DOMINATION AND RESISTANCE IN THE PHILIPPINES: FROM THE PRE-HISPANIC TO THE SPANISH AND AMERICAN PERIOD

Jeffry V. Ocay, Ph.D. (Cand.)
Silliman University Dumaguete City and
Macquarie University, Australia

INTRODUCTION

The history of the Philippines is characterized by the dialectic of domination and resistance—domination by powers from without and resistance by forces from within. This theme defines the main objective of this paper: to present the history of domination and resistance in the Philippine from the pre-Hispanic to the Spanish and American period.

Methodologically, I begin my presentation with an inquiry into the basic socio-economic and political structure of the pre-Hispanic Philippine society. This is followed by a discussion on how the Spanish colonialists transformed this primitive society into a feudal one, with emphasis on the forms of domination the Spanish used to quell the recalcitrant Filipinos on the one hand and on the form of resistance the Filipinos took as a response to this pressure on the other. The third and last section presents a discussion on how the intervention of the Americans from 1898 until 1946 had aborted the progressive development of Filipino critical consciousness that climaxed towards the end of the Spanish regime. However, I will also present how this critical consciousness, which served as the raison d'être of the recurring revolts during the Spanish regime, survived and continued to become the major force that opposed American domination.

The Philippines before the Spanish Conquest

The pre-Hispanic Philippines until the middle of the 16th century is difficult to characterize because prior to the coming of the Spaniards in 1521, there were no known records that account for the social structure of the island, except for a few accounts on trade routes made by some Chinese traders.[1] These trade routes accounts mentioned only the few islands that made contact with China and did not talk about the Filipino people as a whole. It was the chroniclers of the series of Spanish expeditions who made quite reliable account on the island. However, these accounts were focused only on the condition of the Philippine island in the middle of the 16th century, thus, the term "pre-Hispanic Philippines" used in this paper refers exactly to this period.

The only form of social and political organization in the Philippine island during this time was the *barangay*, whom Jocano describes as a community of parents, children, relatives, and slaves.[2] The *barangay* system was common throughout the archipelago until Islam in southern Philippines, especially Sulu and Maguindanao, "consolidated the people under the central authority of the sultanates".[3] According to Corpuz, these *barangays* existed independently from each other without a consolidating supra-*barangay*.[4] Jerome G. Manis also observes that these *barangay* communities existed in isolation, but, nonetheless, have many things in common—its people spoke similar dialect, wore similar kinds of clothing, sang similar songs, lived in similar houses, etc.[5] For Manis, the Philippines during this period can be designated as a "culture area", a territory of different groups of people that possess similar ways of life; however, he pointed out that these "communities were societies unto themselves, independent and distinctive".[6]

The *barangay* in the pre-Hispanic Philippines, however, cannot be equated with its modern understanding as an established political unit. While in the Philippines today the term *barangay* refers to the smallest unit of local government, in the pre-Hispanic period, it only

referred to a kind of native settlement. In the observation of Juan de Placencia, the *barangay* in the pre-Hispanic period was nothing more than tribal gatherings.[7] These gatherings were usually situated near a body of water like riverbanks and coasts. Even the communities in the hinterlands were situated along streams and rivers. Most historians and ethnographers of the Philippines agree that the arrangement of the houses of these native communities followed not a cluster but a linear pattern, except for the *Igorot* communities in northern Luzon.[8]

"Economic reasons seem to be the most important motivating factors underlying residential preferences".[9] The seas, rivers, lakes, and streams did not only serve as the number one sources of food for the early Filipinos, but also as an efficient and convenient means of travel and for transporting goods for trade. It must be noted that as early as 890 B.C.E., records show that the Arabians had already traded with the pre-Hispanic Filipinos through "barter system". But the early Filipinos did not only depend on fishing for survival. Relatively advanced agriculture was already practiced, which was the most conspicuous characteristic of the *barangay* and its economy. Throughout the archipelago, the early Filipinos depended much on agriculture, though other sources of livelihood like hunting, iron working, wood working, boat building, pottery, weaving, etc. had been resorted to.[10] Robert B. Fox notes that the overall impression of this economy "…is that of a people living on a subsistence level within a tolerant and productive environment".[11]

Fox further notes that the economic activity in the *barangay* was based on cooperative labor, wherein "families cleared fields, planted, harvested, built houses, and hunted with the aid of neighbors and kinsmen…".[12] This kind of activity, which many rural Filipinos continue to practice to date, was called *bayanihan*. The basic idea in a *bayanihan* system, in addition to what Fox had noted, is that people in a community or *barangay* come together to help each other

in times of need. A farmer, for example, may request people in the community or *barangay* to assist him in rice planting and, soon after, in harvesting. By tradition, the farmer did not pay the workers a daily wage, but prepared food and drinks for a celebration after the work is completed. And most importantly, he made himself always available when another member of the *barangay* needs his service.[13]

What can be inferred from Fox's account is that the early Filipinos depended on each other or the neighbor for survival, that there was mutual cooperation among them, and that their attitude regarding work was oriented toward the satisfaction of their basic needs.[14] Renato Constantino shares this view. He observes that the pre-Hispanic Philippines was a society whose economy was based on cooperation and that all the workers exercise control on the means of production. He says that…

> the control of the means of production and labor was exercised by the producers themselves, and exchange was an exchange of labor and its products. The simple system had not yet been replaced by one in which the means of production were in the hands of a group that did not participate in the productive process—a leisure class backed by force.[15]

Although the type of society that emerged in the Philippines during the middle of the 16th century can be considered as less developed, "land tenure" was already introduced. According to Corpuz, land was divided among member-families of the *barangay* and can be transferred via inheritance, purchase, or barter.[16] But the whole land area of the *barangay* was not actually distributed to all the member-families. Corpuz further reveals that while families owned residential lots and some strip fields, there remained undivided wide tracts of land owned by the *barangay* as a community. This includes woodlands or forests, fertile uplands, fishing areas,

mangroves, and swamp lands.[17] These were among the tracts of land that the Spaniards grabbed which systematically began in 1565.

The socio-economic structure peculiar to the *barangay* system had brought about the emergence of four distinct social classes, namely: the *datu*, *maharlika*, *timagua*, and a*lipin*.[18] The term *datu* is usually understood as the "chiefly class", *maharlika* the "nobility class", *timagua* the "commoner class", and *alipin* the "slave class". However, it must be noted that the social classes of the pre-Hispanic Philippines were completely different from that of the West. The *datu* or the chief is not similar to the king in Europe, much as the *maharlika*, *timagua*, and *alipin* were not analogous to the Western notion of nobility, commoner, and slave respectively. It is my contention that the Spanish chroniclers used these Western concepts of chief (Pigafetta[19] used the term "king"), nobility, commoner, and slave for purposes of convenience in understanding this society and the subsequent subjugation of the people therein.

The *datus* were considered the ruling class and they administered the economic, social, and religious affairs of the *barangay*. They owned vast tracts of land and sometimes they were viewed to have absolute power. Antonio de Morga observes that "the superiority of these chiefs over those of their *barangay* was so great that they held the latter as subjects; they treated these well or ill, and disposed of their persons, their children, and their possessions, at will, without any resistance, or rendering account to everyone".[20] Throughout the archipelago, the degree of power that each chief possessed varied so that, according to Morga, some chiefs were more powerful than the other chiefs.[21] Pigafetta proved this point true when he asserted in 1521 that in Cebu there were many chiefs that paid tribute to *Datu* Humabon.[22] But, again, it should be noted that the authority of the *datus* over their constituents, described by Morga as "supreme" or "absolute", should not be equated with the absolute authority of the European kings. The *datus*,

to some extent, exercised absolute power over their constituents, but most of the time, they were viewed as *barangay* administrators. Hence, they were not rulers in the strictest sense of the word, but as "elders" whom the people considered as exemplars of a genuine leader. For Delbert Rice, this is the best way to describe the role of the *datus* as the ruling class.[23] Despite of all these, the fact that the pre-Hispanic Philippines did not have a central authority that consolidated the entire island remains incontestable. This be will explained in the succeeding section that this was one of the reasons why the Spaniards found it extremely easy to subjugate the Filipino people and established their power in the island for about 333 years.

The *maharlikas* ranked next to the *datus*. Their primary obligation was to render special service to the *datu* by assisting him in all his endeavors like rowing his boat, building houses, raiding enemy *barangays*, etc. The *maharlikas* had the privilege of not paying taxes and of not working in the fields. They also owned vast tracts of land.

Next to the *maharlikas* were the *timaguas*. According to Jocano, this class "composed the greater bulk of the population".[24] "Their normal obligation was agricultural labor worked off in groups when summoned for planting or harvesting".[25] In Loarca's account, the *timaguas* were characterized as freemen as they could always transfer from one *barangay* to another as they wish.[26] But once a *timagua* settled in the *barangay*, that is, when he offered himself as *timagua* to other *barangay* chiefs, he must observe the following laws:

> When feasts are given to other chiefs he must attend; for it was the custom that the *timagua* drink first the *pitarrilla*, before the chief does so. He must, with his weapons, accompany the chief when he goes on a journey. When the latter enters a boat the *timagua* must go to ply the oar, and to carry the weapons for the defense of the vessel; but if the vessel sustain any damages he receives no punishment for this, but is only reprimanded.[27]

The lowest in the four social classes were the *alipins*. Many Spanish chroniclers characterized this class as "slave". But Robert B. Fox suggested that "servile debtor" or the "dependent class" is the most appropriate term. Jocano agrees with Fox's suggestion and he prefers the term "servile debtor" because according to him, the number one reason why one became an *alipin* was insolvency.[28] In fact, most of these *alipins*, Jocano notes, were serving as house-helps with the assurance that once they fully pay their debts, they become free again.[29] Loarca's account on the "law of slavery" supported this claim. He wrote:

> No Indian[30] in this country is made a slave or put to death for any crime which he commits, even if it be theft, adultery, or murder—except that for each crime there is an established fine, which they have to pay in jewels or gold, and if the culprit is unable to pay the fine he will borrow the money, and pledges himself to the man from whom he borrows. As a result, he becomes a slave until he shall pay what has lent to him; after that, he is free again. Therefore, according to the crime committed, they are slaves…. [31]

Although the status of being *alipin* could be acquired through inheritance, still the main factor was the inability to pay one's debts. Loarca further notes that those who borrowed money and became insolvent became slaves together with the children born during their slavery, and those already born were free.[32]

There were two types of *alipin*: the *aliping sagigilid* or those who had their own houses and *aliping namamhay* or those who lived in their master's house. The *aliping sagigilid*, according to Loarca, lived in their own houses, but are obliged to work for their master one day out of four, having the three days for themselves.[33] The *aliping namamahay*, on the other hand, were those who were thoroughly enslaved. They worked in their master's house, and they might be sold to other masters. These slaves were those captured in inter-*barangay* wars or those who completely lost their fields because of debts.

