill-feeling among the Filipino clergy toward the friars as well as among some of the cosmopolitan elite, but no friars were taken prisoner except in Negros and all were allowed to depart peacefully, as were the other Spaniards.¹⁴⁴

The participation of the Filipino clergy in the support of the war effort was almost universal in the southern Tagalog provinces, Albay and Sorsogon, and Panay (except for Capiz, where the Tagalog Ananias Diokno ruled), because of the good relationship between the local military leaders and the clergy, the respect shown by the former to ecclesiastical law, and apparently to a considerable extent common school ties and blood relationships with the revolutionary leaders. In all these areas guerrilla warfare was carried on with considerable success, very largely because of the religious sanction given it by the support of the priests. Similar co-operation of the clergy existed in the diocese of Nueva Segovia as long as Aglipay appeared to hold the legitimate jurisdiction of ecclesiastical governor of the diocese. Once his excommunication and his deposition by Bishop Hevia became known, most clerical

141. Martínez Cuesta, *Historia*, pp. 447-56.

142. Herrero, *Nuestra prisión*, pp. 136-37.

143. See table I in Daniel Doeppers, "The Philippine Revolution and the Geography of Schism," *The Geographical Review* 66 (1976): 163; and Schumacher, *Readings*, pp. 309-10. To form a more accurate picture, moreover, one must note that in Cebu and Jaro a large number of the parishes listed under Spanish religious were Recoleta and Jesuit missions in Mindanao, where there were no secular clergy. Hence the proportion of parishes possessed by the Filipino clergy in Cebu and Jaro was even much higher than appears in the tables and the evaluation I have made in the text has taken that into consideration.

144. Schumacher, *Revolutionary Clergy*, pp. 137-39, 157, 176-77.

support rapidly eroded. But Aglipay's personal charismatic leadership of the peasants of Ilocos Norte was able to sustain guerrilla warfare well into 1901.

THE MASSES AND THE REVOLUTION

Finally, coming to the question of mass support of the war, it should not be exaggerated. Peasants on whom fell the heaviest burdens of the war, in the Philippines as elsewhere, did long for peace, and as the pressures became more unbearable, and the abuses of many of the provincial and local elite under pretext of patriotism became too evident, some sought to extract themselves from the conflict. In many places where they did continue to cooperate, the American accusation of guerrilla terrorism was undoubtedly true – just as American counter-terrorism and torture were also true, of which Batangas and Samar are only the most flagrant examples. But in spite of the forces between which they were often trapped, the great majority of the little people did support the war, as even the friars were ready to admit.¹⁴⁵ The reasons varied and overlapped with one another – patron-client bonds, the influence of the Filipino clergy, or their own perception of the war in categories of the Pasyon and of the wider religious tradition which pervaded their categories of thought.

When one asks, however, who profited from the Revolution, class generalizations become much more easy to substantiate. Given the American perception, exemplified most notably in Taft, of the clientelist and semifeudal character of Philippine society, all levels of the elite profited, whatever had been their role in the Revolution. If those of the cosmopolitan elite who early abandoned the Revolution became Supreme Court justices and members of the Philippine Commission, diehard generals and lesser figures of the revolutionary government became provincial governors – Generals Cailles, Trias, Delgado, Fullon – or were able to enter the new modernizing economy under favorable conditions – the friar lands sale being one of the most flagrant examples of this. Privately, more responsible colonial officials recognized and deplored cases of cacique oppression of the masses, but in fact

145. Herrero, *Nuestra prisión*, pp. 813-17.

the policy of governing through the elite was the course along which Philippine society would be directed right up to independence. Just as the war had provided opportunities for upward mobility, so in a much more positive way did the public school system, which contributed to a growing middle class, and even access to the elite classes. But in the end the basic social structure was largely intact, and the areas of social unrest at the end of the Spanish regime would continue to be such through the American regime, and indeed most of them – central Luzon, Samar, Negros, with the addition of newly-settled Mindanao – remain so today. The Revolution of 1896-1902 was indeed a nationalist revolution in which all classes of society participated. But beneath that common surge of national feeling, a complexity of motives and forces were at work, which no monolithic framework can adequately explain. Whether through design or through benign neglect the American regime eventually made possible the achievement of *independencia*; *kalayaan* is still a goal to be won for a large majority of Filipinos.