

philippine studies

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

Rizal and Filipino Nationalism: A New Approach

John N. Schumacher, S.J.

Philippine Studies vol. 48, no. 4 (2000): 549–571

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

Rizal and Filipino Nationalism: A New Approach

John N. Schumacher, S.J.

A Nation Aborted: Rizal, American Hegemony, and Philippine Nationalism. By Floro C. Quibuyen. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1999. viii + 344 pages.

Though flawed in part, this is an important book for anyone concerned with the thought of the nationalist movement leading to the Revolution of 1896, and its modification as the result of the American conquest and occupation. Correctly, to my mind, it centers its attention on Rizal and his vision of the nation, inviting "the reader to recover a lost history and vision"(1). In doing so, it first passes under scrutiny in successive chapters (some of the best of the book) the historiography of the nationalist movement during the past half-century, and various historians' understanding of Rizal's project. Penetratingly it challenges the orthodoxy (or orthodoxies) prevailing in many of our universities and among historians, native or foreign, regarding that movement.

Quibuyen's main target is the current university textbooks represented by Teodoro Agoncillo and Renato Constantino. They and their followers, such as Vivencio Jose in his biography of Antonio Luna, and Claro M. Recto outside the university sphere, and lesser figures, have propagated the dichotomy between the "Reform Movement" and the "Revolution." This dichotomy, oft-repeated but oft-refuted—by myself among others (Schumacher 1973, 1997)—by real primary research, persists nonetheless. The roots of that dichotomous approach, which Quibuyen terms, using Gramsci's terminology, "vulgar Marxism" (in the case of Agoncillo, we might better say "vulgar pseudo-Marxism," found more in terminology than consistent ideology) he finds, ironically but correctly, in the Spanish antifriar journalist, Wenceslao E. Retana, and the pro-American, Trinidad H. Pardo de Tavera. Each for their own reasons wished to present Rizal as a reformist, who never countenanced armed revolution. From them it was uncritically and gladly adopted by such Americans as Derbyshire, Worcester, Forbes, and others, among whom we might include Craig, Russell-Rodriguez, and Laubach, and has passed into the books of most Southeast Asianists.

The failure of Agoncillo and Constantino to read Rizal correctly stems from their "dichotomizing and essentializing mind-set, which compulsively pits elite consciousness and politics against those of the masses/subalterns" (36). There is, moreover, a failure—widespread among amateur historians—to distinguish between *tactics* and *strategy* in Rizal's writings and thought. Selective, even dishonest (18, 37, 64), use of Rizal's writings, has enabled the "vulgar Marxists" to present reformism, which Rizal at times saw as a possible partial *means* to his overall vision of an independent, fully formed Filipino nation, as if it were his true *goal*, which it never was.

Quibuyen emphasizes that Rizal and Del Pilar (and Lopez Jaena) should not be thought of as holding a common ideology. "(T)here were more profound political/ideological differences between Rizal and del Pilar, both ilustrados, than between Rizal and Bonifacio" (16). With this I fully agree, and it is a key point (Guerrero and Schumacher 1998, 132). I would add, however, as I have argued in my books, that I would not classify Del Pilar as a mere reformist or assimilationist. For him too, the goal was eventual independence, but, unlike Rizal, he believed that the effective strategy was to aim *first* at assimilation. In his letter of 1891 describing his break with Rizal, he asserts that he and all present were in favor of removing the Spanish flag "in due time and by the proper method," i.e., by winning over anticlerical liberal Spanish politicians to the expulsion of the friars and the grant of political liberties to Filipinos (Schumacher 1997, 259). Then, the elite Filipinos would be free to accomplish *from above* the goal of independence. Rizal, on the other hand, and also Bonifacio within the narrower limits of his vision, sought to prepare the Filipino people for a true national community. Then, the rest would follow. As Rizal has Padre Florentino put it at the end of the *Fili*, "when a people reaches that height, God provides the weapon, and the idols fall, the tyrants fall like a house of cards and liberty shines with the first dawn" (Rizal 1996b, 313). Del Pilar thought to work through Spaniards; Rizal and Bonifacio, only through Filipinos—there is the difference (Schumacher 1997, 131, 258; Guerrero and Schumacher 1998, 72–73).

Concentrating on the private correspondence of Rizal and his associates, Quibuyen is able to bring forth numerous texts which manifest to anyone not imprisoned by the ideological chains of Agoncillo and Constantino, that Rizal was a separatist from at least 1887 onward. With this I fundamentally agree, though I would put the date much sooner. I do not see that the Calamba Hacienda case of 1887–88 (which Quibuyen misunderstands) was the turning point. I would rather see Rizal as a separatist at least from the time that he wrote the *Noli*, which, as I have tried to show in one of my books cited by Quibuyen, formed part of a unified triad of his writings expressing his revolutionary program (Schumacher 1991e, 94–100; 1991f, 108–110). They were not separate works, but a whole program, conceived, at least in broad outlines, from the beginning and logically leading to the (first) Liga and Katipunan.

Quibuyen, in fact, recognizes that Rizal expressed separatist convictions, even if cautiously, in his correspondence with Blumentritt before leaving Europe in 1887. The Calamba affair did not come to a head until 1891, and though it seems clear that Rizal felt the Filipino case against the hacienda to be a just one, he also saw it as a test case in which Spanish friar power could be successfully challenged by a Filipino, and perhaps broken. Here we have another instance of his strategy from below: not to depend on self-seeking anticlerical Spanish politicians to overcome the friars, but for Filipinos to do it themselves. No doubt the eviction and exile of his family and townmates hardened his previous conviction that it was hopeless to depend on legal tactics and hastened his move to the concrete action of founding the Liga. But the fundamental decision had been taken long before.

The second chapter is dedicated to showing in the face of the various statements of Pio Valenzuela, as well as of Rizal's own manifesto from Fort Santiago, that Rizal did not repudiate the Revolution. With regard to the manifesto of Rizal, there is no need to take refuge in Quirino's flimsy excuse that he was under duress, and therefore wrote it to save his life (like Antonio Luna's servile retraction, not only of Masonry, but of every word spoken against Spain or religion [Cavanna 1983, part 3, 135–36, facsimile reproduction]). Everything we know about Rizal contradicts this kind of slavish effort to save himself. He did not condemn revolution, but *this* revolution at *this* time, for which the country was not yet prepared. It neither possessed the logistical resources to fight successfully, nor, more important to Rizal, was it yet formed into one *nation*, the object of his efforts from 1885, when he began the *Noli*, until the Liga Filipina in 1892. He was not, of course, in a position to know that Bonifacio, who, as I have tried to show in volume five of *Kasaysayan* (probably too late for Quibuyen to have read it), also knew that the time for revolt had not come (Guerrero-Schumacher 1998, 145), but had had his hand forced by the discovery of the Katipunan.¹ The manifesto, then, is quite in accord with the position that Rizal had held, at least since 1885.

As to the statements of Pio Valenzuela, though Quibuyen offers plausible arguments to support the 1914 memoirs in which, having in 1896 declared that Rizal was opposed to the Revolution, he now declared that Rizal had favored the Revolution, he neglects one point. Valenzuela was not the first one "captured" (44) when the Revolution broke out; he voluntarily *surrendered* to the Spaniards and *offered* to give information, no doubt to save his own skin (May 1996, 32). Whatever judgment one may make of Glenn May's book, *Inventing a Hero*, to my mind he has shown conclusively that Valenzuela's word, even under oath, may not at any time be trusted. Not only is this true in his interrogation at Fort Santiago, but in his later memoirs, the Sotto court case, and in his communications with Teodoro Agoncillo (May 1996, *passim*). In any case, we agree that Valenzuela's statements provide no difficulty in regard to Rizal.