As evidenced by the type of social organization discussed above, it can be inferred that the pre-Hispanic Philippines already had a system of economy, though for the most part remained on the subsistence level, which could serve as the basis for further social development.[34] Thus, the small and unconsolidated *barangays* in the pre-Hispanic Philippines were societies already in the process of development. It can be argued that even without the Spaniards, the pre-Hispanic Philippine society could in time attain a kind of civilization comparable even with that of the West.[35] Amado Guerrero sums this up in the following:

> The people had developed extensive agricultural fields. In the plains or in the mountains, the people had developed irrigation system. The Ifugao rice terraces were the product of the engineering genius of the people: a marvel of 12 miles if strung from end-to-end. There were livestock-raising, fishing, and brewing of beverages. Also there were mining, the manufacture of metal implements, weapons and ornament, lumbering, shipbuilding and weaving. The handicrafts were developing fast. Gunpowder had also come into use in warfare. As far north as Manila, when the Spaniards came, there was already a Muslim community which used cannons as its weaponry.[36]
>
> There was interisland commerce ranging from Luzon to Mindanao and vice versa. There were extensive trade relations with neighboring countries like China, Indochina, North Borneo, Indonesia, Malaysia, Japan and Thailand. Traders as far as India and Middle East vied for commerce with the precolonial inhabitants of the archipelago. As early as the 9th century, Sulu was an important emporium where trading ships from Cambodia, China, and Indonesia converged.[37]

What is also evident in the type of social organization this pre-Hispanic society had was the dialectic of domination and resistance. The *datus* or the ruling class in general, including the *maharlikas*, lived at the expense of the masses through the exaction of land rent and the coercion of the *timaguas* and *alipins* to till the fields of their masters.[38] The *datus* were not always good *barangay* administrators. The ruling class used arms in order to maintain the social system and for them to remain in power. They also used the same tactic to repel foreign invaders and to

assert their independence from other *barangays*.[39] The ruling class indeed resembled the landlords in the Spanish and American periods.

Now, some prominent historians in the Philippines believed that there was no antagonism between the ruling class (*datus* and *maharlikas*) and the ruled (*timaguas* and *alipins*) because for them there was no account of the ruled class rebelling against their masters. Morga, for example, as already pointed out above, remarks that the superiority of the ruling class was so great that the ruled found it impossible to resist. Regarding the prevalence of conflicts during this time, these historians argued that such conflicts existed only between contesting *barangays*. Hence, the initial conclusion is that the ruled class completely submitted their will to the ruling class. At first glance, this contention seems correct because there was indeed no recorded form of mature rebellion that a group of *timaguas* or *alipins* organized to overthrow their masters. However, if we take a closer look at the attitude of the people in this society, especially the way they chose and rejected their leader, i.e., the *datu*, we can see that there was really antagonism between the ruling class and the ruled. Consider, for example, the way in which the *datu* was reduced to a low-ranked individual. In Jocano's accounts, he noted that a *datu* can be reduced to the rank of *maharlika*, or *timagua*, or even *alipin*. And one of the factors that contributed to this was "desertion". "This means that a *datu*, by his inability to influence decision in the community gathering, had become very unpopular and his followers deserted him for another leader or *datu*."[40] I argue that this was already a form of resistance, a brave act on the part of the masses to free themselves from the untoward disposition of their *barangay* leaders. I argue further that this critical consciousness had matured during the Spanish regime, had grown even stronger in the American regime, but had significantly regressed upon the advancement of capitalism in the country. In other words, the forms of domination that went along with the spread of capitalism

in the Philippines, e.g., technological domination, have aborted the progressive development of the critical consciousness of the Filipinos.

The Philippines during the Spanish Regime

In 1521, the Spanish expedition led by Ferdinand Magellan reached the Philippines. After befriending the native people in mainland Cebu, especially its leader *Datu* Humabon, Magellan declared the entire archipelago a province of Spain. But before he could formally make the Philippines a colony of Spain, Magellan got killed in a skirmish in Mactan, a neighboring island of mainland Cebu.[41] This was the first recorded bloody resistance of the native Filipinos against their colonizers. However, it was not until the arrival of another Spanish expedition led by Miguel Lopez de Legazpi in 1565 that Spain finally took hold of the Philippines. Legazpi then lost no time in subjugating the native people.

The process of subjugating the native people, however, was long and hard because these people lived in a large archipelago composed of about 7, 100 islands and islets, with many scattered *barangays*.[42] Thus, in order to colonize the entire archipelago, the Spaniards had to subdue the native people from *barangay* to *barangay* and then from island to island.

The absence of a centralized government in this society made it extremely difficult for the Spanish colonialists to establish their colonial power and to collect tributes and exact services from the native people. In order to address this problem, the Spaniards systematically reorganized the pre-Hispanic Philippine society by integrating subjugated *barangays* to form the *encomienda*. The *encomienda* is a feudal institution used in Spain before to grant deserving colonists the right to collect tributes and services from the native people of a specified territory

on condition that they protect them in their persons and property.[43] In the Philippines, the *encomienda* was a vast tract of land granted to both the Spanish colonial officials and the Catholic religious orders in exchange for their services in the conquest of the native people.[44] This system became the administrative and economic unit of the Philippines during the early period of Spanish occupation.

The *encomienda* system entailed the forcible resettlement of the small and scattered *barangays* into larger communities called pueblos. The *Recopilación de Leyes de los Reynos de las Indians*, the laws which govern Spanish possessions in colonized territories, provided the specific criteria in the formation of pueblos. It says that pueblos must be located in areas accessible to Spanish soldiers and friars. Specifically, the *Recopilación* required that each pueblo must have a square-shaped plaza at the center where the church and the parish priest's residence, the town hall, the agora, and the houses of the leading families are strategically situated along its four sides. "A regular block-and-street grid was laid out for the houses of the rest of the families."[45] With this kind of settlement, the pueblo became the most effective tool of domination used by the Spaniards during this time because it brought the native people together within close scrutiny and direction of the Spanish colonial officials and friars.

The pueblos were usually headed by Spanish friars who also served as public administrators. This meant that the native people fell under the control of the friars. In fact, Corpuz remarks that the physical organization of the pueblo requires that people live under the church bell.[46] In this way, the economic and political lives of the native people in the pueblo were administered through the church.

Each *barangay* in the pueblo was headed by a *cabeza* or head. According to Constantino, the Spanish colonialists appointed the *datus* to become the *cabezas de barangay* because the

native people had the traditional respect for the *datus*.[47] Thus, the Spanish colonialists would find an influential ally among the native people. And because the responsibility to collect tributes from the native people was delegated to the *cabezas*, the appointment of the former *datus* to the rank of *cabeza* was advantageous to the Spanish colonialists.

The reorganization of the old *barangays* into pueblos had indeed produced a profound socio-economic and political transformation of the pre-Hispanic Philippine society. Because Spain now owned everything of value in the Philippines, the old right of the native people to ownership of land was extinguished. The native people were only assigned a piece of land to cultivate and these were not titled under their names. As a result, the families in the pueblo were reduced to a single class of farmers who were obliged to work their assigned land. In this new system, according to Corpuz, there were no longer sharecroppers because everybody became a farm worker.[48] Even the *datu* class had to work in their land, but their only advantage was that they might be exempted from the exaction of tributes.

Another important upshot of the establishment of the pueblos was the Christianization of the native population. The teaching of the Catholic faith made many native Filipinos renounce their old religion in order to accommodate Christianity, a religion which, according to Marcelino Maceda, the natives did not fully understand.[49]

In the reorganization of the old *barangays* into pueblos, there remained communities that were not resettled. These were the groups of people that the friars brought into their hacienda as workers and then organized them into pueblos. However, these pueblos, Corpuz notes, were abnormal because “they were located within the friar’s hacienda, and hence they had no pueblo common”.[50] In addition, these people did not hold rent-free lands, thus they became landless

farm laborers working in the friar's hacienda.[51] The *hacenderos* then became the first landlords and the landless farm laborers the first tenants in the Philippines.

