

philippine studies

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

Church Lands and Philippine Socioeconomic Development

John N. Schumacher

Philippine Studies vol. 25, no. 4 (1977) 456–469

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

Review Article

Church Lands and Philippine Socioeconomic Development

JOHN N. SCHUMACHER

THE FRIAR ESTATES OF THE PHILIPPINES. By Dennis Morrow Roth. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1977. xi, 197 pages. \$12.00.

LANDED ESTATES IN THE PHILIPPINES. By Nicholas Cushner. (Yale Southeast Asian Studies, monograph series no. 20). New Haven: Yale Southeast Asian Studies, 1976. vi, 145 pages. \$10.50. Distributed by the Cellar Bookshop.

It is a curious coincidence that when the study of the haciendas owned by the religious orders under the Spanish regime has been so long neglected, in spite of their importance to the social and economic development of the Tagalog provinces, two independent studies of the subject should appear within such a brief interval. Neither of them, however, renders the other superfluous, for they differ with regard to their archival sources — and hence also as to the location and ownership of the haciendas studied — as well as in their method. Roth, an anthropologist, has worked principally from the Dominican archives in Manila, with occasional use of the Philippine National Archives and of some Jesuit and Augustinian sources. Hence the geographical focus of his work is *de facto* principally Laguna, Bulacan, and to a lesser extent, Cavite. Cushner has made the old province of Tondo — roughly modern metro-Manila apart from Bulacan — the subject of his study, where almost all of the haciendas were Augustinian or Jesuit, and hence has explored much more intensively the Jesuit records in Rome and Spain, and the Augustinian archives for the period before the British invasion, now found in the Lilly Library of the University of Indiana. He has likewise used the Archivo General de Indias in Seville. Cushner's study terminates shortly after the agrarian revolt of 1745, since the Jesuit haciendas were confiscated by the government on the expulsion of

their owners in 1768, and this collection of Augustinian records likewise terminates before 1762, the date when they were looted by the British in Manila to begin the itinerary which has brought them to the Lilly Library. Roth, on the other hand, though noting that the Dominican archives contain less material for the nineteenth than for the earlier centuries, attempts — with less success than in the earlier period, in my opinion — to extend his analysis up to the period of the Revolution.

METHODOLOGY

Speaking in broad terms, one may say that Cushner is more descriptive in his approach, while Roth is more analytical and comparative. Where they treat the same topics, Roth is likely to give a fuller and more systematic presentation. On the other hand, the historian feels uneasy with his unspoken assumption that the hacienda system was more or less uniform everywhere, even though the substantive data are drawn chiefly from the Dominican haciendas of Biñan and Sta. Rosa in Laguna, and Pandi and Lolomboy in Bulacan. Roth acknowledges frankly in the introduction the uneven character of his documentation:

These deficiencies in data can be overcome only through a process of ethnohistorical reasoning and some educated guesswork. Some of what appears to be straight narrative in this study is actually the result of piecing together and analyzing fragmentary data. I have presented it in a declarative mood because the probability of its accuracy is good. In other cases where documentation is slim or absent, I have used various forms of the subjunctive.

Of course, every historian makes use of a certain amount of educated guesswork and reasoning. But one would wish to see more of the steps on which these are based. Frequently when a statement raised a question in my own mind, I looked to the footnotes, only to be met with a terse reference to a volume and page in the Dominican archives, more often giving no inkling of what the document deals with. The assertion that governors attempting to impose the *vandala* on hacienda tenants were “*invariably* stopped by religious orders and officials in Manila” (p. 71; *italics mine*), for example, is buttressed by a single reference to a document in the Philippine National Archives. Moreover, there is generally no indication as to whether a statement was found in the documents themselves, or is the result of a process of analysis and reasoning whose steps the historian would wish to examine more closely in order to estimate for himself its suaveness.

