

philippine studies

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

Folk Architecture, by Perez, et al.

Review Author: Rene B. Javellana, S.J.

Philippine Studies vol. 38, no. 2 (1990) 267–268

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

the payments, and there were not enough American personnel to supervise the program. But more importantly, the people were still suspicious of the newcomers. Outside of the towns, the guerillas were in control, and Americanistas were either threatened or liquidated. In more than one case, the newly appointed town officials were the guerilla leaders themselves.

The situation in Bicol, or the Third District, was different. There the local leaders refused to engage in open fighting, but having withdrawn to the mountains with much of the civilian population, resorted to random sniping at the enemy.

This situation did not last long. Life in the mountains was not easy, and the guerilla leaders did not have an extensive civilian base to support the movement. Ports were under American control, ensuring continued abaca exports, and American enclaves surrounded the towns, although the guerillas controlled the rural areas as elsewhere, due to inadequate American personnel. Fortunately, the Americans decided on a more intensive pacification campaign, aided to a great extent by the town presidents they had appointed and the clergy, both of whom urged the population to befriend the newcomers. An added factor was the general coolness among the Bicolanos toward the Tagalog leaders. Soon schools, markets, and other civic projects were set up, proving to the people that American rule was "tolerable and even potentially beneficial" [sic] (p. 118).

Different approaches were taken in the other two Tagalog regions. But perhaps the key was the decision to stop supporting the local elite and make them responsible for any anti-American activity. Earlier, their cooperation was sought, but the Americans soon found out that they were playing a dual role, *amigos* when it suited them during the day, guerillas at night. This change in strategy turned the tide, and except for Malvar who surrendered last, resistance eventually ended.

There are a number of errors that a second edition should correct. A few examples: "Guitterez" (p. 39) is most probably Gutierrez; "Anicela" (p. 44), Aniceto; "Sandahatan" (*passim*) Sandatahan; "Malabog" (p. 105), Malibog; etc.

Linn deserves congratulations for his painstaking research. The present book will give ultra-nationalist or simplistic historiographers a pause. Except for the reservations mentioned in this essay, the book is recommended.

Jose S. Arcilla, S.J.
Department of History
Ateneo de Manila University

FOLK ARCHITECTURE. Text by Rodrigo D. Perez III, Rosario S. Encarnacion, Julian E. Dacanay, Jr. Photographs by Joseph R. Fortin and John K. Chua. Quezon City: GCF Books, 1989. 264 pages. illus.

Folk Architecture is a good example of how not to design a book. The elements for a good book are all there. Text by leading authorities: Rodrigo Perez III, who recently published a monograph on Philippine architecture for the CCP series on the Seven Arts, Rosario Encarnacion who collaborated in the now classic *Philip-*

pine Ancestral Houses, and Julian Dacanay, who published a book on *Ethnic Houses*. The photographs are competently taken. Much research has gone into tracking down archival photo material. And the architectural plans show the same care found in the earlier book on ancestral houses. But somehow, the pieces don't fit together.

The introductory essay shows the unsolved problem faced by the editors. Which comes first, text or image? It is disconcerting to read a long line of text if the eye has to jump from word to word because a folksy rendering of a house, a dragon, an anahaw leaf or a design motif intervenes. On p. 11, for example, "between the nipa hut and 19th [eyes skip over foliage motif]-century colonial houses stand houses like those of Panay."

And how do you read the essays of Perez, Encarnacion and Dacanay? One needs a map to navigate, because this time, short essays on various topics intervene. Here's the guide for Perez's essay: Read pp. 12-15, then 31-41, 44-67, 70-97. For Encarnacion's essay, read pp. 106-107, 116-17, 120-33, 138-53, 157-79. For Dacanay, pp. 184-91, 195-217, 223-30, 232-38, 240-56, 258. That sounds like a sixties adolescent trick done in library books (remember "if you want to know who killed whom, turn to p. 37, then to p. 141, then back to 17 . . . *ad absurdum*"), or like following a lead story in the dailies, and gives one a feeling of the book's design problem. The editors must have had the successful *Philippine Ancestral Houses* in mind, but there the parenthetical intrusions did not hinder the flow of the main text.