It was thus the creation of the haciendas that transformed the pre-Hispanic Philippine society into a feudal one—a new type of society that witnessed the intensification of Spanish colonial exploitation. It was in this new society that the plight of the Filipino people worsened as the Spanish colonialists saw to it that they were compelled to pay taxes, render *corvée* labor, and produce an agricultural surplus enough to feed the colonial officials, friars, and soldiers. [52]

Now, it must be noted that the Spanish colonialists found it extremely easy to impose these punitive practices to the native Filipinos because, according to Constantino, the latter at this time had not yet attained a high degree of culture that could serve as the basis for a unified resistance.[53] The native Filipinos did not possess a kind of critical consciousness that could spare them from becoming docile subjects of the Spanish colonialists. In the words of Constantino, the Filipino mind at this stage was "virtually a tabula rasa on which Spanish values were inscribed".[54] But it must not be forgotten that the Filipino mind, like any other, was dynamic, that it was on the process of progressive development. And what was interesting is that, the more the Spanish exploitation intensified, the more it shaped and nurtured the critical dimension of the Filipino mind. Consequently, these harsh practices, because they impoverished the masses and worsened their plight, triggered the emergence of critical consciousness among the Filipinos. As a result, peasant revolts against the Spanish colonialists broke out sporadically all over the Philippines. Guerrero notes that there were at least 200 revolts of uneven scope and duration throughout the Spanish regime, which attest to the great revolutionary tradition of the Filipino people.[55]

Some of the most famous revolts during the early phase of Spanish occupation were the Dagami Revolt in Cebu in 1567, the Manila Revolt (also known as Lakandula and Sulayman Revolts) in 1574, the Pampanga Revolt in 1585, Magat Salamat Revolt in 1587-88 in Manila, Magalat Revolt in Cagayan in 1596, Tamblot Revolt in Bohol in 1621-1622, Bankaw Revolt in Leyte in 1621-22, Maniago Revolt in Pampanga in 1660, Sumuroy Revolt in Samar in 1649-50, and many others. Most of these early revolts were directly caused by the exaction of tributes and forced and *corvée* labor and other forms of abuses by the Spanish colonialists. The Diego Silang Revolt in 1762-1763 in Ilocos is another concrete example. It was reported that on 14 December 1762, a group of about 2,000 natives headed by Diego Silang appeared at dawn before the alcalde's residence and demanded freedom from tributes and personal services.[56] Fernando Palanco speculates that Silang attracted the support of the masses because of this cause. The letter of Fray Francisco A. Maldonado, one of the Spanish priests who had witnessed the event, to Simon de Anda, the incumbent governor-general, supports Palanco's claim. It states: "By force he (Silang) has caused all these towns to rise up…assuring them that they would not pay the tribute nor perform services and other similar things, by which he attracts the mob".[57]

In the eighteenth century, the Filipinos became more conscious about the arbitrariness of feudalism as the Spanish friars unjustly increased land rent, expanded their haciendas through land grabbing, and forced the Filipino masses not only to produce a surplus in staple foods, but also to produce more surplus of raw crops for export to various capitalist countries.[58] As a result, revolts during this time took the form of conscious opposition to feudalism and were no longer primarily viewed as reactions to the exaction of tributes and *corvée* labor. The Agrarian Revolt from 1745-17 in Batangas, Laguna, and Cavite was a concrete example. This was a revolt by

native Filipino landowners against the land grabbing of the Spanish friars which demanded the return of their lands on the basis of ancestral domain.

The nineteenth century, particularly between the 1820s and 1870s, was significant for the Filipinos for three reasons: first, the economy attained relative prosperity because the agriculture industry prospered vis-à-vis the growth in the mining, export, and other industries,[59] and because of the opening of Manila and other key cities to world trade; second, the Spanish colonial education, which was largely restricted to the Spaniards and the few native Filipinos entering the religious life, was made open for the first time to the natives;[60] and third, the three Filipino priests, Fathers Burgos, Gomez, and Zamora, who demanded for equal rights in the Church and who criticized the abuses of the Spanish priests, were executed.[61]

These three points are indeed important because they had direct bearings on the 1896 Revolution. As a result of such economic boom, many Filipino families became rich, and, thus, were able to send their children to school. It can be observed that during this time many students both from the cities and provinces went to Manila, the country's capital, to study at the Royal Pontifical University of Santo Tomas, The Catholic University of the Philippines. Those who were children of the more affluent families even went to Spain to pursue higher education. The most famous of them were Graciano Lopez Jaena, Antonio Luna, Juan Luna, Marcelo H. Del Pilar, and most especially Jose Rizal. Inspired by the nationalist movement initiated by the Filipino clergy and enraged by the execution of the three Filipino priests, these educated Filipinos in no time became the articulators of national resistance against the Spanish colonialists. According to John N. Schumacher and Nicholas P. Cushner, the nationalist movement of the Filipino clergy gave a direction to the subsequent Filipino nationalism. They noted that "it was the survivors of 1872, their pupils, brothers, and sons who were to become

the leading figures of the Propaganda Movement and even of the Revolution and the Malolos Republic—Marcelo del Pilar, Fr. Mariano Sevilla, Felipe Buencamino, Ambrosio Rianzares Bautista, Jose Maria Basa, Ggregorio Sanciangco, and Paciano Rizal, to name a few".[62]

These young intellectuals who were educated in Europe initiated the "Reform Movement", which was known later as the "Propaganda Movement" because they used propagandas in their attempt to foster socio-economic and political reforms in the country. But because most of these reformers were coming from the elite Filipino families, it is understandable that their demands were by no means revolutionary, albeit some of them, like Marcelo del Pilar and Antonio Luna, played a key role in the 1896 Revolution. As a matter of fact, their primary goal was not separation from Spain, but "representation in the Spanish Cortes, equality with the Spaniards, the secularization of the parishes and the expulsion of friars, and greater freedom, including freedom of speech and the press".[63] In other words, the reformists wanted "transformation through assimilation", i.e, Philippine autonomy or independence under Spanish constitution. Joaquin G. Bernas also notes that assimilation was the original goal of the Propaganda Movement. He said that what the propagandists demanded was "not outright secession from Spain but the extension to Filipinos of those rights enjoyed by Spaniards under the Spanish Constitution".[64] Nevertheless, the reformist Jose Rizal, who was often viewed as repudiating Andres Bonifacio's call for an armed struggle to overthrow the Spanish regime,[65] pushes for a more radical reform. To this end, he founded the *La Liga Filipina* which aims "to organize and mobilize the people towards creating, at the community level, structures of defenses, mutual help, and self-reliance".[66] Floro Quibuyen notes that Rizal envisioned the *Liga* to be the forerunner of a resistance movement that would eventually replace

the theocratic Spanish colonial system.[67] It was not clear, however, if Rizal advocated complete separation from Spain.

Because according to Constantino the early revolts of the native Filipinos were movements without a theory while the reformers were exponents of a theory without a movement, it took a Bonifacio to unite the two.[68] Disillusioned by the reformists' hope that Spain would listen and introduce effective reforms, Bonifacio, who was inspired not only by Rizal's works but also by the French Revolution, founded the *Katipunan* or the *Kataas-taasang Kagalang-galang na Katipunan ng mga Anak ng Bayan* (The Highest and most Honorable Society of the Sons of the Country), which aimed to create an independent Filipino nation through an armed struggle. The *Katipunan*, according to Constantino, was "the natural heir of the revolutionary tradition of the people, a tradition which had manifested itself in the uprising after uprising throughout three centuries of Spanish rule".[69]

Within a short period of time, the *Katipunan* spread spontaneously throughout the Philippine archipelago "arousing national feeling and working for the deliverance of the Filipino people as a whole from Spanish oppression and friar despotism".[70] Mass revolts ensued which were mostly concentrated in Manila and the neighboring provinces and then in many provinces in northern Luzon, Visayas, and Mindanao. And in 1896, a national resistance was haunting the Spanish colonial system, but nonetheless was mostly concentrated in areas near Manila.

The 1896 Revolution was indeed the movement that first united the Filipinos in the creation of the Filipino nation. It was also this movement that clearly stipulated the demand for separation and independence from the Spanish colonialists. In the Hegelian sense, the Filipinos of the 1896 Revolution exemplified the slave who became conscious of his plight and began to

realize that it is himself who is free and not the master. The 1896 Revolution, therefore, could be viewed as the Enlightenment period in Philippine history as it made the Filipinos "conscious" of their power to transform for the better the kind of society they were in.

After having convinced that the Filipino revolutionaries had already established their momentum, the Spanish government proclaimed the Philippine island to be under the "state of war" and began using the precept "reign of terror" to quell the *Katipuneros* (members of the *Katipunan*). They arrested suspected rebels, searched homes without a warrant, and confiscated properties of those believed to be supporters of the Revolution. Soon after this, the Spanish government began a series of execution. The most famous of these was the execution of Jose Rizal in Bagumbayan on 30 December 1896.

But the "reign of terror" instigated by the Spanish government failed to achieve the goal of quelling the revolution. On the contrary, it only contributed to the ever growing strength of the revolution. And in 1898, the *Katipuneros* had encircled the Spaniards in Intramuros, Manila. This was supposed to be the crowning moment of the *Katipuneros*, but unfortunately, they did not see the dawn of success because when they were about to defeat the Spanish regime, a new, more powerful, colonizer entered the scene: the Americans.

The Americans who had been at war with Spain towards the end of the 19th century came to the Philippines in 1898 and took away from the Filipinos the victory which was rightfully theirs. That year marked the beginning of American rule in the Philippines. In the following section, I will discuss how the "critical consciousness" of the Filipinos continued to thrive in the post-1896 Revolution no matter how the neo-colonialism of the United Sates reshaped its form, befouled its content, and deflected its true goal.

The Philippines under the American Regime

The intervention of the United States of America in the 1896 Revolution was unexpected because there was no prior relation of whatever kind between the Philippines and the United States. It was the Spanish-American War that broke on 15 April 1898 that brought the Americans to the Philippines in their attempt to extirpate Spanish rule in South America and the Asia-Pacific region.[71] On 30 April 1898, the American forces arrived in the Philippines and the first battle of the Spanish-American War was fought in Manila Bay on 1 May 1898. After a series of defeats throughout South America and the Pacific, the Spanish finally capitulated to the Americans and the Spanish-American War ended with the Treaty of Paris on 10 December 1898. In this treaty, Spain ceded the Philippines to the United States of America in return for a payment of USD 20 million. As a result, the United States in the context of international law legally exercised sovereignty over the Philippines.