ORIGIN AND EXPANSION OF HACIENDAS

Both studies make clear that the primary origin of the Church haciendas

was the land grants made by the King of Spain to various Spaniards who took part in the original conquest; a few went to the Augustinians. Given the pre-occupation of almost all lay Spaniards with the galleon trade, most of their lands eventually passed into the hands of the religious orders (except the Franciscans, whose constitutions did not permit the ownership of property), who used them to supplement the allowances granted by the King for the transportation of missionaries, for their educational institutions (in the case of the Dominicans and Jesuits), for the support of their monasteries and churches in Manila, and for missionaries to China and Vietnam. The orders acquired the haciendas as donations which were given for pious motives, or through sales by Spanish owners who become uninterested or found themselves incapable of managing the estates successfully. Subsequently the estates were enlarged by donations or sales by Filipino *principales*, acting on their own behalf or that of the towns. Though Roth states that "there are no records of land transactions in any of the central Luzon provinces until the early twentieth century except in Pampanga" (p. 119), Cushner has provided in Appendix F a useful listing of all such sales or donations in Tondo province, 1588–1694, the basic formative period of the haciendas, which well illustrate this process. These data make clear the baselessness of the stereotype created by the antifriar propaganda of the turn of this century, and still sometimes met with, that the friar haciendas were the fruit of simple usurpation of Filipino lands by the religious orders.

However, other questions deserve to be raised which push the matter of deprivation of lands a step further. Were the royal grants made to Spaniards, which were eventually donated or sold to the religious, originally Filipino-owned lands? Secondly, were the lands donated or sold by Filipino *principales* really theirs to dispose of? Thirdly, did the haciendas, even if legitimate in their origin, not only as property of the religious, but of those from whom they acquired them, gradually extend themselves beyond their original boundaries at the expense of Filipino villages, as the Rizals asserted concerning the Calamba hacienda in the 1880s?

With regard to the first question, the royal land grants stipulated that they were made only from lands not owned by Filipinos; however, both Cushner and Roth feel that some Filipino-owned lands must have been included, though there is no direct evidence to support this. One cannot deny the possibility, of course, but in general the religious haciendas of Laguna, Bulacan, and Cavite at least, and apparently, those of Tondo as well, seem to have originally been formed precisely in those territories where there were no towns at the beginning of the Spanish conquest, as may be seen from Phelan's list of towns founded before 1650 (*Hispanization of the Philippines*, pp. 168–76), and seems also to be indicated from the lists of Tondo towns and encomiendas reproduced by Cushner in Tables 1 and 2 (pp. 97–98). The towns which were later to be found within such major haciendas as

Biñan, Imus, Buenavista, seem to have come into existence precisely *as a result of* the haciendas rather than to have existed and then been swallowed up by the haciendas. More has to be known, however, about pre-Hispanic population and patterns of settlement to give a completely certain answer.

More important, perhaps, is the question whether the numerous pieces of land sold by Filipinos to the religious orders – either directly in the period after the establishment of the religious haciendas, or indirectly by prior sale to lay Spaniards who in turn eventually sold them to the religious haciendas – actually belonged to those who sold them, or in some cases, donated them to the religious. Here again Spanish law provided a number of safeguards to assure true ownership of land and its availability for sale, but these were not always observed, and both Cushner and Roth feel it likely that unjust transfers of communal land appropriated by principales must have taken place. Cushner notes (p. 20) that no lawsuits against principales selling inalienable common lands have been found, but considers that many of the sales listed must have been such. Certainly Father Martínez de Zúñiga was aware of principales selling lands which were not theirs in the late eighteenth century, and it is even more likely that this would have been true in the confusion of the years shortly after the conquest. The basic problem here, of course, is the obscurity as to precisely what the system of land tenure was in pre-Hispanic times. Roth refers to it as one of the “unresolved questions in Philippine scholarship” (p. 43); Cushner, conceding likewise the uncertainty of answers to the question, attempts an explanation (pp. 17–22) which resembles, but goes beyond, that of Phelan, showing cases of principales administering the land of a town in the name of others, and citing instances of land being sold together with those occupying it. (It is not, however, clear if these were small peasant owners, or *aliping namamahay* who had use, not ownership, of the land of the principales). Communal lands for grazing and gathering firewood were certainly remains of the pre-Hispanic system, and were recognized by Spanish law, but it was concerning these that disputes most often arose between the haciendas and the neighboring villages, particularly in the eighteenth century when the haciendas began to expand production and the population was likewise growing. (Nonetheless it is not clear why Cushner speaks of “rich” communal lands, except perhaps for those disputed between the town of Silang and the Biñan hacienda, when these were normally for grazing and firewood, as he himself states, and generally uplands. Likewise his statement that the quality of peasants’ strips of land around the towns was “poor” is not supported by his source, Comyn). His conclusion that principales often alienated inalienable communal lands seems likely in his explanation of earlier land tenure, but it is evident that the one rests on the other.