The other arguments Quibuyen gives in this chapter are drawn from the *Ultimo Adios* and from what seems to me an oversimplification of Iletto's *Pasyon* thesis, as well as from the narratives of Josephine's joining the revolutionary forces in Cavite. These are used to further bolster his contention that the so-called "nationalist historians" have decentered Rizal from Filipino nationalism because they have unwittingly reproduced American colonial discourse. Though I agree with the conclusion, I am not convinced by the Gramscian categories used in arriving at it. (Though Josephine's arrival in Cavite was no doubt received with enthusiasm by the revolutionaries, the romantic journalistic portrayal by Foreman and other contemporary and later newspaper accounts [65–68] lack any credibility in themselves. Foreman is totally untrustworthy in his post-Revolution editions, where his creative imagination was at work to sell his book, amid the interest aroused by the American intervention in the Revolution).

In chapter three, Quibuyen takes up Benedict Anderson's critique of Leon Ma. Guerrero's translation of Rizal's novels, and the pattern Anderson finds in Guerrero's mistranslations. Acknowledging the validity of Anderson's critique of Guerrero, Quibuyen, however, rightly takes issue with the former's patently false claim that "Filipino" in the novels refers only to creoles, and "people" to the inhabitants of Calamba or Manila. Anderson is, as I see it, one more interpreter of Rizal who seems to have read only his public writings and not his letters. Quibuyen has shown clearly that even the novels reject such an understanding. (Indeed, I have found pure-blooded "Indios" referred to by Spaniards in particular cases as "Filipinos" even in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century documents). However, contrary to Quibuyen, it was not only in the struggle among the *ilustrados* in the 1880s that the general shift in meaning occurred (88). Burgos had habitually spoken of all born in the Philippines as Filipinos (Schumacher 1999, 91, 103, 105, 133, 162, etc.).

More importantly, Quibuyen critiques Anderson's explanation for Guerrero's *dys*translations. For Anderson, Rizal was a patriot; Guerrero a nationalist. But for Anderson, "nationalism in our time dreams of purities and finds it hard to linger *cariñosamente* over the oxymoron, 'pure mix'." In other words, modern nationalism has a predominantly ethnic character, for which there is much sad evidence. It is not hard for Quibuyen to show that such was not the case for Rizal, who did not make distinctions based on the varying ethnic parentage of his fellow-Filipinos, and rather than erasing the past, embraced all who loved the country of their birth. All through the book Quibuyen rejects the excluding sense of nationalism as belonging to Rizal. Again, we may observe that Quibuyen has studied the letters; Anderson, the novels alone, out of the context of the private Rizal. As Quibuyen well says, comparing him to the Guerrero he has criticized, "Anderson, it seems, is unwittingly doing his own elisions and (mis)representations of Rizal's novels!" (78).

In the fourth chapter Quibuyen considers "biography and history," concentrating his attention on the biographies by Austin Coates and Leon Ma. Guerrero, as being the "two most discerning, and the least hagiographic" of biographies. (For my part, I would not accept Coates as an authority for anything. His book is full of unsubstantiated assertions, and where his undocumented statements can be checked, they often turn out to be pure inventions or even gross falsifications [Villaruel 1984, xvii, 14-15, 278, and *passim*]. Despite certain minor criticisms, Guerrero stands alone, in my opinion, as the only reliable and insightful biography of Rizal. Only Quibuyen in this book, though not pretending a full biography, will show greater understanding on some points). Quibuyen notes, however, that even Coates and Guerrero at times proclaim Rizal as the one who "single-handedly, and with ideas all his own, inspired the Filipinos to make the first nationalist revolution in Asia." Rather he insists, "we must reformulate Rizal's intellectual and political biography within the frame of his generation, particularly of the intellectuals" (101). In other words,

how was this vibrant life-world formed? And finally, how was this life-world colonized and eventually dissipated, starting with the emergence of the *caudillo* Aguinaldo and the comprador-bourgeoisie in the revolutionary government, then the genocidal American conquest, and the subsequent formation of the new nation-state and the spread of "official nationalism," culminating in the emasculative historiographic, translative, and interpretative practices of an Agoncillo, a Constantino, a Guerrero, and an Anderson?" (102).

This question he proposes to answer "by interrogating Rizal within the radical tradition which nurtured him, and which he, in collaboration with like-spirited intellectuals, in turn transformed into a national-popular counterhegemonic movement. . . . A life-world that is, alas, no more!" Again, I find the Gramscian Marxist jargon distracts more than it illuminates, and certainly "genocidal" is a gross exaggeration, (like "holocaust"[216]) above all after seeing the recent internecine wars of the former Yugoslavia or of Rwanda.

In this task of reformulating Rizal's intellectual and political biography, Quibuyen signals three moments in the construction of the "grand narrative of national emancipation." Each of these "served as a catalyst for the two currents which make up the national consciousness: the Enlightenment and the *Pasyon* tradition. The three moments are: (1) 1872 and Burgos; (2) 1892, with the Liga Filipina of Rizal and the Katipunan of Bonifacio; and (3) 1896, with the martyrdom of Rizal and the beginning of the Revolution (102-3).

Though I accept the three key "moments" and the two "currents" as crucial to the development of a national consciousness, I would by no means limit the currents to two, as we will see below. But it is in his explanation of

the three moments, I believe, that Quibuyen unfortunately goes far astray, especially in the first. For the events of 1872 he depends almost completely on the unreliable account, written sixty years after the event, by the anti-Catholic and—at the time it was written—antinationalist Buencamino. This leads him into seeing a united movement—what Buencamino calls the Liberal Party (a term used by no one else), supposedly headed by Father Jose Burgos (Buencamino 1969, 3–6). But this alleged Filipino national movement in fact included at least one who, as noted by Quibuyen himself (89—referred to there as Jurado) would later confess himself to have in 1872 been Hispanophile and anti-Filipino—Antonio Regidor y Jurado. There is no contemporary proof for the existence of such an organized movement as a party, embracing liberals, priests, and students, though there were individual contacts, especially between the priests and students, and between Father Burgos and certain liberals. Nor is there proof of any kind that Burgos was the leader of three unified groups, though he was the chief articulator of the idea of a national community, one not shared by the liberal professors, lawyers, and businessmen. The goals of Burgos and the liberals were quite different, except that they all sought to take advantage of the reputedly liberal atmosphere under Governor-General Carlos Ma. de la Torre (Villaruel 1984, 6–9; Schumacher 1999, 22–23). In a later endnote Quibuyen remarks that Artigas spoke of a “Comité de Reformadores” which included “priests, professors, and businessmen” (318, n. 2), and a separate Juventud Escolar Filipino, which is more likely. But even the term “Comité” is not found in contemporary sources, and the only priest who is mentioned as joining in a manifestation to honor De la Torre was Fr. Jose Burgos. The inspirations and goals of the two groups were quite distinct, in spite of the temporary alliance.

Unfortunately Quibuyen seems to be totally ignorant of my *Father Jose Burgos, Priest and Nationalist* (1972), as well as its much fuller expansion in the second edition, *Father Jose Burgos: A Documentary History* (1999)—unfortunately then in press in the same centennial series, with our mutual publisher. But he also neglects the work on 1872 of Leandro Tormo Sanz (1973, 1977), Cayetano Sánchez Fuertes (1979), Fidel Villaruel (1971, 1984), none of which appear in his bibliography. More seriously, had he consulted the two essays on the Cavite Mutiny in my collected essays, *The Making of a Nation* (which does appear in his bibliography), he could not have treated as historical Nick Joaquin’s totally imaginary account in *A Question of Heroes*. For Joaquin based himself on the twentieth-century malicious forgeries of Jose Marco, of whose nature he was quite ignorant (Schumacher 1991c, 44–70, 1991d, 89–90). Competent and entertaining as Joaquin is as a creative artist, and even in portraying convincingly the milieu of a historical period, he is no critical historian, and I find disconcerting the number of times he is cited in this book as a reliable source, which, as far as facts are concerned, he often is not.

