

philippine studies

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

Re-shaping the World: Philip II of Spain and His Time **Editor: Dámaso de Lario**

Review Author: Randolph Joseph H. de Jesus

Philippine Studies vol. 58 no. 3 (2010): 429–434

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. or info@philippinestudies.net.

<http://www.philippinestudies.net>

is one reason why the Philippines is perceived in departments and books of Southeast Asia as unique. Zialcita points three factors that heighten the worries about identity. Firstly, the trend to assume that there was no poverty and inequality in the Philippines before the arrival of the Spaniards; secondly, Spanish legacy alienated the archipelago from Asia; and, finally, Filipino originality underlies the combination of different ideas and influences. It is thought that the mix of cultural influences is anomalous.

The chapter, “La vida después del Imperio: Soberanía y revolución en las Filipinas españolas,” written by Rafael is based on Apolinario Mabini’s texts. Rafael explains how Spanish imperialism was based on a kind of political theology. In fact, the Dominicans imposed on the Philippines St. Thomas’s tradition that supported the reality and primacy of the supernatural order because of its inherent transcendence. This supernatural order did not invalidate the political sovereignty of the Spanish conquest. The contradictions of this sovereignty, which gave primacy to the religious orders until the nineteenth century, made the *ilustrados* put the blame on the friars. They considered that these were blocking their political ambitions. Rafael contextualizes in this framework Mabini’s texts. Mabini criticized Spanish theological sovereignty and wanted independence in order to establish a government represented by a free people.

In “La religión Cristiana Filipina durante la época colonial: transculturación de las costumbres e innovación de las prácticas,” Blanco establishes a process of transculturation by which Spanish Christianity adopted some traits of Filipino culture. In this context, he questions the theory of hispanization implanted by John Leddy Phelan, who considered Spanish acculturation and Christian evangelization as two identical processes. For Blanco there is a binary opposition between hispanization and Christianization, quite often confronting each other.

Delgado in “‘Entre el rumor y el hecho’: El poder económico del clero regular en Filipinas (1600–1898)” explores how the regular orders in the Philippines acquired or purchased urban and rural patrimony. He establishes that the regular orders did not receive a great salary and the Crown responded to combat the abuses committed by the religious. He elucidates how the orders strove to win the lands, by intervening in the testaments of the dying. In addition, Delgado clarifies how the American administration never solved the problem of friar lands.

Arcilla, in “A modo de conclusión: Unas reflexiones sobre la construcción de Filipinas,” concludes that it is necessary to reformulate the history

of the Philippines, as he questions the Spanish black legend spread by the American academy. The Spaniards were in the Philippines for more than three hundred years, and there is a deep Spanish imprint on Filipino culture, such as words in Tagalog or in Filipino pathos, among others.

Repensar Filipinas is a contribution to understand some aspects of Spanish colonial rule from the perspective of the colonizers and the colonized. We expect this book to be the beginning of further meetings in which Spanish, Filipino, and American scholars interact and share their knowledge.

Glòria Cano

Departament d’Humanitats
University Pompeu Fabra
<gloria.cano@upf.edu>

DÁMASO DE LARIO, ED.

Re-shaping the World: Philip II of Spain and His Time

Quezon City. Ateneo de Manila University Press, 2008. 164 pages.

Edited by the Ambassador of Spain to the Philippines Dámaso de Lario, *Re-shaping the World, Philip II of Spain and His Time* gathers the lectures delivered to commemorate the quadricentennial of Philip II’s death. While the book is primarily a discussion of the different aspects of Philip II and the events that surrounded him, it aspires likewise to initiate a dialogue to remove barriers to a better understanding of the past formed by, in the words of Spanish Ambassador to the Philippines Delfin Colomé in his foreword, “the contradictory readings, the ambiguous formulations of our traditional historiographies” (x). Most, if not all, of the essays in this collection are revisionists, particularly in projecting Philip II as other than the “Black Legend.”

Penned by Patrick Williams of the University of Portsmouth, the first essay entitled “Philip II, the Philippines and the Hispanic World” situates the conquest of the Philippines within the larger context of the Hispanic world. Williams discusses the aims, designs, and policies of Philip II in the New World, highlighting not only his interest in the riches of the Indies but also, unlike his father the Holy Roman Emperor Charles V, his conviction that to bring the natives within the folds of the Catholic faith was a sacred duty. His ardency in consolidating his control of the Indies is attributable to the fact that, even if his father did not bequeath him the title of “Holy Roman

Emperor” and thus depriving him of the secular leadership of Christendom, he wanted to show that he was not just any monarch. The expanse of his territories far exceeded those of his uncle Ferdinand to whom was bestowed the title of “Holy Roman Emperor.”