Part of the problem stems from the conflict between the magazine-style layout of the book and the conventions of the book form. The choice of type and the manner of highlighting parenthetical essays do not succeed as well as in *Philippine Ancestral Houses*.

One can also nitpick and ask: why an anthropomorphic letter "T" on p. 9 and the ladder-shaped "H" on p. 11, when all other initial capitals follow a different design? Why is the first paragraph on p. 195 in italics when it is obviously a continuation of the main text, italics being reserved for parenthetical essays? But enough of that, what of the content of the essays?

Being written by three authors, it is expected that these would be dissimilar. Perez's essay is the most macroscopic, and takes the form of a catalogue. Encarnacion's is most limited in scope, but also the most thorough in analysis; it is also the most original of the three, because very little has been written about the folk houses of Panay. Dacanay's essay takes the form of a catalogue and a participant-observer's log of different Mindanao houses.

But the essays still leave one with a sense of unease. Perhaps methodology is involved. Is mere cataloguing enough to understand and appreciate folk architecture? As cultural artifact, the folk house begs to be interpreted within a cultural matrix. True, there are references to beliefs, climatological factors, historical antecedents, etc., but these are not too well woven into the essays. Dacanay does some meshing-in in the epilogue of the Mindanao section and Perez in the introduction; but Perez did better when interpreting Philippine architecture for CCP's *Tuklas Sining* series. Space surrounding space was a recurrent theme of his monograph. Winand Klassen's semiological approach to architecture in *Architecture in the Philippines* is intellectually more satisfying.

What about the photographs? This is the saving grace of the book. Most are well-taken and the publication of archival photos adds value to the otherwise flawed book. But perhaps this is what the book was, after all. A collection of photographs, never meant to be read through by a reviewer, but to be perused on some leisurely Sunday afternoon just as one peruses the Sunday magazines, only occasionally, turning to the text. And maybe, the eye satisfied, interest aroused, the reader might learn a thing or two about a precious Filipino heritage.

Rene B. Javellana, S.J.
Communications Department
Ateneo de Manila University

TUKLAS SINING. Doreen G. Fernandez, *Panitikan: An Essay on Philippine Art*; Alice C. Guillermo, *Sining Biswal: An Essay on Philippine Visual Arts*; Antonio C. Hila, *Musika: An Essay on Philippine Music*; Bienvenido L. Lumbea, *Pelikula: An Essay on Philippine Film*; Rodrigo D. Perez, III, *Arkitektura: An Essay on Philippine Architecture*; Nicanor G. Tiongson, *Dulaan: An Essay on Philippine Theater*; Basilio Esteban S. Villaruz, *Sayaw: An Essay on Philippine Dance*. Manila: Cultural Center of the Philippines, 1989.

Tuklas Sining, to quote the foreword to each of the seven monographs, "is a series of essays and video documentaries on the seven arts in the Philippines published by the Cultural Center of the Philippines. The monographs trace the evolution of the arts in the context of Philippine society and history and help create a Filipino national consciousness and identity. Furthermore, they illustrate how art and culture are essential to the task of nation building."

Beginning with its revamp in 1986, the Cultural Center of the Philippines has taken a more nationalist orientation in its programs and research. *Tuklas Sining* is an innovative fruit of the Center's orientation. *Tuklas Sining*, especially the video documentary part, is long overdue. How can we expect to raise a national consciousness, if we don't know what to crow about? Now, here in the modern idiom of video, we are regaled with the Filipinos' cultural heritage in the seven arts: music, literature, drama, architecture, painting, dance, and the most modern of all, cinema. For the specialist, nothing in the video documentary nor in the accompanying monographs is new, but one must be blasé not to respond to the impact of seeing all seven tapes, perhaps, not all at once, but one at a time. There's a lot that the Filipino can be proud of.

The video and monographs are oriented to a wide viewership and readership, "without sacrificing the authority of information." The specialist might quarrel about some point of erudition or interpretation [I still say Gaspar Aquino de Belen's *pasyon* was published in 1703, not 1704]. The series focuses on trends rather than artists; this is clearly evident in the sequence on contemporary visual art. One may quarrel that trends are the creation of critics and historians because art is essentially individual and art expressions unique. And thus one may propose a different way of organizing material. One may