There are consequently innumerable errors of fact in this section—the Madrid-based *El Eco Filipino* was founded by Federico Lerena, not Antonio

Regidor, who was in the Philippines, not in Madrid, at the time; the Jesuits held no parishes—rich or poor—but only missions in Mindanao; nor were they not friars just “technically,” but the term “friars” refers *only* to the thirteenth-century semi-monastic orders. The Jesuits’ organization and role in the Philippines was quite distinct from that of the friars, and it was only the latter who excluded the Filipino clergy from possessing the parishes. The dispute over the parishes was between the secular and the regular clergy; the friars were members of religious *orders* (the Spanish word *corporaciones* in this context does not mean corporations); both Jesuits and friars together formed the regular clergy, which was never called by the strange term “sectarians,” a term normally applied to small, exclusive, exotic Protestant groups. There are also other less significant errors, such as the age of Fr. Gomez —72, not 84—, and the date of Canseco’s account—1897, not 1985.

Dubious also in this chapter is the dependence on Craig and Laubach (with their atrocious translations of Rizal’s poetry), and ultimately on Retana, for finding in Rizal’s youthful poetry precocious signs of his nationalism. The scholar and almost contemporary of Rizal, Jaime C. de Veyra, in the definitive compilation of Rizal’s poetry, rejects any such “second intentions” as Retana claimed to have found (De Veyra 1946, xi–xii). Even more dubious is the authenticity of the Tagalog verses “Sa aking mga kababata,” allegedly written at the age of eight. No one seems ever to have explained the origin of these verses, and in his compilation of Rizal’s poetry, Jaime C. de Veyra presented without comment, not the Tagalog, but only a Spanish translation, allegedly done freely from the Tagalog by Epifanio de los Santos (De Veyra 1946, 1). Was it then translated back into Tagalog, perhaps by that prolific producer of unknown documents, Jose P. Santos? It was most likely from the latter that Laubach received his Tagalog text, but in the light of May’s recent questioning of De los Santos and especially his son, Jose P. Santos, with their mysterious acquisition of texts, we may rightly suspend judgement as to whether this is a genuine work of Rizal (May 1996, 30–43).

In any case, it was not necessary for the Jesuits to “wean [Rizal] from his native tongue” (117), since Rizal’s correspondence, even with his brother Paciano and his brother-in-law Manuel Timoteo de Hidalgo, as well as with all his educated friends, was almost always in Spanish. At one point Paciano changed to Tagalog lest Jose lose his mother-tongue abroad, but even later, usually wrote in Spanish, at least on important matters. No doubt too it is true that through the Jesuits Rizal attained a deeper appreciation of his Catholic faith, but when he says he owes much to this *Religión*, the meaning of the Spanish word in the context is “religious order,” not “religion” [118]. In this whole section, indiscriminating use is made of secondary authors like Craig, Palma, Laubach, Quirino, all of whom often reconstructed, and in some cases deliberately falsified, Rizal’s life without using any source but their own imagination or prejudices, or dubious anecdotes related to them by interested parties (Villarroel 1984, xv–xvi).

Quibuyen rightly notes that Rizal's purpose in going abroad was much more than getting a better education, and was a purpose which he shared with, or which had been inspired by, Paciano. To reduce this, however, to the creation of a Philippine *Encyclopédie* (120) seems to me much too banal a goal. Perhaps this may have been a tiny element in his overall purpose, but he and Paciano had something much more important in mind, as Quibuyen himself indicates later. It is necessary to go back to the ideals of Burgos and his influence on Paciano, and through him, on Jose, to find the goal the two brothers shared—to create a sense of nationhood among their people. As we have remarked above, Rizal's three major books (and we may to a certain extent include his two major essays, *Sobre la indolencia de los filipinos* and *Filipinas dentro de cien años*) are not separate works, but were early conceived as an integral whole. They were to be the fulfillment of Rizal's goal of creating a Filipino national consciousness by delving into his people's past and present so as to prepare for the actualization of a nation which would not only be independent politically, but which would first be united as a people. Prior to independence must come education, not simply years spent in school, but the formation of an ethical national community—a nation—before a nation-state. This distinction between nation and nation-state, frequently and aptly used by Quibuyen, is a crucial one for seeing the difference between Rizal, on the one hand, and Del Pilar and many of his fellow-Propagandists on the other. Rizal's writings were to be a principal instrument of that education, and so would his Liga Filipina be a concrete implementation of that education, leading to the goal of nationhood, and only then, eventual independence as a nation-state.

After these chapters critiquing the previous historiography about Rizal, Quibuyen devotes the following ones to Rizal's own efforts at rewriting history, precisely as a Filipino, with his edition of Morga's *Sucesos* and his historical essays in *La Solidaridad*. Here he employed the weapon of historical scholarship to destroy the colonial ideology of the Filipinos' obligation of gratitude to Spain for having raised them from barbarism to civilization. More positively, he provided a basis for constructing the national identity, one which would be taken up by Bonifacio in the ideology of the Katipunan. He even delineates the beginnings of an Asian view of the precolonial past. More fully than I have done in my own books, Quibuyen delves into these writings in detail. However, to my mind, he demeans rather than exalts Rizal's achievement by seeing him merely

as antedating the Marxist-inspired analysis of underdevelopment (e.g., the work of the *dependistas* or Basil Davidson's work on African underdevelopment or the early work of Georges Balandier on the colonial situation in Africa), but with one significant difference: the crucial role Rizal attaches to national sentiment as an emancipatory and transformative consciousness. It is this element that constitutes Rizal's activist ori-

entation, which arises from his *partisan* and *participatory* scholarship, in the best tradition of Marx or Gramsci or Fanon (199).

To me, this "partisan scholarship" sounds too much like the historiography of the "vulgar Marxists" like Constantino. Moreover, confessing my ignorance concerning Africanists like Davidson and Balandier, most historians think that the day of the *dependistas* and Fanon has long since passed. A much more varied picture appears when the theories of Immanuel Wallerstein and André Gunder Frank and their followers are put under the microscope of more detailed historical research. Moreover, I do not find either Marx or Gramsci, much less Fanon, as real historians. Rizal needs no support from such sources, and the introduction of so many figures who mean nothing to the ordinary educated Filipino jars as much as the Gramscian jargon.

To be sure, Rizal was not a disinterested German professor writing from his well-furnished study, though he more than once expressed wistfulness at having to subordinate scholarship to politics. His edition of Morga was in fact truly a scholarly work, one which effectively rebutted the colonial history put out by the Spaniards. But it was also propaganda, or, if you will, participatory scholarship, as Blumentritt noted in the preface which Rizal asked him to write. This can be seen from certain arguments, such as the assertion, cited by Quibuyen, that the wealth of towns owned by the friars was not due to the latter's management, but because through their power and influence they have acquired "the best towns with the most fertile plains and well-irrigated fields" (204). The obvious fallacy lies in the fact that before the friar haciendas were set up, e.g., Calamba, there were no towns at all in those places, much less well-irrigated [by whom?] fields. Independent scholars today all accept Retana's later edition of Morga as superior in scholarship to Rizal's, especially since the former used documents from the Archivo de Indias which Rizal never was able to see. As I have remarked elsewhere, Rizal himself was the best proof that there had been true progress under Spain, however much it may have been stultified in many ways by Spanish colonialism. The achievement of Rizal was to create a national historiography, and it was effective, but in the end, at times "he proves too much," even for a "participatory" historiography. He provided for his times an effective antidote to the colonial ideology, but even his friend Blumentritt perceived exaggerations.