The Filipino revolutionaries and the Americans cooperated with each other in the Battle of Manila Bay. It was in this battle that the Filipino revolutionaries had almost defeated the Spaniards in Intramuros, Manila in 1898. But when the Spaniards finally capitulated, the Americans deprived the Filipino revolutionaries the victory that was rightfully theirs by not allowing the latter to enter Manila. As a result, the Filipino revolutionaries withdrew and returned to Kawit, Cavite, and declared Philippine independence there on 12 June 1898, giving Gen. Emilio Aguinaldo, the revolutionary leader, full authority to exercise the power of the government. On 9 September, the revolutionary government moved to Malolos, Bulacan and opened a revolutionary congress there in the 15th of September. On 29 November, the revolutionary congress approved the Malolos Constitution. Finally, on 23 January 1899, the constitutional Philippine Republic was proclaimed.

But the declaration of Philippine independence by the Filipino revolutionaries was deemed null and void because on 21 December 1898, eleven days after the Treaty of Paris was signed, President William McKinley of the United States had already issued a proclamation declaring that the future control, disposition, and government of the Philippines were ceded to the government of the United States of America. President McKinley even instructed the American military authorities to remain in the Philippines and maintain American sovereignty there by force if necessary.[72] This being the case, the Filipino revolutionaries who had been forced to withdraw to peripheral areas to Manila decided to continue the struggle for freedom. On 4 February 1899, the Filipino-American War broke out after an American sentry fired at a Filipino revolutionary in San Juan Bridge just outside Manila.

The American forces then proceeded forthwith in attacking the Filipino revolutionaries. Unable to match the might of the United States forces, the Filipino revolutionaries encountered defeats after defeats. On 23 March 1901, the Americans captured Emilio Aguinaldo in Palanan, Isabela. The following month, in the 19th of April, Aguinaldo took oath of allegiance to the United States of America and appealed to all Filipino revolutionaries to accept her sovereignty. Consequently, thousands of Filipino revolutionaries surrendered as a response to this call.[73] And as far as the Americans and the Filipino elites were concerned, the Filipino-American War ended with the capture of Aguinaldo. However, many prominent historians in the Philippines, like Renato Constantino and Teodoro Agoncillo, contend that the Filipino-American War lingered on even until 1916. As a matter of fact, in 1902, Simeon Ola of the Bicol region and General Lukban of the Visayas led an uprising which aimed to expel the American forces. From 1902-1913, people in Mindanao, especially the Muslims, fought fearlessly against the American invaders. Notable among these movements were the Hassan Uprising and Datu Ali

Uprising of 1903, the Bud Dajo Uprising of 1906, the Jikiri Uprising of 1907, the Datu Alamada Uprising of 1912, the Bud Bagsak Uprising of 1913, and many others.[74] These uprisings clearly attest to the fact that the Filipino people's resistance to colonial domination did not end with the surrender of Aguinaldo, and that the surrender of Aguinaldo to the Americans did not bring the Filipino-American War to a close.

Aside from the political, resistance to American colonialism also found expression in the quasi-religious and religious aspects of Philippine society. These movements actually had their roots in the Spanish period when some native Filipinos returned to pre-Hispanic beliefs in their attempt to reject Spanish rule via the rejection of Catholicism, and when several Filipino priests protested for equal rights within the (Catholic) Church. These movements saw their revival at the outset of American occupation in the Philippines. Notable among these quasi-religious rebel movements were the *Dios-Dios* movement[75] and its descendant, the *Pulahanes* movement.[76] Adherents to these movements were highly superstitious and miracle-conditioned so that they believed that their leaders were endowed with supernatural powers. In fact, they believed that their amulets or *anting-anting* made them invulnerable to enemy bullets. Many Filipino historians gave emphasis to these quasi-religious rebel movements because no matter how irrational their beliefs and practices might be, they posited a clear goal of liberation from colonial oppression, thing that successfully mustered the support of the masses. The *Pulajanes* leader Faustino Ablen of Leyte, for example, "promised his followers that once they had destroyed the enemies—the Americans and all Filipinos who cooperated with them—he would lead them to a mountain top on which stood seven churches of gold. There they would find all their dead relatives, alive and happy and their lost carabaos".[77]

Meanwhile, the most conspicuous revolutionary move initiated by the Filipino clergy was the establishment of the *Iglesia Filipina Independiente* (Philippine Independent Church) in August 1902.[78] Although this movement was viewed at first as the anti-friar nature of the 1896 Revolution, it continued to express the Filipino aspiration for independence during the American occupation. The reason to this is understandable. Because the Americans rendered the advocacy of independence seditious, it is but prudent for the Filipino masses to drag the struggle for independence in non-political spheres.

To some extent, however, the cunning colonial policy of the United States had been successful in quelling the recalcitrant Filipinos so that even if they were facing uprisings after uprisings, the Americans were able to put up their insular government in the Philippines and advanced their economic interests not only in the Philippines but in the entire Asia-Pacific region. It is important to note what Corpuz observes that from the very beginning the primary interest of the United States was not to Christianize and civilize the native Filipinos and to help them prepare a government of their own, as what President McKinley expressed in his proclamation of "Benevolent Assimilation" on 21 December 1898, but precisely to expand American trade in the Philippines in particular and in Asia in general. According to Corpuz, the strategy of the United States was to make the Philippines a source of cheap raw materials like sugar, hemp, copra, etc. for U.S. industries on the one hand and a market for U.S. exports on the other.[79] Through this strategy the Philippines remained a completely agricultural economy during the American regime. In addition to this, and after the enactment of the Payne-Aldrich Tariff Act of 1909, which first introduced "free trade" in the country, the Philippine economy became completely dependent upon the United States—the country imported virtually all her requirements of finished goods. In fact, records show that imports from the Unites States were

8.7 per cent of all imports from all other countries in 1900, which rose to 20.3 per cent in 1909 and 64.2 percent in 1911.[80]

With the relative peace attained during the first decade of their colonial rule, the Americans had indeed been quite successful in promoting their economic interest in the Philippines. However, the presence of sporadic mass uprisings which continued to threaten their colonial policy led the Americans to supplement military suppression with a more subtle form of domination in suppressing the critical consciousness of the Filipino masses. For this purpose, the Americans used propaganda in the form of colonial education, colonial politics, and American-oriented media. According to Constantino, colonial education had reshaped Philippine society in the image of the Americans, colonial politics had converted the Filipino elites who had collaborated with the Americans into adjuncts of colonial rule, and the American-oriented media had Americanized the Filipinos.[81] Let me explain these points briefly before I engage on how the recalcitrant Filipinos managed to continue their struggle for freedom after several setbacks during the American regime.

As early as 21 January 1901, the Second Philippine Commission[82] enacted Act No. 74 which aimed to establish a public school system with free public primary education. The following year, a high school system was established. Then eventually, schools of trade and art, agriculture, and commerce were also established. To see to it that the introduction of American education in the Philippines would fulfill the goal of transforming the attitudes of the Filipino masses toward the American interests and policies in the country, as Constantino maintains, the Americans imposed the use of English language as the medium of instruction in all educational levels.[83] In addition to this, the Americans sponsored several hundreds of young Filipinos for educational training in different universities in the United States. It is estimated that in 1903,

the first batch of young Filipinos for training in different universities in the United States numbered one hundred which rose to more than two hundred in 1912.[84]

The introduction of American education in the Philippines with English language as the official medium of instruction and the sponsorship of Filipino scholars in the United States indeed proved beneficial for the Americans because they produced American-oriented public administrators who promoted American interests in the government and American-oriented managers who ran American firms in the country. While it is true that the introduction of education and English language in the Philippines was also beneficial to the Filipinos because it helped them attain socio-economic, cultural, and political advancement, an opportunity deprived of them by the Spaniards, the fact that the Americans only used it as mere means for their pursuit of economic exploitation in the Philippines should not be discounted. It must be noted that no less than Captain Albert Todd, the director of the first American army's educational program in the Philippines, admitted that "the primary goal of the army's teaching was not to educate the Filipinos, but rather to pacify them by convincing them of American good will".[85] Glenn A. May also notes that the American policy-makers, the President, Cabinet officers, Congressmen, and colonial administrators were convinced that the key to the success of American colonial policy in the Philippines was education.[86] And according to Constatino, this cunning act only miseducates the Filipinos. He writes:

> Education *in this manner* became miseducation because it began to de-Filipinize the youth, taught them to look up to American heroes, to regard American culture as superior to theirs, and American society as the model par excellence of Philippine society.[87]

As we can see, the introduction of American education in the Philippines enabled the Americans to produce, in the words of Constantino, adjuncts of colonial rule. This is evidenced

by the growing number of Filipino intellectuals who obtained degrees both locally and abroad. Constantino further maintains that these intellectuals served both the American dictated government and American owned business firms in the Philippines.[88]

Another direct offshoot of American education was the proliferation of American-oriented mass media in Philippine society. Because of the compulsory public elementary and high school education with English language as the medium of instruction, the Filipinos, especially the elites and the middle and upper middle classes, easily became avid supporters of American press and other American products. Indeed, the Filipinos became insatiably consumers of American products. Doreen G. Fernandez maintains that this process of "Americanizing" Philippine society was made possible by the introduction of American education and English language, which also at the same time facilitated the entry of American mass media in the country.[89] As result, Fernandez says, many Filipinos now read American newspapers, magazines, and comics, listened to American music, and watched Hollywood films.[90] Fernandez further says that American education, English language, the media, and the advent of commercial ads[91] have alerted the Filipinos to American life and culture and its desirability.[92] The American-oriented media, therefore, facilitated the transformation of the consumption habits of the Filipinos, a decisive factor which intensified, if not completed, the subjugation of the Filipinos by the American colonialists.