The third question, whether the haciendas expanded illegitimately at the expense of surrounding Filipino villages (apart from the illegal sale of communal lands by principales, which might or might not involve collusion

of hacienda administrators) is not satisfactorily explained by either author, though both agree illegitimate expansion must have taken place. When the agrarian revolt of 1745 broke out, the Filipinos in revolt generally claimed that the haciendas had usurped communal lands belonging to them from their ancestors. Significantly the revolts did not take place among the tenants of the haciendas, except in one case, but among those of neighboring towns, who even attacked the tenants of the haciendas. One of the principal sources of trouble was in Cavite where the inhabitants of Silang, backed by their parish priest, complained that the hacienda of Biñan had encroached on their lands. The *Oidor* Calderón, who put down the revolt, though maintaining the rights of property of the hacienda in general, did take certain lands away from this hacienda (and others) which were in excess of their original grants. Other elements in the dispute seem to have been not so much over the ownership of land as over the traditional right to use uplands for wood-gathering and pasture. In an earlier period when large areas of the haciendas were uncultivated, these rights had not been challenged, but as land became more valuable, particularly with the introduction of Chinese and Chinese mestizos into Biñan as tenants, the hacienda administrators began to enclose such lands or to charge for their use.

Though the evidence seems to make clear that there was an expansion of Biñan and other haciendas at the expense of neighboring Filipino villages, it is at the same time by no means clear to what extent we should speak of simple cases of deliberate usurpation. Roth notes that shortly after Calderón's solution of the 1745 revolt, he was found in Pampanga, where there were no religious haciendas, rebuking the principales for having usurped large amounts of land (p. 114). At least one factor involved in the grievances would appear to be a changing concept of land ownership, one stimulated no doubt by the beginnings of commercial agriculture and the increasing value of land in the areas near Manila. In the continuing change from traditional Filipino to Hispanic notions of property, both the Hispanized Pampanga principales and the Spanish religious hacienda administrators might have been adopting standards, perhaps reasonable to them, but in conflict with traditional norms. Perhaps it is significant that both among the principales of Pampanga, as the research of Larkin and Wickberg has shown, and among the tenants of the hacienda of Biñan, Chinese mestizos were prominent — men who were not traditional peasants, but who were heavily Hispanized and hence "modern" in their way of thinking.

Another related factor alluded to by both authors is the vagueness of some of the original hacienda boundaries. Cushner mentions, for example, that one of the original boundaries of the Augustinian hacienda of Muntinlupa was "the lands of the people of Parañaque." In the seventeenth century when much of the intervening land was unused, or used only for grazing, such a vague boundary did not lead to serious disputes, but by the eighteenth

century the case was different, both as to extent of land usage and as to concepts of property use.

One final observation may be made with regard to the land titles of many of the religious haciendas having been "acquired by tainted means" as Roth remarks (p. 112). Cushner too, speaking of the Spanish juridical device of *composición de tierras*, by which on the payment of a fee to the government defective titles were legalized, remarks that the procedure in fact "reinforced and legalized unjust land seizures, for a defective title or a case of unjust possession of land could be legitimized" (p. 65). Both observations are in one sense correct, but a distinction should be made between those cases where titles were defective because of actual usurpation of lands and those where the defect was rather in the failure to fulfil requirements of Spanish law. In the former case, the lands were indeed "tainted," and it was true that government inspection of land titles was more intended to raise money for the government than to do justice to Filipinos. In the latter case, however, within which most of the instances cited seem to be comprised, the failure to fulfill legal formalities did not necessarily, though it might, imply any injustice done to rightful owners. In this connection too, mention should be made of the well-known fact that many Spanish laws, often made in Madrid without knowledge of local situations, or made for the entire Indies, having in mind greatly differing conditions in Mexico or elsewhere in America, were ignored by officials in the Philippines as being inapplicable.