A major contribution of Quibuyen here is highlighting the influence of Johann Gottfried Herder on Rizal's notion of a national ethical community, with its stress on culture, a concept "both nonracial and antistatist" rather than one based purely on blood or ethnicity. Like Herder, he stressed the cultural dimension—the nation as a historically constituted community of language and culture. A few points on which Quibuyen indicates the affinity between the two men are:

the notion that the integrity of all peoples and historical epochs have intrinsic value and must be respected; the stress on the influence of cli-

matic and geographic factors and historical circumstances on the development of cultures; the lifelong rejection of tyranny and the affirmation of human rights and all that fosters human freedom and dignity (164).

Since Rizal bought for himself the thirty-eight volumes of Herder's complete works, these brief words on his influence indicate how fruitful a thorough study of his influence on Rizal could prove to be.

Another insightful probe into Rizal's concept of the Filipino nation, the topic of chapter six, is Quibuyen's suggestion that "Rizal's meaning is closer to the Medieval Latin dictum, *Vox populi, vox Dei* [the voice of the people is the voice of God]," which Rizal uses as the subtitle in chapter seven of the *Fili*, "than to the eighteenth-century notion of the 'sovereign people'" (165). Whereas the latter notion, invented by the American founders with their Enlightenment background, puts the government, as representing the people, as the repository of authority, the medieval and Catholic notion emphasizes the authority in the people or nation (not nation-state), in whose interest the government (state) is morally obliged to act (165-69). Quibuyen adverts here to the "unexplored Catholic dimension in Rizal's political thought," one deserving of exploration in depth, for its affinities with the thought of Thomas Aquinas and Suarez (as well as the young Marx). Of course, Rizal was exposed to both of these Catholic thinkers, at least in summary form, at the Ateneo Municipal and the University of Santo Tomas. Without myself having explored any of these in depth, it was to this background that I referred in my article, "Higher Education and the Origins of Nationalism" (Schumacher 1991, 35-43). It was in this Manila education that the young Filipino nationalists, Rizal in particular, came into contact with principles of common good, equality, human rights, etc., from which their Spanish professors hesitated to draw the now obvious conclusions, but their students often did. Quibuyen brings together his ideas on Rizal's concept of the Filipino nation succinctly:

Rizal's concept of the nation has cultural, historical, and ethical dimensions. All of these notions come together beautifully in Rizal's concept of *el sentimiento nacional* (171).

This national sentiment is latent in the people, and it is the purpose of Rizal to "awaken" it by his writings and by his actions (171-75).

Beginning with chapter eight, "A Grand Narrative of Redemption and Tragedy," Quibuyen attempts to show how Rizal after 1891 moved from trying to persuade the peninsulars that the Filipinos were a nation to *asserting* the fact by coming home and uniting with the people. He asks, again in Gramscian categories, "how was a 'historic bloc' formed, and by whose 'moral and intellectual leadership'? In short, how did a counterhegemonic movement get under way?" (217). "This grand narrative was built from the teachings and organizational efforts of Rizal and Bonifacio, who were brothers in the [sic] Masonry and steeped in the Enlightenment and the Pasyon traditions.

From this grand narrative and the historic bloc that began forming from 1892 to 1898 emerged the new nation" (218). One must remark, however, that only in the widest sense were Rizal and Bonifacio "brothers in Masonry," since Rizal had become inactive in Masonry before Bonifacio ever joined it, and Rizal never took part in Filipino Masonry. Moreover, there is no evidence that the two men ever met personally, to the extent of speaking together. At his trial, Rizal denied ever having heard of Bonifacio, though he admitted that many people whose names or faces he could not remember were introduced to him at the meeting in the house of Doroteo Ong-junco, and that Bonifacio might have been one of them (De la Costa 1996, 12, 98). Bonifacio was certainly a devoted disciple of Rizal, but from afar.

If I understand the Gramscian terminology correctly, I agree in substance with Quibuyen. But I have many difficulties. As Rizal repeats many times in his letters, especially to Del Pilar, even from the beginning he never wrote to convince the peninsulars; he wrote for Filipinos, and wanted *La Solidaridad* to do the same (Schumacher 1997, 71, 90, 258, 259). Secondly, therefore, all his writings were part of that "counterhegemonic movement," not only from 1891, but from at least 1885 when he began the *Noli*. Thirdly, whatever possible influence the *Pasyon* narrative may have had on Bonifacio, I see no evidence that it influenced Rizal. Fourthly, even Iletto acknowledged by the title of his unpublished dissertation (Iletto 1975) that he was dealing with Tagalog, not Filipino, society, and though the subtitle of the published version (Iletto 1979) speaks of the "Philippines," I do not think his evidence demonstrates that the thesis is applicable to "the [Filipino] people" as a whole (Schumacher 1991g, 190–91). Finally, I have similarly (ibid., 187–89) expressed my reserves regarding the extent to which Bonifacio was influenced by the *Pasyon*, and have seen him as more secular, influenced by the Enlightenment ideas of Rizal and of Masonry. I would have even greater reserves here, where Quibuyen makes "the cosmic saga from Paradise to the Fall to Redemption" the "narrative of resistance in the revolution against Spain" (219–20). I find no convincing evidence of this generalization in the factual narratives of the Revolution. The vast majority of Filipinos, even of Tagalogs, thought in various other, more simple, categories (Schumacher 1991g, 184–92).

Going beyond the claims of Iletto, Quibuyen maintains that "it is certain that Bonifacio read Rizal's novels from the perspective of the *Pasyon*" (224), and then conveyed Rizal's ideas in popular form. I find two dubious assertions here. As one can see from Quibuyen's own analysis, it was *the Morga*, not the novels which are explicitly at the basis of the interrogation in the Katipunan initiation rite, as well as of Bonifacio's article in *Kalayaan*. No doubt he was influenced by the novels in a general way, but that is another question. Secondly, as a whole, the succeeding chapter reconstructs a plausible narrative (from the *Morga*), but it never examines empirically to what extent this was verified in fact, and whether it in fact affected Filipinos as a whole. At the risk of being termed an empiricist (which I am as an historian) this is

my main difficulty even with Iletto's thesis on the Pasyon. I do not find that Quibuyen has given facts to show that "by 1892, the youth had responded [to Padre Florentino's exhortation at the end of the *Fili*], and the Revolution to realize the imagined community that the master narrative of the Pasyon had promised was under way" (245). No doubt Quibuyen refers to the Liga Filipina and the Katipunan, but both Rizal and Bonifacio, I would maintain, were only *beginning*, and in Bonifacio's case, only among the Tagalogs, to work toward their goals of creating a *nation*, which would be eventually ready to establish itself as an independent *nation-state*.

On the other hand, I would rather agree with Iletto, as cited unfavorably by Quibuyen, that the Enlightenment and the Pasyon are "two separate non-intermingling, and even opposed, currents" (220). This is quite compatible with Zeus Salazar's remarks, quoted in Quibuyen (222–23) on Rizal's more holistic view of the Philippine problem, in comparison with Del Pilar and Lopez Jaena — that is, "it was the colonial system as such . . . which was the cause of the disease that afflicted *Filipinas*." (However, in accordance with what I have said about Del Pilar being a separatist, but one who envisaged a different strategy than Rizal, I could not accept Salazar's comparative summary cited here. Much less, could I accept his view of Lopez Jaena, who as he progressively deteriorated morally and intellectually, did not even care about the future of the Philippines, and became more and more an anarchist in fact, if not in name, extolling revolution for its own sake [Schumacher 1997, 287–90]).