In his empire, as often said, the sun never sets. Although the Philippines was an economic liability, it was important because it linked Asia to the American part of the Spanish empire. Williams writes, “the conquest of the Philippines was also the expression—perhaps the fullest expression—of Philip’s vision of how the Hispanic World would develop under his kingship . . . In the Philippines, Philip II brought the worlds of Asia, the Americas and of Europe together” (15–16). With the inclusion of the Philippines in his empire, Philip secured for himself the distinction of being the monarch who “joined the European world with the world of China” (16).

A few minor errors mark this essay, such as the designation of Andres de Urdaneta as a Dominican (14), when in fact he was an Augustinian, or Domingo de Salazar as an Augustinian and the first archbishop of Manila (28), when in fact he was a Dominican and the first bishop, not archbishop, of Manila. But these errors do not affect the arguments of this essay, which shows effectively that the conquest of the Philippines is best understood within the larger context of the European World and the Americas.

In “The Economy of the Philippines in the Age of Philip II (1527–1598),” Germelino Bautista of the Ateneo de Manila University describes the colonial economy as “consumption-oriented rather than productive, and it was plagued by capital flight” (54). Bautista describes, firstly, the different forms of provisioning of nomadic hunting-gathering tribes, sedentary farming communities in the mountains, the coastal or riverine non-Muslim communities, and the coastal-based trading (slave raiding) Muslim communities; secondly, he describes the groups that were directly under or linked to the colonial system, mostly lowland peoples who were under the tribute system and other forms of colonial exactions. Despite the formal establishment of colonial institutions and the imposition of colonial policies, Bautista argues that no substantial change occurred in the economy. The colony was dependent on the galleon trade and also on the *situado* (the subsidy from Mexico). Whatever profits were earned from trade benefited only a few in the colony, mostly Chinese and local leaders who belonged to the tribute-exempt classes; profits earned were used mainly for maintenance and consumption.

One of the most prominent events in the history of Spain and England that continues to excite the imagination is the dispatching of the “Invincible” Spanish Armada of Philip II against the Protestant Elizabeth of England. It turns out that much of what most people know about the Spanish Armada is apocryphal. Hugo O’Donnell of the Real Academia de Historia and the Museo Naval clarifies the misperceptions, contrived or otherwise, surrounding the fleet in his essay, “The Gran Armada: A Revision.” What have been regarded as hard facts about the Armada were caused by careless transcriptions of documents, causing historians to misread and misinterpret the events surrounding the Armada’s disastrous defeat. Documents that can now be consulted, for instance, suggest that the term “invincible,” customarily used to describe the Spanish fleet, was never mentioned in contemporaneous documents. According to O’Donnell, the most common phrase used to refer to the Spanish fleet was “La Felicísima Armada.” Furthermore, this phrase did not refer specifically to the fleet launched against England but was commonly used to refer to all the fleets during that period.

Historians have mulled over the reasons for the terrible and shameful defeat of the Armada. For some it was caused by the incompetence of the admiral, Alonso Perez de Guzman, the Duke of Medina Sidonia, and the inaptitude of Alessandro Farnese, the Duke of Parma; for others the precipitate demise of the very capable Marquis of Santa Cruz Alvaro de Bazan, due to the harsh reproach given him by no less than Philip II, was the cause; others contend that the fleet was simply unprepared. O’Donnell dismisses all of these arguments. He stresses that all along, during the years of preparation for the invasion, the fleet’s purpose was known in England. However prepared the fleet might have been it no longer took the English by surprise, which would have been an essential element of victory.

In his essay, “Philip II of Spain and the Council of Trent,” Fr. José Arcilla, S.J., of the Ateneo de Manila University highlights the role of Philip II in keeping “western Christianity from completely disintegrating” (91). Committed to the suppression of heresy, Philip II is the central figure whose efforts made possible the reconvening of the ecumenical Council of Trent that, aside from institutionally reforming the Catholic Church from within after the Lutheran/Protestant Reformation, also settled certain disputed doctrinal questions. Although Philip II eventually supported the reconvening of the Council as a continuation of its two previously interrupted periods from 1545 to 1552, the process leading to the reconvening was far from smooth.