Such, for example, was the prohibition against royal land grants being sold to religious orders, which was universally evaded by selling to a third party who in turn resold the land to the religious order. Because of the fact that only the religious orders had sufficient stability to make haciendas productive for the food needs of Manila, the practice was tacitly allowed by the Manila government. (Cushner, mentions, without source, a prohibition of *Filipinos* selling lands to the religious. This seems to be a confusion with the former prohibition, since the records reproduced in his Appendix F show several such transactions specifically recorded and not merely evaded). The main reason behind the prohibition seems to have been the characteristic preoccupation of the Spanish government even in the sixteenth century, but much more so in the eighteenth, with the spread of mortmain, the inalienable character generally given to landed property of the Church. But whereas in Spain this concentration of land ownership did inhibit economic progress, in the Philippines it was the haciendas which served as the catalysts of improved methods of farming and marketing, certainly until the nineteenth century at least. Roth mentions how frequently doctrinaire ideologists criticized the Philippine haciendas while really having in mind the conditions in Spain. Those who were more aware of the needs of the country simply ignored the inapplicable laws. More often than not, when accusations were made, in this sphere as in so many others, it was rather due to rivalries or antagonisms

which had other roots than any particular desire to right wrongs. Thus it is difficult to accept, e.g., Roth's citation of the Oidor Carvajal as one who "showed perhaps more understanding and sympathy for the Filipinos than any other Spanish official of his time" (p. 50), or his Memorial as "a detailed firsthand account of the financial operations of a typical hacienda in the early 1780s" (p. 80). No doubt many of Carvajal's strictures on the haciendas were correct (though it is not clear how his is a "first-hand account"), but the rhetoric of sympathy for the plight of the Filipino is quite typical of the "enlightened" officials of late eighteenth century Spain and the Philippines, who were more interested in castigating the religious orders than ameliorating the lot of Filipinos. One need only think of Carvajal's contemporary, Simón de Anda, whose attacks on the friars made him seem to be a champion of the Filipino clergy, until his abandonment of the cause of the latter exposed the doctrinaire antifriar sentiments which had led him to adopt his earlier stance. This is not to say, of course, that there was no validity to the charges made, but that they must be critically evaluated and not taken at face value, much less made out to be totally accurate sources, as Roth does repeatedly, anymore than any of the other polemic documents of the disputes of the time.

HACIENDA LABOR

Both Roth and Cushner have made considerable contributions to our understanding of the hacienda labor system. The latter distinguishes five laboring strata: salaried labor, unsalaried labor, *inquilinos*, *reservas*, and "the group farmer." Of the last-named category all that is known is that contracts were made between Spanish landowners and whole villages to work hacienda land. Cushner believes that probably smaller groups were selected by the principales to perform the necessary labor on behalf of the town. Without further details about the terms of the contracts or their dates, it is useless to speculate, but it seems to me possible that these may have been comprehended under one of the other categories. The slaves, whom Roth also mentions but about whose identity he is uncertain, Cushner shows most probably not to have been Filipinos, even though Christian, but those called *Cafres*, *Macassares*, or other such names in the sources, who were brought in by the Portuguese from India or elsewhere in Portuguese Asia. Also among the "non-salaried" Cushner includes the *indios de la estancia* "who provided labor service in return for a small plot of land." One would like to know more about these, for, as Cushner observes, if they were really unsalaried laborers they would probably have been called *reservas*. He conjectures that they may have been holdovers from the pre-Hispanic system of tenure, where they had held a piece of land in exchange for labor services to the datu. When the land was

sold or transferred to the hacienda by the *datu*, they remained, rendering services to the hacienda instead.