The failure to accept the fact that 1892 was only a beginning, and one frustrated in the case of Rizal, lies at the basis I believe, of the unsatisfactory portrayal of "The Revolution That Never Was" in chapter nine. First of all, Quibuyen accepts from Corpuz and Agoncillo the totally improbable figure for a secret society of 30,000 Katipuneros in mid-1896—another unsupported and highly dubious Valenzuela assertion (Guerrero-Schumacher 1998, 144–45). Baldomero Aguinaldo declared that at the time of the Revolution, there were less than 300 Katipuneros in Cavite—a hotbed of the Katipunan (Aguinaldo 1964, 154). No doubt, as Baldomero asserted at the same time, they were quickly joined by a great number of *revolucionarios*, but these were not the carefully indoctrinated group that Rizal and Bonifacio had envisaged. It was not the restlessness of the masses, but the discovery of the Katipunan which pushed it to armed revolution, against the desires of Rizal and even of Bonifacio. To use the author's Gramscian terms, there was not yet a historic bloc ready for the counterhegemonic struggle. Hence the internecine conflicts which rent the Filipino struggle, differently conceived and differently motivated by different persons, different factions, and different classes.

Correctly he sees a new—and unfortunate—part of the national narrative with the ascendancy of Aguinaldo and the elimination of Bonifacio. "The narrative of Redemption as the forging of a moral community was pushed aside by the narrative of establishing an independent nation-state" (252). While having no brief for Aguinaldo, both ambitious and ruthless, and recognizing

Bonifacio as being in the general line of Rizal, I feel that notion of a nation—a historic bloc—was not yet an ideal fully understood by Bonifacio. He too was ruthless, as seen in his torture and murder of helpless and innocent friars in Cavite, much to the scandal of the ordinary Caviteño, who considered him an atheist (Schumacher 1981, 50); and in his betrayal to Spanish authorities of wealthy men, like Francisco Roxas, out of vengeance (251). The effort to create a moral community envisaged by the Katipunan was more the work of Emilio Jacinto, as Bonifacio himself recognized, and it was as yet quite early in the process of its formation (Schumacher 1995, 37–52).

Consequent upon Quibuyen's overestimation of the might of the revolutionary forces, he deems in a somewhat contorted argument that had Aguinaldo not agreed to the Pact of Biak-na-Bato, the Revolution of 1896 could have succeeded, and established a government before the Americans ever came. In proof, he cites the victories achieved in central Luzon by Makabulos and others in early 1898, after Aguinaldo's departure for Hong Kong (253). But these were more guerrilla activities on a hit-and-run basis, as is shown by the fact that nowhere else in the Philippines did this happen, and most friars felt safe enough to return to their parishes, and thus many were taken prisoner in 1898. It was precisely because Aguinaldo was trapped with a handful of men in Biak-na-bato that he had no choice but to accept the best Spanish offer he could get. To think that, having lost all of Cavite to the Spaniards, he could somehow reverse the situation from his isolated and logistically insecure position goes contrary to all probability.

From here on, Quibuyen concentrates on the naiveté and erroneous judgments of Aguinaldo, as if it were only the deficiencies of the latter which led to the war and the American occupation. Aguinaldo was and will continue to be a controversial and not very attractive figure, but one fact should give pause in attributing his allowing American exclusion of Filipino troops from Manila to his obsequiousness, naiveté, and ignorance of what the Americans were intending. That is, that *all* (not merely most, as Quibuyen says [271]) the obsequious proclamations purporting to come from Aguinaldo were actually written by his various advisers, like Ambrosio Rianzares Bautista, Felipe Buencamino, Pedro Paterno. Among these, Mabini was only one, and not the most important in the early stages. For Aguinaldo did not even have a *reading* comprehension of Spanish, much less the ability to write lofty proclamations, as was demonstrated by his having Mabini translate parts of the Malolos Constitution into Tagalog, so that he might know what he was to approve! (e.g., Mabini 1965, 91; Taylor 1971, 3:193).

But if Aguinaldo was ill-educated, especially in Spanish, that does not mean that he was stupid, and a good case could be made for his having gone along with the Americans because it was the best choice available, given his lack of arms, and the very real possibility that the agitation in the United States by a sizable number of American anti-imperialists might prevent a permanent American occupation. (The Treaty of Paris passed the US Senate by

only one vote). It likewise does not seem true that he regarded the war as unwinnable from the beginning, as the hope placed by Filipinos on the possibility that anti-imperialist Bryan might win the American election of 1900, was general. It was only after Bryan's defeat that the widespread surrender of Filipino leaders began.

The comparison with Vietnam is deceiving. The Vietnamese were supplied with ample help by Russia and China; no Great Power had any intention of helping the Filipinos or frustrating the Americans unless they could themselves be the occupier, especially Germany and Japan. In the circumstances, seeking independence under an American protectorate was a rational proposal. To think that any Filipino leader could have secured complete political independence amid the imperialist hunger of the Great Powers for the Pacific in 1898 seems unrealistic. Just a few decades earlier, even Spain had had difficulty in keeping the French out of Basilan, and the Germans and British out of Sulu. (Incidentally, no source is given for the statement that "a half a million" Filipinos died for independence [216, 266]. No one will ever know the number with any certainty, but the most scientific approach so far, by John M. Gates, concludes that with the available methods, the number could vary from a lowest possible one of 127,000 to a highest of 360,000 [Gates 1984; 367-78]).

Quibuyen concludes the book with a chapter on how the Americans appropriated Rizal for their own purposes. Unfortunately relying on such poorly informed sources as the racist Dauncey (whose remarks he sees as "charmingly innocent" [281]) and the paid hack of American business interests, Katherine Mayo, he shows nonetheless that the heroic figure of Rizal did continue to exist as a symbol of resistance to the Americans. But his examples are mostly such fringe groups as the Rizalistas of Mt. Banahaw and Mt. San Cristobal, the Pulahanes of Samar, and later, the Colorums of Surigao. These, however, were only a tiny percentage of Filipinos. What Quibuyen terms, following Iletto, "the 'subversive reading of Rizal': a popular image of Rizal that was shared by the Malolos Republic under Aguinaldo [?] and by peasant millennial groups such as the Colorum" did, as he says, "[persist] through the American colonial regime" (283). But I know no factual evidence that "it was this 'subversive meaning of Rizal as the Tagalog Christ that was commemorated when the second anniversary of his martyrdom was solemnly observed in all the towns under the control of the revolutionary forces."

Hence, it was the American image of Rizal rather than that of the Filipino resistance that prevailed, because at the time of the Revolution Rizal was not looked upon by Filipinos as a whole for their aspirations, only by a certain number of Tagalogs, mostly among the colorums. He was revered too in a quite different way by some Spanish-speaking ilustrados and Filipino priests, none of whom, however much they admired him, considered him to be a Tagalog Christ, much less a Filipino Christ. When Rizal began to become well-known throughout the country, it was through American government-spon-

sored celebrations—presenting the acceptable picture, of course—and the public school system, likewise inculcating the American-approved version.

