

Hispanic-Filipino Identity: Loss and Recovery

Elizabeth Medina
October 1999
Santiago de Chile

Interest: To present the hypothesis that the loss of Hispanic-Filipino identity and memory during the North American colonial period led to a decontextualized, partial treatment of the Hispanic Filipino era in Philippine history texts (1521-1898).

To understand the current state of diffuse Filipino cultural identity and historical awareness as a product of a historical and psychosocial rupture whose consequence was the loss of Hispanic-Filipino memory and identity.

To propose a reorientation of Philippine history and culture toward the recovery of the Hispanic-Filipino memory through a global approach to the past that incorporates a qualitatively higher level of cultural awareness and psychological complexity.

Point of View: Cultural identity is the result of the accumulation of sociohistorical process and arises in all members of a society once a critical mass of historical experience is reached.¹ When a people attain collective self-awareness, the image of the larger, cohesive self is behaviorally expressed in the articulation and materialization of the will to sovereign nationhood.² The study of cultural identity and mentality shift is virtually undeveloped in Philippine historiography and is an imperative for Filipinos to understand their past and correctly emplace themselves in global culture, history and coexistence.

Filipino historical writing must move beyond simple chronology, external narrative, and partial interpretation that leaves out our history's cultural complexity and thus renders it unintelligible. Methodological hermeneutics as a tool for penetrating into the deeper significance of historical narrative to "discover the world that corresponds to the text" (Beuchot, 4) is key to accessing a cultural past that is preserved in our historical documents but that cannot be reliably interpreted unless the inquirer is able to bridge the temporal and cultural distance between herself and the texts (Mallery, "Methodological Hermeneutics", 2).

Hypothesis: A history of two successive colonizations, separated by a brief interregnum in which the First Filipino Republic – synthesis of the 377-year Hispanic-Filipino historical process – was founded and then dismantled, cannot be correctly understood when presented as an external narrative that leaves out the multiple processes of psychosocial upheaval concatenated between 1872 and 1913, and whose sequelae undoubtedly continue to act over the present. *Philippine history viewed in isolation is not an "intelligible field of study"* (Toynbee, 5). For it to be such, it must be emplaced within the major frame of the process of the Spanish Empire and compared to the processes of the Latin American

¹ See Appendix I for elaboration on concept and doctrinary bases.

² Medina, E., "Sobre el asunto de la Identidad", *Revista Electrónica del Movimiento Humanista*, N° 5, junio de 1996, 76-79. In *Mundo del Nuevo Humanismo*, <http://www.mdnh.org> (Select: "Revista E. del MH").

nations. Finally, given the fact of serial colonization, the study of *mentalité* – specifically, the shifts in historical and cultural consciousness brought about by radical changes of sociopolitical paradigm (Berman, 109) – is a requirement for the profound comprehension of Filipino history. This paper is an experiment in the application of hermeneutics and the study of *mentalité* to clarify aspects of the Filipino past that up until today seem to us inadequately grasped as a coherent whole.³

We will exemplify the ideas presented with texts written at different times, by historians and non-historians, postmodern Filipinos, Spaniards, and Hispanic-Filipinos.

Key Terms

Confiscation: “A rupture in the continuum of life” (Berman, 44). In this work the term is used in the broad sense of the co-opting or denial of the other’s human intentionality. Human intention is a psychosocial phenomenon, i.e., it arises in the psyche or consciousness and is expressed in the behavior. Thus we use the term ‘psychosocial rupture’ as a form of confiscation, a break in the psychic and collective continuum of life, that is negative for national development and the evolution of culture.

Hermeneutics: Defined by J. C. Mallery as a general science of interpretation traceable to the Greeks’ study of literature and to ancient Biblical exegesis. Developed by Schleiermacher and Dilthey in the early 19th century as a method for understanding texts, verbal utterances, art, etc., through empathy and intuitive linguistic analysis.

Interiority: Used by M. Berman in the sense of individual or collective psychosomatic life. In this work, interiority refers to the inner world, whence the vital impulse or *élan vital* arises and projects itself outward to the human world as individual and collective intention.