Philip II, despite being the defender of Catholicism, was not in all instances obedient and subservient to the pope. Nevertheless, Father Arcilla reiterates the unquestionable role of Philip II in preventing further dissensions within the Catholic communion.

The reader who may not be familiar with the Council of Trent would find the use of the term “session” rather confusing. In the essay it refers to the three periods of the Council of Trent, although it could be misinterpreted as meaning that the participants of the council met thrice only. Properly speaking, twenty-five sessions were held during the entire three periods of the Council of Trent.

In “Philip II and the ‘Philippine Referendum’ of 1599,” Fr. Fidel Villaroel, O.P., discusses the conquest of the Philippines with reference to the “referendum” that Philip II ordered in the royal *cedula* of 8 February 1597. He discusses the referendum in relation to the doctrines of the Dominicans Francisco de Vitoria and Bartolome de las Casas and the struggle for justice in the Americas. Echoing what happened in the Americas, missionaries saw and denounced the injustices committed against the natives of the Philippines, some even questioning the legitimacy of the conquest.

After the Dominican Domingo de Salazar, the first bishop of Manila, arrived in the Philippines he called a diocesan synod to solve the apparently worsening strained relations between civil officials, including *encomenderos*, and the ecclesiastics. Inevitably the question of the legitimacy of the conquest raised earlier by some missionaries occupied the synod, with the abuses and injustices against the natives specifically regarding the tribute continuously denounced. This contentious issue was the primary source of misunderstanding between civil officials and missionaries. Bishop Salazar could not but affirm that the Spanish king had no legitimate title over the Philippines and, therefore, the collection of tributes and other exactions from the natives in the name of the crown was unjust.

Bishop Salazar and Miguel de Benavides, the future bishop of Nueva Segovia and later an archbishop of Manila, sailed for Spain to press their point. After Bishop Salazar died, Miguel de Benavides zealously continued his campaign. It was the latter who, after presenting memorials to Philip II, secured another *cedula*, which this time explicitly instructed the new Governor-General Francisco Tello de Guzman to restore to the natives whatever taxes and properties were collected unjustly from them. To satisfy his conscience Philip II, in the same *cedula*, told the governor-general to secure the

voluntary submission of the natives, thus paving the way for a “plebiscite” or a “referendum” that would finally give Philip II a just title to the Philippines. The culmination of the struggle for justice, documented “referendums” were held in the provinces of Pangasinan, Cagayan, and La Laguna.

Father Villaroel encloses the word referendum in quotation marks, aware as he is of a specific technical meaning used at present that would not be strictly appropriate to describe the natives’ acceptance of Spanish rule. Since the time of the Romans, the terms referendum and plebiscitum have acquired different senses. The referendum of 1599 was not done through direct voting. Given the circumstances at that time, the native chieftains decided for the people. Considering that the referendum happened at a time when the idea of absolute rule was gaining acceptance, it was truly exceptional for Philip II to ask a people whether they wanted to accept his rule or not.

In “The Arts in the Reign of Philip II,” the last essay in the collection, Fernando Marías of the Universidad Autónoma de Madrid argues that Philip II was “much more than a stimulator in the renewal of the arts in Spain” (151). According to Marías, the most prominent contribution from the reign of Philip II, particularly in architecture, was the invention of the Plaza Mayor. Philip II built the Escorial, a structure from which the impression of Philip II as a great builder and an original inventor is mostly derived. However, the reputation of Philip II as “almost an artist” is exaggerated. The façade of the Escorial, the design of which is usually attributed to Philip II, is “a mimetic synthesis of formulas found in architectural treatises rather than an invention based on compositional skills” (138).

Drawings made by Philip II would lead us to a fairer assessment of his reputation. Obsessed with balance and symmetry, Philip II paid much more attention to minute details rather than artistic design. Says Marías about the corrections and annotations of Philip II to the reports submitted to him about his building project, “we find an almost absolute terseness with regard to artistic direction” (138). Moreover, Philip II was too indecisive about the design and ornamentation of his buildings and even with the paintings he purchased and commissioned. Despite these shortcomings, his patronage of the arts contributed immensely to artistic renewal in Spain.