Elias Ataviado in his history of the Revolution in the Bikol provinces, has a revealing incident. The Bikolanos did not rally to the Revolution in 1896, seeing it as a Tagalog effort to dominate the other ethnolinguistic groups. After Aguinaldo's pact of Biak-na-bato, the clause providing for the division of government posts between Spaniards and *Filipinos* made them recognize that even if the struggle of the Tagalogs seemed to have failed, the struggle henceforth was one of all Filipinos, not merely Tagalogs (Ataviado 1999, 62–63). With the coming of the Americans, they took it more seriously. On the third anniversary of Rizal's execution in 1899, the new parish priest of Albay, Father Juan Calleja, well-acquainted with Rizal's writings, as the ordinary non-Spanish-speaking Filipino was not, assembled the people of Albay after Sunday Mass and gave a conference on Rizal. In it, "he explained the life, the studies, the struggles, the ideals, and the death of our National Hero" (Ataviado 1941, 2: 30), and the people of Albay were inspired to support the war. In this regard Quibuyen's statement is correct, though the image portrayed was not of a Tagalog or Filipino Christ. But after their victory, the Americans had control of the symbol. Picturing Rizal as a peaceful reformist, they used him as Quibuyen notes "to win the hearts and minds of the Filipino people. This is hegemony building par excellence" (302).

In his epilogue, Quibuyen distinguishes two types of nationalism predominant today. One is "a movement affirming and securing the ethnoracial unity of a people," such as in the parts of the former Yugoslavia, Quebec, Kurdistan, etc. A second type is "a movement seeking to establish a nation-state," such as the 1960 nationalisms of Africa or the state nationalisms of Asia (303). "The first type, as the world now painfully knows, tends to degenerate into atrocities like 'ethnic cleansing.'" "The second . . . usually leads to a situation of corruption, repression and human misery that rivals, if not exceeds the monstrosities of the colonial era" (304). Rizal fits into neither of these categories, for his "national community as an ethical community" is to be distinguished from the nation-state, and in Rizal's mind antedates it. He compares him with a number of exponents of "self-critical nationalism," most of whom I must confess are unknown to me (304–5). Nonetheless, the point made here and in the book as a whole, seems to me one of its most important contributions, namely, Rizal's distinction between "people," "nation," and "state." The people must be formed into an ethical community, which is the nation, before they can hope to have a nation-state, working for the common good. What I do not see is that "Rizal became the interface between the two major streams in nineteenth-century Philippine nationalism—the liberal ilustrado stream and the Pasyon-inspired millennial folk current" (305, citing Michael Gonzales). Quibuyen continues: "For a brief moment—from 1896 to 1902—a national community built on the foundations laid by Rizal, Bonifacio, and Mabini [?]

seemed on the verge of emerging. Alas, American imperialism . . . aborted the birth of the nation" (305–6). I do not think Rizal would have agreed with the first part of that statement, though Bonifacio with his *Katagalugan* might have. It is true that Rizal had laid the *foundations* of a national ethical community, which was aborted by American imperialism to a large extent, but he would have been the first to acknowledge that this was true only among the Spanish-speaking Filipinos, and that only the foundations were laid. Bonifacio and his ideas were totally confined to certain sectors of the Tagalogs, and unknown in the rest of the Philippines. Countless Filipinos had not yet been influenced by either of the two currents. Other factors moved them to defend the motherland. One need only think of the continuity and abuses of many *principales*, as demonstrated by Milagros Guerrero (McCoy and De Jesus 1982, 155–90). Moreover, Mabini, for all the good that may be said of him, was a follower of neither Rizal nor Bonifacio, and to the extent he was anyone's, it was Del Pilar, and later, Aguinaldo.

Unfortunately, Quibuyen's thoughtful work, has been extremely ill-served by his publisher. Simple proofreading has been poorly done all through, with words missing in a number of sentences (e.g. 97, 101, 271). These the intelligent reader can normally supply, but what is one to make of a sentence which begins: "The appropriation of *Rissole* did not (as *Schemata* seems to argue) . . ." (297; italics mine)? To one like myself, who am accustomed not only frequently to use the name of Rizal, but to put my own name at the end of my letters, the unintelligible sentence is clear. It is evidently the work of an inattentive proofreader using "spell-check" on the computer, and pointing the mouse to "change" instead of to "ignore," thus changing Quibuyen's correct text of *Rizal* and *Schumacher* into gibberish. Had there been any real old-fashioned proofreading, even a person of limited English would have recognized the absurdity of the sentence. Nor is this the only case: *Ileto* becomes *Islet*, (3) and a whole slew on p. 242: *Tao* for *Tano*, *Tandang Sell* and *Tending Sell* for *Tandang Selo* (in two successive lines!), *Sips* for *Sisa*, etc. The index is full of similar computer-induced errors: *Alejandro* for *Alejandrino*, *Despiyol* for *Despujol*, *De Pilar* for *Del Pilar*, *Leus* for *Zeus*, *Herden* for *Herder*, etc. The copy editor's attempt to list all names containing the preposition "de" under D has led to Spanish names (which do not recognize the preposition in alphabetizing) being treated together with Filipino names (which ordinarily include the preposition as part of the name). Thus one finds such unheard of persons as *De Mas*, *De Izquiedo* [*sic*], *De San Agustin*, *De Unamuno*, etc., which no one knowing Spanish would look for under D. In general, the index is unsatisfactory for a book of this length. Worst of all, beginning on p. 104 and for the rest of the chapter, a new series of endnote numbers begins, which of course makes all the endnotes for the succeeding pages of the chapter almost impossible to find. If the Ateneo Press had not persisted in its obsession for putting notes in their most inconvenient place, as endnotes, instead of where they belong, at the bottom of the page, such an error could not have occurred.

Different type faces are found in a single paragraph (321), and conversely, body text and extracted quotations are run into each other (98). Latin language quotes are almost always erroneous — *imperium* for *imperii* (8), *voce* for *voces* (33). It would add exorbitantly to this already long review to list all the other presumably typographical errors, and we will just mention a few which notably affect the sense—*filipinas* for *filipina* (113), “returned to Manila” for “returned Manila”(215); “became” for “become”(141); “species” for “specie” (143); “the history cunning can play tricks on us all”(269)—whatever that means.

Numerous errors in translation or infelicitous renderings of Spanish texts abound through the book. It is unfortunate that the author chose to use the English Centennial translation (JRNCC) instead of the Spanish originals, even though he notes (319, n. 5) its many inadequacies. Latin again fares worst. Rizal’s correspondence with the equally erudite Blumentritt has many multilingual aphorisms. Rizal’s lament (33) is translated, as in the English JNRCC edition, “Voices crying in the desert where all are lost” (314, n. 8), which should be, if one refers to the original Latin in the Spanish edition, “*dum omnes rapiunt*,” i.e., “ . . . while all plunder [them]” (*Epistolario Rizalino*, 1938, 5: 633). Another term used by Rizal and Blumentritt, and often by Quibuyen himself, *Staatsraison*, appears in different forms, “*staats raison*” (183, 186) being the most frequent, ignoring the fact that in German double nouns like this are compounded and all German nouns begin with a capital letter. This latter point, incidentally, eviscerates the argument that Rizal capitalized “Philippinen” for “Filipinos” in order to assert a Filipino identity (317, n. 12).

It is not that Quibuyen is ignorant of, or has not consulted the Spanish at all, for in certain crucial passages he does supply the Spanish original in an endnote. But apart from the JRNCC not being a critical edition of Rizal’s writings, for which the centenary in 1961 would have provided a rare opportunity not likely to come again, many of the translations were done by people who were either incompetent in Spanish, or lacking in knowledge of Rizal, and thus able to give only a dictionary definition, and not one which made sense in the context. Most egregious of these was translating Antonio Luna to the effect that “Borneo will be a keystone for us” (179), where the original Spanish says: “Borneo será un Cayo-Hueso para nosotros,” (*Epistolario Rizalino* 1933, 3:294), that is: “Borneo will be a Key West for us.” The reference is to a base like that of the Cuban revolutionaries on the island off Florida, called Cayo-Hueso by Spaniards, but Key West by Americans, from which (with American connivance) they attacked the Spaniards in Cuba. The mistranslation is crucial, since it shows that Luna and perhaps Rizal were thinking in terms of a revolution like that of the Cubans. A citation from Fernando de los Rios’ report (201) speaks of “the indios who were hanged”—unintelligible in the context of portraying their despair, when it should be “who hanged themselves.” (Here the translation is from Blair and Robertson, likewise often unreliable). Some translations simply make no sense at all, or fail to convey the nuances of Rizal.