Now, if we take a look at the history of resistance movements in the Philippines from the Spanish period until the first decade of American rule, we can notice the gradual but constant development of "critical consciousness" among the Filipinos. The Filipinos, especially the masses, bitterly fought for independence against the Spaniards for more than three centuries and against the Americans for about a decade. It can also be observed that it was during the

Filipino-American War that the Filipino revolutionaries experienced a devastating defeat. Understandably, the decade that followed the establishment of American rule in the country witnessed the weakening of the resistance movements, a period described by Constantino as the period of "relative quiescence".[93] Constantino believed that two major reasons contributed to the regression of the Filipinos into passivity, namely: first, that after centuries of bitter struggle the Filipino revolutionaries became exhausted and partially discouraged; and second, because of the "adoption of the 'wait-and-see' attitude among the people as the propaganda about the benefits of American colonialism seeped down to the villages and farms".[94]

It must be remembered that the Filipinos were hopeful, though reluctantly suspicious, that the intervention of the Americans in the 1896 Revolution and President McKinley's declaration of "Benevolent Assimilation" would help realize their long-desired independence from colonial oppression. But no matter how the American colonialists intensified their propaganda campaign, their economic exploitation of the Philippines eventually became evident as the economic condition of the country failed to improve and in fact even worsened. Consequently, after the relative quiescence during the second decade of American occupation, roughly from 1916 until the early 1920s, the Filipino masses had once again become critically conscious of their plight which resulted in the reactivation of the old resistance movements and the emergence of new ones. Thus, by the early 1920s social unrests erupted both in the cities and the countryside. Because the number of these resistance movements was indeed huge, let me just highlight the major ones.

Perhaps the most interesting resistance movements that emerged during the later part of American occupation in the Philippines were the labor unions and peasant unions.[95] Unlike the quasi-religious rebel movements during the early phase of American occupation, these

organizations had clearly defined economic and political objectives, which were expressed in their protests against the abuses of the capitalists and the landlords. The labor unions like the *Congres Obrero de Filipinas* founded on 1 May 1913 and the *Legionarios del Trabajo* founded in 1919 demanded for an eight-hour working day, child and women labor laws, employer's liability law, protection of Philippine products from foreign competition, and even the adoption of *Tagalog* as the national language.[96] On the other hand, the peasant unions like the *Union ng Magsasaka* (Farmers' Union) founded in 1917 fought against the evils of tenancy and usury and demanded for the humanization of landlord-tenant relations, just land rent and land taxes, the amendment of certain land laws to alleviate the plight of the peasants, and many others.[97] Because these demands were hard to win, the laborers and the peasants resorted to mass rallies, protests, strikes, and the likes. Although the laborers and the peasants had their respective socio-economic demands, it is interesting to note that they were united in their political advocacy, that is, protection from the exploitation by the landlords and capitalists and independence from American colonialism. Jeremias U. Montemayor viewed these workers and peasants unions primarily as a weapon of common defense against exploitation by the landlords and the American-supported capitalists, though in many cases they can be considered as bridge between the people and the government, instrument for agrarian peace, and means for economic advancement of the workers and the peasants.[98]

The labor unions and peasant unions, however, were not free from internal conflicts. The early phase of unionism in the Philippines, Constantino observes, was marred by disunity and dissension because some of the union leaders were tempted to pursue their own personal interests.[99] This condition triggered the true-blue nationalists to resort to more radical moves

which resulted in the establishment of the Partido Komunista ng Pilipinas (Communist Party of the Philippines) in 7 November 1930.[100]

The Communist Party of the Philippines, an offshoot of the *Katipunan ng mga Anak-Pawis ng Pilipinas* had the following aims:

> 1) Unite the workers and peasants and the exploited masses in general in their own class organizations; 2) Struggle against the rule of American imperialism in the Philippines; 3) Struggle for the betterment of the living and working conditions of the workers and peasants; 4) Struggle to achieve immediate, absolute, and complete independence of the Philippines and establish a real people's government; 5) Unite with the revolutionary movement the world over; and 6) establish the Soviet system in the Philippines.[101]

By this time, the Communist Party of the Philippines posed the greatest threat to American colonialism and imperialism in the Philippines. And even if its original leaders were sentenced to jail, the Party continued to attract huge number of people from the working class and peasants. In the decades that followed, the Communist Party of the Philippines remained the vanguard of the Filipino nationalists who tirelessly struggled for independence from American colonialism and imperialism.

Finally, another influential resistance movement that emerged in the later part of American occupation in the Philippines was the *Sakdal* Movement founded by Benigno Ramos[102] on 28 June 1930, with the initial publication of its organ, *Sakdal*, a weekly newspaper whose write ups bitterly attacked not only the American colonialists but also their local puppets like government officials, *hacenderos*, churchmen, and the Constabulary. According to Constantino, the paper soon became popular among all sectors of Philippine society and, consequently, its readers formed the nucleus of the *Sakdalista* organization.[103]

The Sakdalistas confronted three major issues of American colonialism, to wit: 1) American education, 2) American economic control, and 3) American military bases. To the first, the *Sakdalistas* argued that the American sponsored educational system in the Philippines did not genuinely intend to educate the Filipino masses but to glorify American culture; second, they believed that American economic control was the root cause of massive poverty in the Philippines; and third, they charged that the American military bases in the Philippines benefited only the United States.[104] With this conviction, the *Sakdalistas* proposed a complete economic and political independence from the United States of America, a radical move which gained outright support from the masses, especially the suffering peasants.

In just few years after its founding in 1930, the *Sakdal* Movement attracted huge number of devout followers from different parts of the Philippine island. And in their desire that their programs be heard in the national political scene, the *Sakdalistas* established the *Sakdal* Party in the middle of October 1933. Party chapters then were quickly established all over the Philippines drawing ever growing support from the masses, especially the poor and the oppressed. Motoe Terami-Wada enumerated four major reasons why the masses joined and strongly supported the *Sakdal* Movement and later the *Sakdal* Party, namely: 1) the Sakdal Movement was admired for fearlessly exposing the wrongdoing of the politicians; 2) it was perceived to be truly of and for the poor and oppressed people; 3) it was uncompromising in its stand on the independence issue; and 4) it possessed integrity in terms of living up to its principles and its records of not being after of the people's money.[105]

Throughout the 1930s until the entry of the Japanese Imperial Army in December 1941, [106] the *Sakdalistas* remained one of the fiercest critics of American colonial policies in the country. However, in 1945, almost simultaneously with the defeat of the Japanese in World

War II, the *Sakdal* Movement died out. The decades that followed then witnessed again the quiescence of the Filipino revolutionaries as they were overwhelmed by the feelings of relief and gratitude towards the Americans who for the second time liberated them from another external power—first, from the Spaniards in 1898, and this time, from the Japanese.

Conclusion

In retrospect, the historical account of the Philippines presented above shows that indeed the dialectic of domination and resistance that characterized Philippine history persisted since the pre-Hispanic through the Spanish and American period. It is observed that there was already a *baranganic* tension as well as class tension, i.e., tension between the ruling class (*datus* and *maharlikas*) and the ruled (*alipins*) during the pre-Hispanic period. However, a mature form of resistance was not directly observable because there was no evidence of organized uprisings initiated by the ruled class. What the disadvantaged class did to escape subjection was to transfer to other *barangays* or, in extreme cases, opted for the replacement of the *barangay* leader (*datu*) who became unpopular due to defeats in *barangay* wars or due to the fact that he is no longer able to influence decision in the community.

When the Spaniards came, we can notice that domination and resistance became conspicuous as the native Filipinos violently reacted to the untoward disposition of the colonizers. This can be seen in the series of uprisings that constantly posed as "threat" to the nearly four centuries of Spanish domination. What is also noticeable during the entire span of Spanish domination was the gradual but progressive development of Filipino critical consciousness which climaxed in the 1896 Revolution. This was proven by a shift in the form of struggle that the native Filipinos employed to counter Spanish colonial domination—from mere reaction to the exaction of tributes and other forms of Spanish punitive rule, the Filipinos,

after more than three centuries of Spanish subjection, finally demanded complete separation from the motherland Spain. The 1896 Revolution attests to this fact.

Finally, the same scenario can be observed during the four decades of American occupation. Domination and resistance continued to preponderate in the socio-political image of the Philippines. It is interesting to note, however, that this period witnessed the considerable erosion of Filipino critical consciousness as the Americans employed more subtle form of domination, e.g., colonial education, in pacifying the entire nation. But equally interesting is the fact that despite the attainment of relative quiescence during the first half of American occupation, Filipino critical consciousness was reactivated in the succeeding decades, thus, it can be observed that in the final years of American occupation, resistance was once again on the rise.

ENDNOTES

[1] A.V.H. Hartendorp noted that the Chinese began to engage in trade with the early settlers of the Philippine island in the middle of the 12th century. Thereafter, Chinese merchant colonies were established in few places of the island which flourished in the 13th century. See A.V.H. Hartendorp, *History of Industry and Trade of the Philippines* (Manila: American Chamber of Commerce of the Philippines, 1958), 2.

[2] F. Landa Jocano, "Introduction", in *The Philippines at the Spanish Contact: Some Major Accounts of Early Filipino Society and Culture*, ed. F. Landa Jocano (Manila: MCS Enterprises, 1975), 9.

[3] See O.D. Corpuz, *An Economic History of the Philippines* (Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press, 1997), 13. The social organization of the Muslims in Mindanao, especially in Sulu, is important in understanding the highly diverse feature of Philippine social structure. However, I will not consider this topic in details here as I only have to give an overall impression of Philippine society which is a necessary step in arriving at the main goal of this paper. For an

overview of the basic social organization of the Muslims in Mindanao, see Wilfredo F. Arce, "Social Organization of the Muslim Peoples of Sulu", *Philippine Studies* 2, no. 2 (April 1963): 242-266.

[4] Corpuz, *Economic History*, 13.

[5] Jerome G. Manis, "Philippine Culture in Transition", *Silliman Journal* 2, no. 2 (April-June 1960): 105-133.

[6] Ibid.

[7] Juan de Placensia, "Customs of the Tagalogs", in *The Philippines at the Spanish Contact: Some Major Accounts of Early Filipino Society and Culture*, ed. F. Landa Jocano (Manila: MCS Enterprises, 1975), 108.