Sometimes something similar happened in the case of the more familiar inquilino, or leaseholder. Some of these had originally owned their own land and sold it to the hacienda, whether for need of money or for the sake of escaping such government exactions as the *polo* and *vandala*, remaining on the land afterwards as inquilinos. Cushner notes that for the seventeenth century most inquilinos had plots of one or two *balitas* (a hectare or less), while at the end of the eighteenth century inquilinos would own large enough plots of land to sublease it to *kasama* on a sharecropping basis. This would indicate a major change in renting patterns, if Cushner's figures are verified in other provinces. Roth does not take up the question specifically for the seventeenth century, but indicates that in the middle of the eighteenth century, the average landholding of an inquilino on the Bifian hacienda was a half *quinon* (2.9 hectares) and a similar ratio existed on the Imus hacienda. This appears to be the maximum area one person could farm himself. Whether the difference was due to the progressive clearing of lands as generations passed, or to different conditions in different provinces or in different types of haciendas is not clear. But the existence of the differences points up the difficulty of generalizing for Philippine haciendas as a group from the study of only one set of sources. How different the conditions might be is pointed up by the fact that just at the time that the Laguna haciendas were continuing to expand at the end of the eighteenth century, the Augustinians were abandoning that of Meysapan (between Guadalupe and Parañaque) in Tondo province.

The *reservas*, laborers assigned to the haciendas and exempted from the compulsory government labor of the *polo*, appear to have been a major source of the hacienda labor force in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, and are treated most extensively by Roth. For these *reservas*, originally assigned to the haciendas from among the *vagamundos* — those without fixed residence and hence not enrolled in a *barangay* for purposes of tribute and compulsory labor — the government received a payment of four pesos each from the hacienda. Since otherwise these *vagamundos* often were able to escape completely from tribute and *polo*, this system at first increased government revenue. But as the timber-cutting *polo* as well as the *vandala* became more and more oppressive in the seventeenth century, more and more Filipinos sought the status of *reserva* to escape from these government requisitions and forced labor, and numbers greatly in excess of that legally allowed seem to have been common on the haciendas. Though this is an indication that a position on the hacienda was a great benefit to the ordinary Filipino, the burden on the neighboring towns was often increased by the flight of so many to the haciendas, and was often the subject of complaint from these towns as well as from government officials.

To the above-mentioned types of labor must be added the sharecroppers or *kasama*, who are only briefly alluded to by Cushner, since the development of this form of labor took place largely after the period with which he is dealing. Roth, however, traces in some detail from various indirect indications the development of the peculiar form of the sharecropping system which became characteristic of friar haciendas in the latter part of the eighteenth century. Increasingly the land was rented from the hacienda by noncultivating inquilinos, who in turn sublet it to their *kasama* on a sharecropping basis. The process went on more quickly on some haciendas than on others, but it seems to have been quite complete by the end of the nineteenth century. Many of the rich inquilinos were Chinese mestizos who came into the haciendas from the outside in the nineteenth century. With their accumulated capital they were in a position to supply money to the small peasant and thus eventually got control of his land on the hacienda. Though the administrators of the haciendas originally objected to the system, they came to prefer to rent to these noncultivating inquilinos, who were more certain sources of rent, and who relieved them of the necessity of making loans to the tenants as well as of much of the administration. It would appear therefore that both the hacienda and the inquilinos profited from the arrangement, but the *kasama*, now with two strata of owners above him, suffered diminution of his income.

FRIAR HACIENDAS AND THE REVOLUTION

The rapid growth of commercial agriculture in the nineteenth century, combined with a likewise rapid growth in population, made the haciendas increasingly more valuable. To whom this increased profit went is a key question with reference to the Revolution. The owners of the haciendas clearly profited; the peasant *kasama*, it appears, did not, and even suffered a decrease in his real income. The extent to which this was true is tied up with the question whether the inquilinos' income decreased, since that of the *kasama* was by definition a share of what remained after the inquilino had paid the rent to the hacienda. In a rather complex argumentation, which I confess myself unable fully to follow, Roth maintains (pp. 138-45) that rents on the haciendas increased in the nineteenth century while yields fell; the combination led to "deteriorating economic conditions" for both inquilinos and *kasama* (p. 146). That rents were raised in the nineteenth century is not surprising; the magnitude of the raises and the extent to which they were disproportionate to the yield of the land is much less clear. Roth makes use of disparate data from different dates and different haciendas to arrive at his conclusions, but the assumption that all had the same or similar conditions remains unproved, and the use of one probable inference as the base for inferring another probability leaves the historian uneasy before such