I am quoted (probably by the copy editor) as saying of Burgos "his references are brief and not at all accurate" (133)—quite contrary to what I actually said: "his references are *relatively* brief and *not all* accurate." "Principalía" (129) is a collective, not a singular noun, as it is wrongly used here. "Novenae" (204) should be "novenas." "Corporaciones religiosas" means not "religious corporations" in the commercial sense, but simply "religious orders."

Quibuyen himself is not exempt from minor and major errors of fact, most of which do not affect his central arguments. Thus Miguel instead of Vicente Barrantes (6); Trinidad Pardo de Tavera appears as a mestizo (42) and as a creole (285). Valenzuela was not a member of the original Liga (Retana 1907, 245–48). The name "Hong Kong Junta" was not usually used for the fellow-exiles of Aguinaldo in 1897 (252), but for the later group of Jose Ma. Basa, Galicano Apacible, Doroteo Cortes, and others who tried to raise arms and arrange assistance for Aguinaldo. A letter of Governor-General Pedro Sarrio of 22 December 1707 is cited—at third hand—but Sarrio was governor 1778 and 1787–88. All these are minor.

Quibuyen's account of the Calamba hacienda affair, however, is quite inaccurate and incomplete. The *canon* or land-rent on haciendas like Calamba had always been paid, not just since 1883; what was objected to was its extension (23). The "taxes" spoken of (*buwis*) were rent, not taxes. It is untrue that the original hacienda had been a small amount of land when it was Jesuit property—it was 14,809 hectares in 1754, five years before the Jesuits acquired it—(Roth 1977, 98). Nor had it then been enlarged in "a horror story of Dominican corruption and financial deceit on a massive scale" (24).² This is a great exaggeration, and fundamentally untrue. Again, Buencamino's narrative in his memoirs of sixty years later is a mixture of truth and falsehood. Acting as the Rizal family lawyer in 1891, Buencamino had written to Jose: "The friars cannot prove their ownership of the lands of Calamba, but your townsmen cannot do so either." The only thing certain in the chaotic state of the law was the historical fact of rent having been paid, which created a legal presumption in favor of the Dominicans. (Schumacher 1997, 247; *Epistolario Rizalino*, 1933, 3:151). The doubt on ownership did not concern the whole hacienda, but certain portions, principally the homesites in the town. Moreover, Paciano had earlier cautioned Rizal against attacking the Dominicans, who had been so generous to the Rizal family in giving them extra land, even without having to pay rent immediately (Schumacher 1997, 246–49; *Epistolario Rizalino* 1930, 1: 81–82). In fact, here and elsewhere, Quibuyen relies heavily on the unsupported assertions of Coates, whose unreliable, though pretentious, book is largely undocumented on crucial points, and often depends on pure imagination or malice.³ To anyone who has visited the Rizal home in Calamba, it is evident that it was not "burned to the ground." Nor was the family fortune gone by 1896 (39), as may be seen from how they were able to travel and to set up a new home, first in Hong Kong, and later in Binondo,

even after the events of Calamba, to say nothing of the prosperity of the various members of the family in later years. Quibuyen does his work no honor by repeating, as if it were a fact, the absurd story that the Dominicans tried to win Rizal over at Dapitan by offering him a hacienda, 100,000 pesos, and a professorship at the University of Santo Tomas, if he would repudiate the *Noli* and *Fili*. As Father Villarroel had long ago remarked, it would not even be worthwhile to mention this, had it not appeared, without the slightest documentation, in Carlos Quirino's novelistic biography, and been repeated from there by Leon Ma. Guerrero, who covered his integrity as an historian—relatively—by the phrase “it is said.” Could the Pontifical University, guardian of Catholic orthodoxy, have offered a professorial chair to a professed freethinker and rationalist? (Villarroel 1984, 275–76). Even the solicitous Jesuits would not allow him to live in the convento in Dapitan without demanding that he make a full retraction of his political and religious “errors,” that he make the Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius, and give evidence of his loyalty to Spain and a good Christian life. Not surprisingly he refused (Bonoan 1994, 37). But it is an indication how unbelievable is the alleged offer of the Dominicans.

As has long been established by historians, the *encomienda* was not a land grant; much less did the *encomendero* have the priority to buy and sell that land's produce at a price he was to determine (143). The error is increased by saying that the *encomendero* had the right to collect “rentals (*no*) or tributes” (*yes*) in money or kind, “in return for which he was morally enjoined (but not legally required)—*untrue*” to defend and protect their well-being and security” (320, n. 9). Further compounding the error, he concludes that this was the origin of the hacienda system (which began principally in the eighteenth century, whereas the *encomienda* system was dead by mid-17th century. Such erroneous concepts lead to an even more erroneous statement that “the *encomienda* is also the origin of the wealth of many landed oligarchs in the Philippines today, some of whom are the direct descendants of the *encomenderos*, such as the Sorianos, Ayalas, Zobels, Elizaldes of Philippine commerce and industry” (320, n. 10). All of this is totally untrue, among other reasons, because all those named immigrated to the Philippines in the nineteenth century, and had never had *encomendero* ancestors. Even if the *encomienda* had been a land grant, none but the Ayalas gained wealth in land, not through the *encomienda*, but through the ancestor of Margarita Roxas de Ayala, Juan Pablo Roxas, who bought up cheaply government-confiscated Jesuit haciendas in the early 19th century, such as Nasugbu and Calatagan (Connolly 1992, 39).

Quibuyen is a political scientist and anthropologist, and though he is steeped in the writings of Rizal far beyond the great majority of historians, his acquaintance with the history of the Revolution and of Philippine history in general is at times lacking. As I have said above in calling attention to these

errors of fact on matters of Philippine history, none of them substantially affects the main contentions of the book. Its value lies in its detailed analysis of the intellectual and political biography of Rizal on which he is well-informed. However, it sometimes neglects to see the impact of other major and minor figures on Rizal, and hence at times fails to understand him fully. His critiques of earlier interpreters of Rizal are penetrating, and he opens up a number of other directions for research on Rizal's thought and the thinkers who influenced him. I remain unconvinced of the grand Pasyon narrative as a framework for understanding Rizal, particularly the downplaying of the secular Enlightenment current which I believe to have been a dominant, though not exclusive, influence on his thinking. I confess too both my lack of acquaintance with the thought of Gramsci, and my failure to see that the complex terminology emanating from him is helpful to an understanding of Rizal, since I have been able to come to rather similar conclusions without its aid. Perhaps the difference in approach of a political scientist and a historian lies at the roots of this. It is to be hoped that a new printing, or even a new edition, would eliminate the errors of proofreading and of fact which mar this major contribution to the intellectual biography of Rizal. Finally, I would not share the pessimism contained in the conclusion as to whether Rizal's thought continues today to have influence. Despite all their efforts to do so, the Americans no more than the Spaniards succeeded in remaking the Philippines "In Our Image," as asserted by the title of the error-ridden work of Stanley Karnow, Pulitzer prize-winner or not (216).

Notes

1. Milagros Guerrero in the same volume, though minimizing the influence of Rizal on Bonifacio I emphasize, agrees that the latter was forced to armed action before the Katipunan was ready. (Guerrero-Schumacher 1998, 153-58, 160).