[8] I will argue in the following section that the transformation of this linear pattern of native houses into a nucleated and clustered kind was one of the forms of domination used by the Spaniards.

[9] Jocano, "Introduction", 4.

[10] William Henry Scott, *Barangay: Sixteenth Century Philippine Culture and Society* (Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1994), 54-75.

[11] Robert B. Fox, "The Philippines in Prehistoric Times," in *Readings in Philippine Prehistory*, Vol. I (Manila: Tradewinds Books, 1979), 58.

[12] Ibid., 58-59.

[13] See also Jose S. Arcilla, *An Introduction to Philippine History*, Second Edition (Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1973), 40.

[14] William Henry Scott also observes that the native Filipinos were so compassionate in terms of helping their needy fellow *barangay* members. See Scott, *Barangay*, 135-136.

[15] Renato Constantino, *The Philippines: A Past Revisited (Pre-Spanish – 1941)*, Vol. I (Manila:RENATO CONSTANTINO, 1975), 39.

[16] Corpuz, *Economic History*, 17.

[17] Ibid.

[18] Agoncillo's account mentions only three, to wit: the nobles (*datus*), freemen (*maharlikas*), and dependents (*alipins*). See Teodoro A. Agoncillo, *History of the Filipino People*, Eighth Edition (Quezon City: GAROTECH Publishing, 1990), 35-36.

[19] Pigafetta was Ferdinand Magellan's chronicler who recorded their encounter with the people of Cebu. It was also Pigafetta who made an account about how Magellan was killed in the Battle of Mactan in 27 April 1521. See "Pigafetta's Account", in *The Philippines at the Spanish Contact: Some Major Accounts of Early Filipino Society and Culture*, ed. F. Landa Jocano (Manila: MCS Enterprises, 1975), 68-70.

[20] Antonio de Morga, "Relation of the Philippine Islands and of their Natives, Antiquity, Customs, and Government", in *Readings in Philippine Prehistory*, Vol. I (Manila: Tradewinds Books, 1979), 296.

[21] Morga, "Relations of the Philippine Island", 295.

[22] Among them were Cilaton, Cimaningha, Cimatichat, and Cicanbul. See Pigafetta's Account", in *The Philippines at the Spanish Contact*, 65.

[23] Delbert Rice, "Ancient Philippine Democracy: Pre-Hispanic Social Structures and Their Modern Implications", *Silliman Journal* 19, no. 3 (Third Quarter 1972): 249-312.

[24] Jocano, "Introduction", 11.

[25] Scott, *Barangay*, 223.

[26] Miguel Lopez de Loarca, "Relation of the Philippine Islands: Of the Inhabitants of the Pintados Islands and Their Mode of Life", in *The Philippines at the Spanish Contact: Some Major Accounts of Early Filipino Society and Culture*, ed. F. Landa Jocano (Manila: MCS Enterprises, 1975), 93.

[27] Loarca, "Relation of the Philippine Island", 93.

[28] Jocano, "Introduction", 12. According to Scott, captivity during inter-*barangay* wars and birthright were some of the other reasons why one became an *alipin*. See Scott, *Barangay*, 224.

[29] Jocano, "Introduction", 12.

[30] The early Spanish chroniclers wrongly named the Philippine island as "the *Indias or Indies*", thus, they also wrongly called the Filipinos the *Indios* or Indian. However, it is also important to note that the people in the island during this time did not have a name of their own. It was only after when the island was named *Filipinas* (i.e., Philippines), in honor of King Philip II of Spain that the people in the island were called Filipinos.

[31] Loarca, "Relation of the Philippine Island", 91.

[32] Miguel de Loarca, "Relation of the Philippine Island", in *Readings in Philippine Prehistory*, Vol. I (Manila: Tradewinds Books, 1979), 218-219.

[33] Loarca, "Relation of the Philippine Island", 91.

[34] My above presentation of the basic socio-economic and political structure of the pre-Hispanic Philippine society has been too limited. For a fuller appreciation of the pre-Hispanic Philippine social structure, see Rice, "Ancient Philippine Democracy", 249-312. See also William Henry Scott, "Filipino Class Structure in the Sixteenth Century", *Philippine Studies* 28 (Second Quarter 1980): 147-175 and Vicente B. Valdepenas, Jr. and Germelino M. Bautista, "Philippine Prehistoric Economy", *Philippine Studies* 22 (Third and Fourth Quarter 1974): 280-296.

[35] However, it is my contention that the Spaniards obstructed the natural development of these indigenous communities by imposing their own culture upon the Filipino people, that is, by Hispanizing Philippine society to their own advantage.

[36] Amado Guerrero, *Philippine Society and Revolution* (Oakland, California: International Association of Filipino, 1979), 5.

[37] Ibid., 6.

[38] Ibid., 4.

[39] Ibid., 5.

[40] Joncano, "Introduction", 17.

[41] For a detailed account on how Ferdinand Magellan got killed in Mactan, see "Pigafetta's Account", in *The Philippines at the Spanish* Contact, 68-70.

[42] As a matter of fact, it took about 135 years for the Spaniards to completely conquer the native people. In Corpuz's account, the entire Spanish conquest lasted from 1565 to 1700. See Corpuz, *Economic History*, 23.

[43] Horacio De la Costa, "The Legal Basis of Spanish Imperial Sovereignty", *Philippine Studies* 1, no. 2 (1953): 155-162.

[44] Guerrero, *Philippine Society and Revolution*, 6-7. Nicholas P. Cushner and John A. Larkin had made a complete list of land grants in the colonial Philippines from 1571-1626. See Nicholas P. Cushner and John A. Larkin, "Royal Land Grants in the Colonial Philippines (1571-1626): Implications for the Formation of a Social Life", *Philippine Studies* 26 (First and Second Quarter 1978): 102-111.

[45] Corpuz, *Economic History*, 25.

[46] O.D. Corpuz, *The Roots of the Filipino Nation*, Vol. 1 (Quezon City, Philippines: AKLAHI Foundation, 1989), 79.

[47] Constantino, *Past Revisited*, 93.

[48] Corpuz, *Economic History*, 28.

[49] Maceda, "Westernization", 78-123.

[50] Corpuz, *Economic History*, 28.

[51] Ibid.

[52] Guerrero, *Philippine Society and Revolution*, 7.

[53] Renato Constantino, *Identity and Consciousness: The Philippine Experience* (Quezon City, Philippines: Malaya Books, 1974), 4.

[54] Ibid.

[55] Guerrero, *Philippine Society and Revolution*, 9.

[56] See Fernando Palanco, "Diego Silang's Revolt: A New Approach", trans. Jose S. Arcilla, S.J., *Philippine Studies* 50 (Fourth Quarter 2002): 512-537.

[57] See Fray Francisco A. Maldonado's letter to Simon de Anda, quoted in Palanco, "Diego Silang's Revolt", 525.

[58] Guerrero, *Philippine Society and Revolution*, 10.

[59] A decisive economic development in the Philippines actually began in the second half of the eighteenth century, but I intentionally leave this out in this section because it has little to do with the progressive development of education in the second half of the nineteenth century, an important event in Philippine history which directly influenced the 1896 Revolution. See instead Maria Lourdes Diaz-Trechuelo, "The Economic Development of the Philippines in the Second Half of the Eighteenth Century", *Philippine Studies* 2, no. 2 (April 1963): 195-231 for a comprehensive discussion on the economic development of the Philippines in the second half of the eighteenth century.

[60] Prior to 1863, there were already primary schools ran by Catholic missionaries in many parts of the country. For example, as early as 1592, the first school ran by the Jesuits was established in the *encomienda* of Esteban Rodriguez de Figueroa in Tigbauan, Iloilo. See Henry Frederick Fox, "Primary Education in the Philippines, 1565-1863", *Philippine Studies* 13, no. 2

(April 1965): 207-231. But the year 1863 was pivotal to the history of education in the Philippines because on 20 December 1863, Queen Isabela of Spain signed a Royal Decree ordering the foundation of a free public primary school system in all pueblos in the Philippines. See Frederick Fox and Juan Mercader, "Some Notes on Education in Cebu Province, 1820-1898", *Philippine Studies* 9, no. 1 (January 1961): 20-46. What was important in this Royal Decree, according to Fox and Mercader, was not that it introduced free elementary education, for many parishes already provided these, but the fact that it set up for the first time a national educational system under government control. See Ibid.

It must be noted, however, that the function of education in the Philippines since the establishment of the first school in 1592 and throughout the entire Spanish regime was primarily religious in nature, with the Church controlling all its contents. Moreover, the Spaniards did not teach the native Filipinos the analytical skills which is necessary in interpreting the historical facts, economic and political events, etc. of the country; what they taught instead were reading, writing, and speaking "in Spanish" and just the memorization of the supposedly developmental texts. See Chester L. Hunt and Thomas R. McHale, "Education, Attitudinal Change and Philippine Economic Development", *Philippine Sociological Review* 13, no. 3 (July 1965): 127-139. To ensure that the Church continues to dictate the educational content, the friars insisted for their appointment as local inspectors of schools; they also saw to it that the Archbishop of Manila is included as member in the overseeing body called the Superior Commission of Education. See Ibid. Thus, as Hunt and McHale argued, education during this time both by intent and design was geared towards Spanish colonial objectives. See Ibid.

[61] A succinct presentation of the inequalities in the Church during the second half of the nineteenth century is provided by Jose S. Arcilla, S.J. in his review of John N. Schumacher's book *Revolutionary Clergy: The Filipino Clergy and the Nationalist Movement, 1850-1903*. See Jose S. Arcilla, S.J., "Revolutionary Clergy", *Philippine Studies* 31 (First Quarter 1983):109-116.

[62] John N. Schumacher and Nicholas P. Cushner, "Documents Relating to Father Jose Burgos and the Cavite Mutiny of 1872", *Philippine Studies* 17, no. 3 (July 1969): 457.