More than reconciling the different and sometimes conflicting interpretations of Philip II, the publication of this collection is all the more important as it shows that topics that do not deal directly with the Philippines can be published locally. Unfortunately in the Philippine academe there is not

much interest on topics unconnected to the Philippines. Most historians in the Philippines specialize on the Philippines; thesis proposals not pertaining to the Philippines would most probably be rejected; history departments in the Philippines are mostly, in fact, Philippine history departments. It is, therefore, a most welcome surprise that *Re-Shaping the World, Philip II of Spain and His Time* was published here. It is hoped that this will not be the last of its kind.

Randolph Joseph H. de Jesus

Department of History
Ateneo de Manila University
<rhdejesus@ateneo.edu>

RAQUEL A. G. REYES

Love, Passion and Patriotism: Sexuality and the Philippine Propaganda Movement, 1882–1892

Singapore: NUS Press; Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2008. 304 pages.

For some years it has been fashionable to argue that more attention should be paid to the intimate and sentimental aspects of colonialism and nationalism, to the private parts of government and politics. Historians are regularly reminded that the political is personal—indeed, that all politics is fundamentally identity politics. Rarely, though, have the sexual and gender preoccupations of nationalist and anticolonial men received the scrutiny to which Raquel A. G. Reyes subjects leaders of the late nineteenth-century Philippine propaganda movement. In *Love, Passion and Patriotism*, Reyes meticulously and relentlessly explores the sexual frustrations and ambitions of Antonio Luna, Juan Luna, Marcelo H. del Pilar, and, above all, José Rizal. In so doing, she revealingly extends our knowledge of the social life and identity formation of this important generation, building especially on the pioneering work of Reynaldo Ileto, Vicente L. Rafael, and Resil B. Mojares.

Reyes demonstrates repeatedly how Europe offered libidinal stimulation for these cosmopolitan intellectuals, stirring their imagination and providing resources for their sexual and gendered self-fashioning. In Paris, for example, Juan Luna frequently felt disconcerted, his masculinity challenged by sexually confident and morally questionable women. These modern women provoked anger in him and outbursts of manly pride or *amor propio*, culminating in the murder of his wife and mother-in-law. Reyes bravely claims that such

violent *amor propio* was central to *ilustrado* male patriotic identity. In her analysis of brother Antonio Luna's vignettes of Madrid, she observes again the eroticizing of European women, along with the same sense of alienation and disenchantment, and the same concern with manly appearance and decorum. Supposedly under threat, Filipino masculinity demanded loud self-assertion—and this strident declaration might often shade into nationalism.

The second half of *Love, Passion and Patriotism* focuses on Rizal's interest in the regulation of Filipina sexuality and hygiene. Reyes shows us vividly how the First Filipino conjugated sexual obsessions with clinical logic. In particular, Rizal used organic analogy to describe the pathologies of Philippine society, suggesting his colonized country had come to resemble a diseased female body. In a mixture of medical and moral admonition, he warned of the dangers of uncontrolled female passion and urged nationalist males to guard the sexual honor and reproductive behavior of their women. Thus, writes Reyes, "female sexuality became central to the *ilustrado* drive for social reform" (243). Nationalist claims to self-discipline and civilization countered the colonial discourse on the ungovernable Filipino libido and female depravity. Asserting their *amor propio*, ilustrados enforced the "bourgeois regime of polite etiquette, self-control and moderation" (254), thereby displaying male Filipino eligibility for civic recognition and self-government.

On occasion, Reyes's analysis of the intimate and private merges into the salacious, but generally she deftly negotiates the boundaries of what we need to know. Sensibly she concentrates on the self-fashioning of a few key figures, locating with considerable delicacy the intersection of sexual desire and nationalist dreams in the work of each of them. Toward the end of the book, however, I wanted to hear more from the modern women who adorned these manly Filipinos. I wondered, too, what happened to their masculine ideals in the twentieth century, under the regime of the United States. (Surely it would be worth performing the same analysis on those, like T. H. Pardo de Tavera, who became functionaries in the new colonial state, and on members of the following generation?) The book abounds in enticing observations that deserve further study. For example, the prominence of physicians in nationalist circles receives some attention, but the role of scientific training in fashioning identity requires more critical investigation—especially as the connection of science and nationalism seems pertinent in other places during this period, including the Dutch East Indies and Japanese Taiwan.