a fragile structure. Part of the argument on decreasing yields, for example, is based on a figure for 1820 from San Pedro Tunasan, which Martínez de Zúñiga had thirty years earlier incidentally declared to be as fertile as Biñan. This casual and general remark of Zúñiga, whose accuracy with regard to Biñan the author has already discounted on the question of yield, is then measured against a specific year on Tunasan, with no indication of how typical that year might have been, or whether it could have been a year of crop failure. Moreover, Tunasan had passed into the hands of lay lessees at the expulsion of the Jesuits, and one would like to know to what extent it had suffered the decay that Zúñiga notes came on so many of the other former Jesuit estates. The yield on haciendas in general may well have decreased, but the evidence from Tunasan in 1820 joined to a 1790 figure for the atypical minuscule hacienda of San Juan del Monte is scarcely probative. One must also question the argumentation by which one figure from Marín y Morales' 1901 *Ensayo* is used to argue to a drastic decrease in yield, while all his other contemporary figures attesting to the profitability of the haciendas for the *inquilinos* are rejected (pp. 141–43).

Such argumentation from disparate data and dubious inferences is rather frequent in the last two chapters of Roth's book where the effort is made to explain why "it was only on these [friar] estates that agrarian unrest was a dominant factor in the revolution of 1896" (p. 146). The relative dearth of source material on the haciendas in the Dominican archives for the nineteenth century in comparison with the seventeenth and eighteenth, which Roth notes in the beginning of his study, has no doubt contributed to this, but likewise the rather narrowly economic perspective from which the problem is investigated. Agitation against the friar haciendas, to the extent that it existed, was not merely, and most probably not principally, an economic question at all. Rather, as I have tried to show in my book on the Propaganda Movement, even the most notorious case of Calamba was, both in the mind of the government and of the friars on the one hand, and in that of the Rizals and their allies on the other, only secondarily economic. The primary issue everywhere was political and nationalistic — the haciendas were a source and a manifestation of the influence of the friars in Philippine society, and the agitation against them was part of a wider effort necessary to destroy that influence so as to make possible the emergence of a Filipino nation.

Roth has served himself ill by taking the Calamba case as the framework of his study — his first chapter is a brief overview of the Calamba controversy, accompanied by quotations concerning other haciendas from the notoriously unreliable testimony given before the Philippine Commission at the beginning of the American regime. (Besides the faulty transcription and translation which plagues the published accounts of all these hearings, the predominance therein of professed enemies of the friars makes it impossible to take statements at face value unless otherwise corroborated.) But Calamba was in many

ways a hacienda very different from, e.g., neighboring Bifian. It had been lay-owned until 1759, when its owner, unable to make it succeed, had given it to the Jesuits. On the expulsion of the latter in 1768, it had passed through several hands, before being bought in 1830, in ruinous condition, by the Dominicans, who then began to build it up. The fact too that sugar played such a large and increasing part in the products of the hacienda differentiated it from others, and made it more susceptible to disturbances from the world market than the predominantly rice haciendas. To argue from the agitation in Calamba to general agrarian unrest in 1896 is to say the least tenuous. Nor is it convincing to say that "the hacienda towns of Cavite, Bulacan, and Laguna were some of the principal battlegrounds between Spanish and Filipino forces" (p. 152). So were non-hacienda towns, of course, nor is there any evidence that I am aware of that agrarian questions were raised in 1896. No doubt the haciendas were attacked by the Revolutionary forces, but for the obvious reason, apart from hostility to the friars on the part of some leaders, that they were sources of rice and money for the support of the Revolution.