³ We have not overlooked a most interesting aspect of Philippine history between 1896 and 1901, which concerns the fact of how the Philippines, in the late 1890s the long-time colony of a moribund empire, succeeds in freeing herself and but is abruptly deprived of freedom by another empire that is being born, and under whose dominion the sociocultural character of the Filipino nation undergoes a radical change. Under the U.S. a new ‘tectonic layer’ of North American culture is laid over Filipino national life. However, as we develop in the succeeding sections of this work, more than merely establishing itself, it *undermined* the previous layer of Hispanic Filipino consciousness in order to consolidate the neocolonial regime. Our thesis is that a serious deficiency of current Filipino historiography is its failure to give the proper weight to the fact that it was not enough and could not be enough for the Filipino nation to have been declared independent of the U.S. in 1946. The primordial step is yet lacking of recovering the psychosocial moment of the founding of the First Republic, acknowledging the serious cultural and psychic rupture that was produced in 1901, and recognizing the process of ontological confiscation that followed with its attendant consequences, before the Filipinos can resume the development of an authentic process of national self-construction. It is a fact that, today, the Filipino is North Americanized and no longer Hispanic. It is not our interest to deny this fact or to culturally disparage it. Our interest is rather to encourage the North Americanized Filipino of today to undertake a serious sounding of the subterranean Hispanic Filipino layer that underlies the surface North American one, because only in this way will it be possible for the Filipino nation to feel grounded in a profound spiritual substratum of great historical and cultural weight which bonds them psychosomatically to the Latin American peoples. We do not pretend to deny, in other words, the complexity of Filipino ontology and historiography; but rather to honor and do it justice.

Mentalité: Defined by Berman as the history of psychic life in general, the offshoot of the French *Annales* school founded by Lucien Febvre and Marc Bloch in the 1920s. According to Febvre, the study of “the collective mental baggage of a civilization” and by Berman as “the fundamental outlooks...that [reach], like a geological formation, far below the visible level” (121).

DEVELOPMENT

I. The Identity Gap as Dissociation from the Hispanic-Filipino Past

We had stated in the “Point of View,” from which this work examines the postulated loss of Hispanic-Filipino identity and the need for its recovery, that “cultural identity is the result of the accumulation of historical process and arises in the members of a society once a critical mass of sociohistorical experience has been reached.” We posit that such loss is expressed today in a psychological and emotional dissociation of postmodern Filipinos from the Hispanic-Filipino world, the result in turn of the North Americans’ triumph over the First Republic and restructuring of Filipino societal life, culture and identity between 1901 and 1946 according to the paradigm of the United States. In the course of those 45 years, the Filipino people became dissociated (or “separated from association or union with”⁴ the Hispanic past) through linguistic change, education, technological transformation and the spread of U.S. customs, mores and cultural forms through telecommunications.

However, the radical shift from a religious, tradition-bound, classical European cultural landscape to an Anglo-Saxon model of secular, technical modernity was *not* the major factor of the dissociation – it was *the disappearance of the Hispanic-Filipino generation* that led the movement, first for assimilation and equality of rights under Spain, and second, the Revolution and the founding of the Republic. The flower of this generation of paradigmatic Filipinos was eliminated from the life and leadership of the new nation through death, exile, and – after the establishment of North American rule – through its survivors’ marginalization and replacement by non-nationalist ilustrados who became the Americans’ collaborators, in the purported continuation of the failed national project, this time under more benevolent, democratic guardians – the very same destroyers of that national project. Nevertheless, the condition for the new moment was the renouncement of the past. This renouncement was passed on to the new generations in the form of the unmooring and subsequent forgetting of their grandparents’ and parents’ psychosomatic rootedness in the Hispanic-Filipino world.

The severing and forgetting of those bonds left a legacy of ahistoricity and disconcertment in the face of a documentary Himalayas in the Spanish language that could not be denied and had to be scaled, simply because it was there. Three generations of Filipino historians – whose elders, formed under the U.S. colonial regime, adopted the banner of a nationalism that vindicated the Tagalog language and ethnic purity, and rejected Spanish and mestizo culture – began to minimize the Hispanic historical component and emphasize the Asian racial and geographical elements in the equation of Filipino identity. And yet, the result of

⁴ Definition of dissociation, Merriam Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary, 10th ed.

their efforts has been the exacerbation of cultural diffuseness and alienation in a nation whose behavior is marked by diaspora and nondefinition, despite the rhetoric of its political and cultural figureheads. The country itself, rather than striding toward unification and recovery of the mystique of self-determination that still smoulders with life in the historical accounts of the late 19th century, seems to move with increasing velocity in an entropic direction. The Centennial of the First Republic left it unarguably clear that the national soul continues to hang onto the fragile thread of nostalgia in the midst of an endemic climate of drift permeating every sphere of collective life.⁵

This “climate of drift” is our subject and we have termed it “dissociation.”

The Philippines, though Asian in geography, and the Filipinos, though Malay and Chinese by blood, nevertheless have a mediate history of 400 years of virtually uninterrupted rule by two Western powers: Spain and the United States. The Republic of the Philippines is 53 years old – a toddler by historical standards. Since human identity is configured primarily, not by race and geography, but by historical and social experience (Silo, *Contribuciones al pensamiento*, 89), to be dissociated from one’s history is to be dissociated from one’s identity. Identity formation is a slow and cumulative process and does not admit violent ruptures and psychic gaps without compromise to its integrity and cohesion. Thus we believe that the historical and psychosomatic dissociation from the Hispanic-Filipino past that was brought about by American colonization is the most important issue that Filipino historiography must examine today.