2. The figure for the size of the hacienda in 1754 is the latest we have. In 1759, it was given to the Jesuits by its owner, a Spanish layman, in exchange for his support for the rest of his life. In 1768, with the expulsion of the Jesuits from the Philippines, it was confiscated by the government. After years of government ownership and leasing it out, it was bought in 1803 by a Spaniard named Asanza, and on his death in 1833, bought by the Dominicans. In 1903, the next year for which we have figures, it was 16,424 hectares (Roth 1977, 16, 98). Whether the expansion came under the Jesuits, the lessee(s), Asanza, or the Dominicans, we cannot know. It certainly was not "massive." And in the absence of a titling system before the 1890s, exact figures were impossible (except the 1903 figure, which was that given by the American government surveyors preparatory to the government purchase of the friar lands).

3. A Dominican first-hand account, by the brother-administrator of the hacienda, though also marred by ill feelings and passage of years, like Buencamino, is in Jose S. Arcilla, SJ, ed., "Documents concerning the Calamba Deportations of 1891," *Philippine Studies* 18 (1970): 577-633. A fair and full treatment is in Villarroel 1984, 200-7.

References

- Arcilla, Jose, SJ. 1970. Documents concerning the Calamba deportations of 1891. *Philippine Studies* 18: 577–633.
- Agoncillo, Teodoro M. 1956. *The revolt of the masses. The story of Bonifacio and the Katipunan*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines.
- Aguinaldo, Emilio. 1964. *Mga gunita ng himagsikan*. Kawit: C.A. Sunatay.
- Ataviado, Elias M. 1941. *Lucha y libertad* Manila: Commonwealth Press. Vol. 2.
- . 1999. *The Philippine revolution in the Bicol region*. Translated by Juan T. Ataviado. 2nd ed. Foreword by John N. Schumacher, SJ. Quezon City: New Day Publishers. Vol. 1.
- Bonoan, Raul J., SJ. 1994. *The Rizal-Pastells correspondence. The hitherto unpublished letter of José Rizal and portions of Fr. Pablo Pastells's fourth letter and translation of the correspondence, together with a historical background and theological critique*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Buencamino, Felipe, Sr. 1969. *Sixty years of Philippine history*. Translated by Alfonso Lecaros; notes by Mauro Garcia. Manila: Philippine Historical Association.
- Cavanna, Jesus Ma. y Manso, CM. 1983. *Rizal's unfading glory: A documentary history of the conversion of Dr. Jose Rizal*. 4th ed. Manila: N.p.
- Connolly, Michael J., SJ. 1992. *Church lands and peasant unrest in the Philippines. Agrarian conflict in 20th Century Luzon*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- De la Costa, Horacio, SJ, ed. and trans. 1996. *The trial of Rizal*. 2nd ed. Foreword by Raul J. Bonoan, SJ. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- De Veyra, Jaime C. 1946. *Poesías de Rizal con un estudio de la personalidad de Rizal por el mismo*. Documentos de la Biblioteca Nacional de Filipinas, no. 14. Manila: Bureau of Printing.
- Epistolario Rizalino*. 1930–38. 5 vols. Documentos de la biblioteca nacional de Filipinas compilados y publicados bajo la dirección de Teodoro M. Kalaw. Manila: Bureau of Printing.
- Gates, John M. 1984. War-related deaths in the Philippines, 1898–1902. *Pacific Historical Review* 53: 367–78.
- Guerrero, Leon Ma. 1963. *The first Filipino. A biography of José Rizal*. Manila: National Heroes Commission.
- Guerrero, Milagros C. 1982. The provincial and municipal elites of Luzon during the Revolution, 1898–1902. In *Philippine social history: Global trade and local transformations*, edited by Alfred W. McCoy and Ed. C. de Jesus, 155–90.
- Guerrero, Milagros C., and John N. Schumacher. 1998. *Reform and revolution*. In *Kasaysayan: The story of the Filipino people*. Manila: Asia Publishers. Vol. 5.
- Ileto, Reynaldo Clemeña. 1975. *Pasión and the interpretation of change in Tagalog society (1840–1912)*. Ph.D. diss., Cornell University.

- . 1979. *Pasyon and revolution. Popular movements in the Philippines, 1840–1910*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Mabini, Apolinario. 1965. *The letters of Apolinario Mabini*. Compiled and translated by the National Heroes Commission. Preface by Carlos Quirino. Manila: National Heroes Commission.
- May, Glenn Anthony. 1996. *Inventing a hero. The posthumous re-creation of Andres Bonifacio*. Madison: Center for Southeast Asian Studies, University of Wisconsin-Madison.
- McCoy, Alfred W., and Ed. C. de Jesus, eds. 1982. *Philippine social history: Global trade and local transformations*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, and Sydney: George Allen & Unwin.
- Retana, Wenceslao E. 1907. *Vida y escritos del Dr. José Rizal*. Madrid: Victoriano Suárez.
- Rizal, José. *Noli me tângere*. 1996a. Trans. Ma. Soledad Lacson-Locsin. Makati City: Bookmark.
- . *El filibusterismo. Subversion*. 1996b. Trans. Ma. Soledad Lacson-Locsin. Makati City: Bookmark.
- Roth, Dennis Morrow. 1977. *The friar estates of the Philippines*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Schumacher, John N., SJ. 1972. *Father José Burgos: Priest and nationalist*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- . 1973. *The Propaganda Movement. The creators of a Filipino consciousness, the makers of revolution*. Manila: Solidaridad Publishing House.
- . 1981. *Revolutionary clergy: The Filipino clergy and the Nationalist Movement, 1850–1903*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- . 1991a. *The making of a nation: Essays on nineteenth-century Filipino nationalism*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- . 1991b. Higher education and the origins of nationalism. 1991a: 35–43
- . 1991c. The authenticity of the writings attributed to Father Jose Burgos. 1991a: 44–70.
- . 1991d. Published sources on the Cavite mutiny. 1991a: 71–90.
- . 1991e. The *Noli Me Tângere* as catalyst of revolution. 1991a: 91–101.
- . 1991f. The Propagandists' reconstruction of the Philippine past. 1991a: 102–118.
- . 1991g. Recent perspectives on the revolution. 1991a: 178–209.
- . 1995. The civil and religious ethic of Emilio Jacinto. *Landas: Journal of Loyola School of Theology* 9 (1): 37–52.
- . 1997. *The Propaganda Movement, 1880–1895. The creation of a Filipino consciousness, the making of the revolution*. 2nd ed. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- . 1999. *Father José Burgos: A documentary history, with Spanish documents and their translation*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Taylor, John R.M. 1971. *The Philippine insurrection against the United States. A compilation of documents with notes and introduction*. 5 vols. Eugenio Lopez

- Philippine History Series. Introduction by Renato Constantino. Pasay City: Eugenio Lopez Foundation.
- Tormo Sanz, Leandro. 1973. 1872. *Documents compiled and annotated by . . .*. Translated by Antonio Molina. Manila: Historical Conservation Society.
- . *El obispo Volonteri "combarcano" de Rizal*. Madrid: *Missionalia Hispanica*.
- Sanchez Fuertes, Cayetano, OFM. 1979. Rizal frente a los franciscanos. In *España en extremo oriente: Filipinas, China, Japón. Presencia Franciscana, 1578–1978*, edited by Victor Sánchez and Cayetano S. Fuertes, 519–82. Madrid: Editorial Cisneros.
- Villarroel, Fidel, OP. 1971. *Father Jose Burgos, university student*. Manila: University of Santo Tomas Press.
- . 1984. *Jose Rizal and the University of Santo Tomas*. *Orientalia Dominicana*, no. 2. Manila: University of Santo Tomas.