In spite of the frequency with which the statement is made, I can find no evidence in Roth or elsewhere that justifies speaking of the Philippine Revolution as an agrarian revolt. That some of the Revolutionary leaders, whether themselves inquilinos or not, were anxious to get control of friar lands, and did profit from the sale of the haciendas during the American regime, is of course true. That the Malolos government expropriated the friar lands is of course also true. And as Roth points out, the development of the inquilino-kasama system on the friar haciendas during the nineteenth century did loosen the patron-client ties between landlord (friar) and peasant. "Social differentiation had disrupted clear lines of hacienda authority" (p. 153). But for all this, I have not seen any evidence of *peasant* unrest on the friar haciendas, apart from the antifriar agitation in general that followed the Revolution, primarily political in nature and motivated by nationalism, in which the Calamba unrest, itself an affair of inquilinos, not of peasant kasama, was only an early and isolated episode.

Still less do I find any reason to say that "the revolt of 1745 derives its primary significance as a forerunner of the 1896 revolution on the estates" (p. 101), or that it "was the first large-scale manifestation of Filipino anger against the monastic orders" (ibid). With regard to the second point, one need only read Roth's own account of the 1745 revolt to see that it was against the *haciendas*, not against the religious orders as such, for it was religious parish priests of towns like Silang who joined the protests against hacienda encroachment (pp. 107-8), and in at least one case it was a friar who was asked by rebels to act as intermediary with the government, as long as he should not be from the order owning the estate in question (Cushner, p. 60). With regard to the 1745 revolt being a forerunner, even of the Calamba agitation, one only need recall that the rebels from Silang in 1745 were not

hacienda tenants, but were precisely protesting against the hacienda of Bifian introducing as tenants Chinese and Chinese mestizos, among whom would have been the ancestor of Jose Rizal, Lam-co. It was the wealth which had come to Francisco Mercado Rizal in moving from the Bifian hacienda where his ancestors had prospered, to the disadvantage of the people of Silang, to the more progressive hacienda of Calamba with its new opportunities, which enabled him to support his son in Europe. Rather than there being a continuity between the agitation of 1745 and what existed in Calamba in the 1880s, it was the targets of the first who became the movers of the second. But the issues were quite different.

Finally, one must note that particularly in these last two chapters of Roth one must take exception to the methodology by which data from widely separated dates are used to draw conclusions. Considering the number of possible factors which could have intervened, particularly the sale of the Bifian hacienda to the Insular government, and the unknown quantity of which parts of the hacienda were being sold and of what quality land, it seems adventuresome to criticize an 1800 figure of Martínez de Zúñiga on the basis of a 1924 figure of the Bureau of Lands. Even more unjustified is the statement that in the nineteenth century, "administrators were in the habit of expelling sharecroppers and seizing their crops even if the inquilinos were not in arrears" (p. 131), when the footnote gives as a source a Labor Department report of 1936, to which Roth notes that this "probably also took place in the nineteenth century" (p. 186, n. 1). Other examples equally based on a static view of the haciendas, quite abstracted from the extensive changes in twentieth-century Philippine society, could likewise be cited. One must conclude that in spite of some valuable data and observations, Roth's chapter on the nineteenth century and the conclusions suffer from serious weaknesses in historical methodology.

Equally inconsistent with historical realities as well as tendentious is the statement that in the nineteenth century "the state theoretically could have assumed the task" of education (p. 95) rather than the Dominican institutions supported by the haciendas. Anyone who knows anything about the nineteenth-century Spanish bureaucracy in the Philippines and what it did with that part of the educational system it did pretend to manage, will realize the improbability of such a statement, apart from the even more improbable assumption that if the haciendas had been taken from the friars their output would have been used more for the common good than it was by the orders who provided education and other services for the Filipino people. Subsequent history has shown that the selling of the friar haciendas, however desirable it may have been from certain points of view, particularly the disinvolvement of the Church from unseemly land disputes, has brought benefit only to the clever people who made themselves more wealthy while bringing greater misery to the Filipino peasant.