[63] Doreen G. Fernandez, "The Philippine Press System: 1811-1898", *Philippine Studies* 37 (Second Quarter 1989): 320.

[64] Joaquin G. Bernas, "Filipino Consciousness of Civil and Political Rights", *Philippines Studies* 25 (Second Quarter 1977): 165.

[65] There is an unresolved debate in the Philippines whether Jose Rizal favored and supported the 1896 Revolution. Some prominent historians like Gregorio Zaide asserted that Rizal supported the revolution and was aiming for independence. One of his evidences was the memoir written by Dr. Pio Valenzuela, secretary general and founding member of the *Katipunan*, who was sent to Dapitan in late June 1896 by Andres Bonifacio to consult Rizal about the plan of the revolution. Rizal was quoted saying: "So the seed grows. The resolutions of the association are very just, patriotic, and above all, timely because Spain is weakened by the revolution in

Cuba. I approved these resolutions and I suggest that they be complied with as early as possible in order to take advantage of opportunity." See Floro Quibuyen, "Rizal and the Revolution", *Philippine Studies* 45 (Second Quarter 1997): 229. Teodoro Agoncillo, Renato Constantino and other nationalist historians objected to Zaide's claim and argue instead that Rizal repudiated the revolution and remained an "assimilationist" until his execution on 30 December 1896. Their crucial evidence is not what Rizal wrote or what his contemporaries said about him, but what he said in 15 December Manifesto, exactly two weeks before his execution, and Pio Valenzuela's prison testimony. Both of these documents clearly showed that Rizal repudiated the revolution. See Ibid., 237-244. My take on this issue is not so much on whether Rizal supported the revolution or repudiated it, but on the fact that he failed to articulate explicitly the need for complete independence of the Philippines from Spain.

[66] Floro Quibuyen, "Rizal and Filipino Nationalism: Critical Issues", *Philippine Studies* 50 (Second Quarter 2002): 210.

[67] Ibid.

[68] Constantino, *Past Revisited*, 169.

[69] Ibid., 167.

[70] Ibid., 168.

[71] Constantino and many other nationalist historians in the Philippines believe that the underlying principle behind this move is economic as the United States of American at the turn of the 20th century launched her expansionist policy.

[72] The decision of the Americans to take over the Philippine territory was made possible by two expansionist principles then current, namely, "Manifest Destiny" and "The White Man's Burden". Through the principle of Manifest Destiny, the Americans believed that part of their world power endowed by God is the obligation to civilize the dark places in the world. This principle was first applied when the white Americans subjugated the American Indians in North America. Mark D. Van Ells writes: "White Americans believed it their 'manifest destiny' to spread their civilization across North America, and felt justified in destroying—sometimes to the point of genocide—the 'backward' race that stood in their way." See Mark D. Van Ells, "Assuming the White Man's Burden: The Seizure of the Philippines, 1898-1902", *Philippine Studies* 47 (Fourth Quarter 1995): 609. When this principle was applied in the Philippines, the first colonial territory of the United States, it became "The White Man's Burden". Because the Americans viewed the Filipinos as uncivilized and savage, they believed that God called them to civilize their "little brown brothers" (i.e., the Filipinos). Ibid., 613. These principles made the Americans unwilling to relinquish their control over the Philippines. As one American protestant

missionary in the Philippines said: "to relinquish control of the Philippine island is 'utter blasphemy". See Ibid.

[73] Teodoro A. Agoncillo observes that this act was not due to the influence of Aguinaldo as their leader but it was due primarily to the tactics the Americans used to quell the Filipino revolutionaries: peace propaganda and military brutalities. According to Agoncillo, the Filipino revolutionaries had no choice because if they do not assent to the peace propaganda of the Americans, the captured Filipino revolutionaries and most especially the civilians would suffer American military brutalities. See Teodoro A. Agoncillo, *History of the Filipino People*, 8th Edition (Quezon City, GAROTECH Publishing, 1990), 227-230.

[74] For a detailed account of a series of uprisings that continued to threat American sovereignty even after the capture of Aguinaldo, see Constantino, *Past Revisited*, 256-286.

[75] The term *dios-dios* is taken from the Filipino word *Dios* or *Diyos*, which means God. It was used by the Spanish *guardia civil* and other government records to refer to activities of the native Filipinos which were religious and political in nature. According to Sophia Marco, this movement which proliferated in Luzon and Visayas is a messianic movement whose leader was viewed as a messiah, a just king who could save its members from colonial oppression and other forms of oppression exacted by the local ruling class. See Sophia Marco, "*Dios-Dios* in the Visayas", *Philippine Studies* 49 (First Quarter 2001): 42. She further notes that because this movement undermined Spanish authorities, the Spaniards disapproved and tagged this movement as *dios-dios*—a mockery of what true religion ought to be. Ibid., 44.

[76] This movement was called as such because its members wore *pula* uniforms. *Pula* is Filipino term for red. See Constantino, *Past Revisited*, 281. Like the members of the *dios-dios* movement, the members of the *pulahanes* movement viewed their leaders as "messiahs" who could save them from poverty and the injustices inflicted by the Spaniards and later by the Americans. According to Sophia Marco, the *pulahanes* movement was actually a descendant of the *dios-dios* movement. See Marco, "Dios-Dios", 67. For an overview of these quasi-religious rebel movements, see Earl Jude Paul L. Cleope, "The Negros Millenarian Movement", *Silliman Journal* 41, no. 2 (July-December 2000):61-81 and Deliah R. Labajo, "Reformative and Dissident Religious Movements in Cebu:1900-1990", *USC Graduate Journal* XX, no. 1 (September 2003):66-75.

[77] Constantino, *Past Revisited*, 282.

[78] The *Iglesia Filipina Independienet* is also known as *Aglipayan* Church in honor of its first Supreme Bishop Fr. Aglipay.

[79] Corpuz, *Economic History*, 219.

[80] Ibid

[81] Constantino, *Past-Revisited*, 314.

[82] The Second Philippine Commission appointed by President McKinley on 16 March 1900 became the first civil government in the Philippines on 1 July 1901 with Commissioner William Howard Taft as the Civil Governor. See Glenn A. May, "Social Engineering in the Philippines: The Aims and Execution of American Educational Policy, 1900-1913", *Philippine Studies* 24 (Second Quarter 1976): 135-183.

[83] Teodoro A. Llamzon enumerated four primary reasons why the Americans used English as the medium of instruction in Philippine schools, to wit: 1) there was great linguistic diversity in the island, and none of the languages had the necessary diffusion, prestige, and lexical adequacy to qualify as a medium of instruction; 2) there were strong feelings of regional jealousy among different linguistic groups; 3) there were no educational materials available in any of the Philippine languages; and 4) it seemed that English was a neutral language acceptable to all, and if used as a medium of instruction, would eventually develop into a common language. See Teodoro A. Llamzon, "On the Medium of Instruction: English or Pilipino", *Philippine Studies* 18, no. 4 (October 1970): 683. While all of these reasons proved to be plausible, the hidden truth of the use of English by the American colonial education as an instrument to pacify and dominate the Filipinos must be spared from oblivion.

[84] Constantino, *Past Revisited*, 316. To date, the United States continues to sponsor Filipino scholars to pursue both degree and non-degree courses in American universities through the Ford Foundation and Fulbright. This only goes to show that education, especially American education, had been successful in quelling the critical consciousness of the Filipino people and made them oblivious about American atrocities in the past and the real intention of the United States which is to exploit the Philippines economically.

[85] See May, "Social Engineering in the Philippines", 137.

[86] Ibid., 135-136.

[87] Constatino, *Past-Revisited*, 318. Italics mine.

[88] Ibid.

[89] Doreen G. Fernandez, "Mass Culture and Cultural Policy: The Philippine Experience", *Philippine Studies* 37 (Fourth Quarter 1989): 492.

[90] Fernandez, "Mass Culture and Cultural Policy", 492.

[91] For a detailed account of the history of advertising in the Philippines, see John A. Lent, "Advertising in the Philippines", *Philippines Studies* 17, no. 1 (January 1969):72-95, Vitaliano R. Gorospe, "Advertising in the Philippines: Some Ethical Questions", *Philippine Studies* 12, no. 4 (October 1964): 605-622, and Higino A. Ables, *Mass Communication and Philippine Society* (Quezon City: The University of the Philippine Press, 2003).

[92] Fernandez, "Mass Culture and Cultural Policy", 492

[93] Constantino, *Past Revisited*, 349.

[94] Ibid.

[95] Labor unions in the Philippines actually began as early as January 1902 when Don Isabelo de los Reyes founded the *Union de Litographos e Impresores de Filipinas*, the first labor union in the Philippines. From a union of lithographers, it later expanded and became the *Union Obrera Democratica Filipina*, a federation of small unions of printers, lithographers, cigar makers, tailors, and shoemakers. See John J. Carroll, "Philippine Labor Unions", *Philippine Studies* 9, no. 2 (April 1961): 220-254. However, as records show, it was not until the latter part of American occupation that union members became actively involved in the struggle for economic and colonial independence.

[96] See Constantino, *Past Revisited*, 364-365 and also Carroll, "Philippine Labor Unions", 227.

[97] To say that all landlords in the Philippines were abusive is sheer exaggeration. But history shows that most, if not all, of the farmers in the Philippines until to this day are victims of various forms of feudal injustice. Christobal P. Hofilena's study, "Towards Social Justice for the Farm Laborers", shows that almost all farmers in the Philippines were in many ways victims of feudal injustice. See Christobal P. Hofilena, "Towards Social Justice for the Farm Laborers", *Philippine Studies* 3, no. 2 (June 1955): 157-163. In this study, Hofilena also offers some practicable advices on how the landlords can make real advances towards the solution of those social problems.

[98] Jeremias U. Montemayor, "The Federation of Free Farmers", *Philippine Studies* 3, no. 4 (December 1955): 375.

[99] Constantino, *Past Revisited*, 366.

[100] Ibid., 368. Please note that this refers to the original Communist Party of the Philippines, now known as PKP-1930, and must be distinguished from its splinter-group Communist Party of the Philippines (CPP) founded by Jose Maria Sison on 26 December 1968, with a Maoist orientation.

[101] George Santayana, "Milestones in the History of the CPP", quoted in Constantino, *Past-Revisited*, 368.

[102] For a discussion on the life of Benigno Ramos, see Motoe Terami-Wada, "Benigno Ramos and the *Sakdal* Movement", *Philippine Studies* 36 (Fourth Quarter 1988): 427-442 and

also Grant K. Goodman, "An Interview with Benigno Ramos", *Philippine Studies* 37 (Second Quarter 1989): 215-219.

[103] Constantino, *Past Revisited*, 373.

[104] Ibid., 374.

[105] Motoe Terami-Wada, "The *Sakdal* Movement, 1930-34", *Philippine Studies* 36 (Second Quarter 1988): 145.

[106] The American occupation in the Philippines was interrupted for four years when the Japanese occupied the Philippines from 1941-1945. During this time, the Filipino revolutionaries, especially the *Hukbalahap* (*Hukbo ng Bayan Laban sa Hapon* or Army of the Country Against the Japanese) cooperated with the American and Filipino soldiers against the Japanese. But after the war, the Americans outlawed the *Huks* with Douglas McArthur declaring it to be one of the largest and most powerful enemies of the state. See Renato Constantino and Letizia Constantino, *The Philippines: The Continuing Past* (Quezon City: The Foundation for Nationalist Studies, 1978), 163-169.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ables, Higino A. 2003. *Mass Communication and Philippine Society*. Quezon City: The University of the Philippine Press.

Agoncillo, Teodoro A. 1990. *History of the Filipino People*, Eighth Edition. Quezon City: GAROTECH Publishing, 1990.

Arce, Wilfredo F. Social Organization of the Muslim Peoples of Sulu. *Philippine Studies* 2, no. 2 (April 1963): 242-266.

Arcilla, Jose S. 1973. *An Introduction to Philippine History*, Second Edition. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.

_____. *Revolutionary Clergy: The Filipino Clergy and the Nationalist Movement, 1850-*1903, *Philippine Studies* 31 (First Quarter 1983):109-116.

Bernas, Joaquin G. Filipino Consciousness of Civil and Political Rights. *Philippines Studies* 25 (Second Quarter 1977): 163-185.

Carroll, John J. Philippine Labor Unions. *Philippine Studies* 9, no. 2 (April 1961): 220-254.

Cleope, Earl Jude Paul L. The Negros Millenarian Movement. *Silliman Journal* 41, no. 2 (July-December 2000):61-81.

Constantino, Renato. 1975. *The Philippines: A Past Revisited (Pre-Spanish – 1941),* Vol. I. Manila: RENATO CONSTANTINO.

_____. 1974. *Identity and Consciousness: The Philippine Experience*. Quezon City, Philippines: Malaya Books.

Constantino, Renato and Letizia Constantino. 1978. *The Philippines: The Continuing Past*. Quezon City: The Foundation for Nationalist Studies.

Corpuz, O.D. 1997. *An Economic History of the Philippines*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press.

_____. 1989. *The Roots of the Filipino Nation*, Vol. 1. Quezon City, Philippines: AKLAHI Foundation.

Cushner, Nicholas. Legazpi 1564-1572. *Philippine Studies* 13, no. 2 (April 1965): 163-206.

Cushner Nicholas P. and John A. Larkin. Royal Land Grants in the Colonial Philippines (1571-1626): Implications for the Formation of a Social Life. *Philippine Studies* 26 (First and Second Quarter 1978): 102-111.

de la Costa, Horacio. The Legal Basis of Spanish Imperial Sovereignty. *Philippine Studies* 1, no. 2 (1953): 155-162.

de Loarca, Miguel Lopez. 1975. Relation of the Philippine Islands: Of the Inhabitants of the Pintados Islands and Their Mode of Life, 197-220. In *The Philippines at the Spanish Contact: Some Major Accounts of Early Filipino Society and Culture*, ed. F. Landa Jocano. Manila: MCS Enterprises.

de Morga, Antonio. 1979. Relation of the Philippine Islands and of their Natives, Antiquity, Customs, and Government, 266-306. In *Readings in Philippine Prehistory*, Vol. I. Manila: Tradewinds Books.

de Placensia, Juan. 1975. Customs of the Tagalogs, 108-124. In *The Philippines at the Spanish Contact: Some Major Accounts of Early Filipino Society and Culture*, ed. F. Landa Jocano. Manila: MCS Enterprises.

Diaz-Trechuelo, Maria Lourdes. The Economic Development of the Philippines in the Second Half of the Eighteenth Century. *Philippine Studies* 2, no. 2 (April 1963): 195-231.

Fernandez, Doreen G. The Philippine Press System: 1811-1898. *Philippine Studies* 37 (Second Quarter 1989): 317-344.

_____. Mass Culture and Cultural Policy: The Philippine Experience. *Philippine Studies* 37 (Fourth Quarter 1989): 488-502.

Fox, Frederick and Juan Mercader. Some Notes on Education in Cebu Province, 1820-1898. *Philippine Studies* 9, no. 1 (January 1961): 20-46.

Fox, Henry Frederick. Primary Education in the Philippines, 1565-1863. *Philippine Studies* 13, no. 2 (April 1965): 207-231.

Fox, Robert B. 1979. The Philippines in Prehistoric Times, 35-61. In *Readings in Philippine Prehistory*, Vol. I. Manila: Tradewinds Books.

Goodman, Grant K. An Interview with Benigno Ramos. *Philippine Studies* 37 (Second Quarter 1989): 215-219.

Gorospe, Vitaliano R. Advertising in the Philippines: Some Ethical Questions. *Philippine Studies* 12, no. 4 (October 1964): 605-622,

Guerrero, Amado. 1979. *Philippine Society and Revolution*. Oakland, California: International Association of Filipino.

Hartendorp, A.V.H. 1958. *History of Industry and Trade of the Philippines*. Manila: American Chamber of Commerce of the Philippines.

Hofilena, Christobal P. Towards Social Justice for the Farm Laborers. *Philippine Studies* 3, no. 2 (June 1955): 157-163.

_____. Towards Social Justice for the Farm Laborers. *Philippine Studies* 3, no. 2 (June 1955): 157-163.

Hunt Chester L. and Thomas R. McHale. Education, Attitudinal Change and Philippine Economic Development. *Philippine Sociological Review* 13, no. 3 (July 1965): 127-139.

Jocano, F. Landa. 1975. Introduction, 1-43. In *The Philippines at the Spanish Contact: Some Major Accounts of Early Filipino Society and Culture*, ed. F. Landa Jocano. Manila: MCS Enterprises.

Labajo, Deliah R. Reformative and Dissident Religious Movements in Cebu:1900-1990. *USC Graduate Journal* XX, no. 1 (September 2003):66-75.

Llamzon, Teodoro A. On the Medium of Instruction: English or Pilipino. *Philippine Studies* 18, no. 4 (October 1970): 683-693.

Lent, John A. Advertising in the Philippines. *Philippines Studies* 17, no. 1 (January 1969):72-95.

Maceda, Marcelino . The Westernization of the 'Filipino' Ethnic Communities. *Mindanao Journal* 1, no. 2 (October-December 1974): 78-123.

Manis, Jerome G. Philippine Culture in Transition. *Silliman Journal* 2, no. 2 (April-June 1960): 105-133.

Marco, Sophia. *Dios-Dios* in the Visayas. *Philippine Studies* 49 (First Quarter 2001): 42-77.

May, Glenn A. Social Engineering in the Philippines: The Aims and Execution of American Educational Policy, 1900-1913. *Philippine Studies* 24 (Second Quarter 1976): 135-183.

Montemayor, Jeremias U. The Federation of Free Farmers. *Philippine Studies* 3, no. 4 (December 1955): 373-388.

Palanco, Fernando. Diego Silang's Revolt: A New Approach, trans. Jose S. Arcilla, S.J. *Philippine Studies* 50 (Fourth Quarter 2002): 512-537.

Pigafetta's Account, 44-80. In *The Philippines at the Spanish Contact: Some Major Accounts of Early Filipino Society and Culture,* ed. F. Landa Jocano. Manila: MCS Enterprises.

Quibuyen, Floro. Rizal and the Revolution. *Philippine Studies* 45 (Second Quarter 1997): 151-257.

_____. Rizal and Filipino Nationalism: Critical Issues. *Philippine Studies* 50 (Second Quarter 2002): 193-229.

Rice, Delbert. Ancient Philippine Democracy: Pre-Hispanic Social Structures and Their Modern Implications. *Silliman Journal* 19, no. 3 (Third Quarter 1972): 249-312.

Schumacher John N. and Nicholas P. Cushner. Documents Relating to Father Jose Burgos and the Cavite Mutiny of 1872. *Philippine Studies* 17, no. 3 (July 1969): 457-529.

Scott, William Henry. 1994. *Barangay: Sixteenth Century Philippine Culture and Society*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.

_____. Filipino Class Structure in the Sixteenth Century. *Philippine Studies* 28 (Second Quarter 1980): 147-175.

Terami-Wada, Motoe. Benigno Ramos and the *Sakdal* Movement. *Philippine Studies* 36 (Fourth Quarter 1988): 427-442.

_____. The Sakdal Movement, 1930-34. *Philippine Studies* 36 (Second Quarter 1988): 131-150.

Valdepenas, Vicente B. Jr. and Germelino M. Bautista. Philippine Prehistoric Economy. *Philippine Studies* 22 (Third and Fourth Quarter 1974): 280-296.

Van Ells, Mark D. Assuming the White Man's Burden: The Seizure of the Philippines, 1898-1902. *Philippine Studies* 47 (Fourth Quarter 1995): 607-622.