Similar manifestations of antifriar sentiments are found elsewhere: "*On occasion* there seem to have been administrators who strove to deal equitably with the tenants of the haciendas" (p. 57; italics mine). The gratuitous implication that such was a rare thing finds no support even in Roth's own selection of evidence. It is unfortunate that a book which could not have been done without extensive cooperation from the Dominican archivist, and which is otherwise a pioneering work making many contributions, should be marred by such unnecessary prejudices.

UNRESOLVED ISSUES AND DIRECTIONS OF RESEARCH

The two books under review, in spite of the reservations which have been made and the questions raised, are major contributions to a hitherto mostly unexplored area of research into the social and economic development of Tagalog society under the Spanish regime. Both have greatly enlarged our knowledge of the economic development of the Tagalog provinces during that period, and have at least opened up numerous avenues of research on the sociocultural evolution of Tagalog society as a whole. Much, however, remains to be done. One indication is the contradictions which may be found between the two authors. A very simple example is the fact of different equivalents given for land measures: Cushner transposes the old Philippine measures of *quignon*, *balita*, *braza*, etc. into the English system (p. 73) rather than the more convenient metric system used by Roth (p. 173), but the *quignon* of Cushner is 20 percent larger than that of Roth, though both used at least one common source for deriving their equivalents. Not having access to the original sources, one is at a loss to know which is correct; indeed it is difficult to know then what reliance can be placed on the figures for hacienda expansion. On the other hand, the figure of 414 square miles given by Cushner for the hacienda of Biñan (p. 105) is wildly wrong by any computation, as are apparently all the other figures in this table. (Inasmuch as this table is strangely incomplete, perhaps there is an editor's or printer's error involved here).

On a different level, Roth asserts that most of the properties donated by Filipino principales "did not form parts of the haciendas, but were administered as separate *capellanias*" (p. 43), while Cushner indicates that in Tondo at least, they were regularly incorporated into the haciendas (pp. 20, 29). The question is not whether one author is correct and the other wrong, though that may be so, but whether there were different practices on different haciendas, or in different orders, or whether data on some points are erroneous or simply missing. This and other issues I have raised in this article indicate the necessity of more extensive research into other haciendas than those used in these two books. The Recoleta and the later Augustinian archives have not been investigated, nor have the Jesuit sources for the haciendas outside Tondo, nor

the archives of the archdiocese of Manila. Especially the study of the haciendas in the nineteenth century, inadequately treated by Roth, as I have already indicated, can only be done in conjunction with a study of the haciendas owned by lay Spaniards and Filipinos, as well as with an investigation of the general agrarian picture of the provinces involved, and the relation of agrarian developments to the wider society.

Numerous other questions have been raised by these studies. If the *principales* really lost their power and prestige in the seventeenth century, as Cushner asserts (p. 19), how did the feudal structure of the sixteenth and seventeenth century survive to reemerge in the *inquilino-kasama* system of the end of the eighteenth? What is the significance in relation to the development of the Filipino elite of the fact that not only Spanish-owned haciendas but Filipino *principales* in Ilocos, Pangasinan, and Pampanga were granted exempt laborers by the government (Roth pp. 181–82, n. 48)? What is the relation between the changes in land tenure in the seventeenth century recounted here and the disruptions of Tagalog society due to the timber-cutting and vandala, as described by Phelan? Both authors make allusions to this disruption in their treatment of the *reservas* but the disrupting forces are not fully related to each other.

New avenues of research, apart from the questions raised, have also been opened up. Some of the information contained in the tables of the two authors and the valuable appendixes of Cushner point the way to future research on demographic trends, standards of living, the role of the haciendas in developing agriculture in the Tagalog provinces, and the sociocultural development accompanying this, which laid the substratum for the more rapid development of nationalism in this region relative to the rest of the country. In spite of some of the criticisms raised here, both these pioneering works deserve careful attention by historians of the Philippines, to follow up on the directions they have opened up for the study of Filipino society (rather than Spanish society in the Philippines) during the period of Spanish colonial rule. Hopefully such study will not be merely economic in nature. But at the same time, if valid syntheses are to be achieved, it will only be with prior research into economic developments such as essayed in these works.