Nature and Manifestations of Hispanic-Filipino Dissociation

The nature of the dissociation is simple: the Filipinos of today did not experience the culture of Hispanic Philippines, Spanish has been lost in the Philippines as a living language, and there is a strong cultural and historiographical bias against the Spanish period.

In the overleaf of Agoncillo and Alfonso’s *History of the Filipino People*, which was the high school history text in 1971, Agoncillo stated:

In Fernandez’s *A Brief History of the Philippines*, for instance, only a few chapters are given over to a discussion of the period from 1872 to 1896, which is the real

⁵ Lawyer, politician and writer José Diokno said at the PEN Conference, National Press Club, Manila on July 1983: “The late León María Guerrero, perhaps the best English translator of Rizal, has stressed Rizal’s ‘timelessness, or more precisely, (his) timeliness in another world and another age.’ Guerrero is right. For there is scarcely a page of Rizal’s writings that holds no lesson for us today. Almost a hundred years after he described the ills and vices of our society, they remain to plague us.” In another talk at a KAAKBAY forum in Mandaluyong in 1984, he said: “I wonder how many of you have read Prof. Luisa Doronila’s report on the textbooks that are being used in our public schools and the effects they are having on our children. When the children were asked what they preferred to be – Filipinos, Americans, Japanese, etc. – the lowest rank was gotten by those who wanted to be Filipinos. What are we doing to our children? Our system must be the complete opposite. Our system must tell our children the truth. Our system must seek as much as it can to unleash their creativity” (*A Nation for our Children*, 89).

Filipino period. In other histories, the same pattern is followed, as though a deviation from the lines set by Retana were the most grievous of crimes.

We do not know what the lines set down by W.E. Retana consisted of, but Agoncillo here clearly equates Filipino history with only that history in which Filipinos figure as overt actors. However, a modicum of process vision and information can enable a student of our history to surmise that the Malolos Constitution of 1898 was not simply a copying of the constitutions of Guatemala, Costa Rica, Brazil, Mexico, France and Belgium, but had to do with the development of Hispanic-Filipino awareness of constitutional process. This awareness was no doubt linked to the triumph of the Spanish Revolution of 1820, which forced Fernando VII to recognize the Liberal Constitution of 1812 (Buldain Jaca, 8), thus extending to the colonies – including the Philippines – the right to representation in the Cortes during the ‘trienio liberal’ from 1820 to 1823. The experience of representation in the Cortes and other Spanish liberal reforms which reached the Islands left their mark on the Hispanic Filipino consciousness. In his *Aparato Bibliográfico*, W.E. Retana left several clues in the course of the conscientious documentary tracking he carried out through time. Researcher Alfredo Chicote cites one:

On page 487 of Volume II of the *Aparato*, Retana includes a printed pamphlet which was the speech given by José de Vergara, elected as a deputy to the Cortes in representation of Manila in 1813. In his speech Sr. Vergara says:

"Although the Sovereigns inherited the scepter from their elders, it is well known that the nation deposited the principle in their hands, proclaiming them absolute monarchs. The Realm was later made the patrimony of their successors, but they owed its origins to the free consent of their vassals..."

The most curious thing is that on the inside of the pamphlet's cover there is a curious engraving in the old Filipino alphabet with the handwritten initials "R.A.". Surely it was owned by José A. Ramos, a well known Filipino engraver who, according to Retana, "was a fervent Mason and a man of revolutionary ideas." Doubtless the latter was attracted by the ideas in the pamphlet, thus linking the political process that began with the Cortes of Cádiz to the Filipino revolutionary process of the end of the 19th century.

Other quotes from the pamphlet of the deputy José de Vergara:

"...and thus, [the exercise of] sovereignty being suspended, since it cannot be exercised by our legitimate monarch, this high privilege has returned to the nation, invested in several individuals who have been given the name of Deputies..."

"In short, today to say Deputies to the Parliament is the same as to say Monarchs."

In these succinct lines, a political theory may be summarized in the phrase "sovereignty emanates from the people;" a phrase that held a special attraction for the Filipino revolutionary José A. Ramos.

However, according to the partial vision which led our postwar historians to adopt a discriminatory attitude against their own history, since all events before the late 19th century were irrelevant, to give them importance was to demean ourselves, since our only role in them was – and this was axiomatic – that of degraded *chongos* and *indios*, the human cattle of the Spanish colony. A reductionism that failed to grasp the complex process that necessarily had to have unfolded long before the actual birth, growth and achievements of the Hispanic-Filipino nation that called itself ‘La República de Filipinas.’

Thus our history books have traditionally given students accounts of societal life in those days that are anecdotal, external descriptions, bewildering for students because they are meaningless insofar as aiding them to close the cultural gap between their present reality and the past, and only impress on them that times have changed and that past is gone completely and forever. The recent boom of books whose leitmotif is the search for personal identity mainly consists of family memoirs that create a salutary but ghostly impression of rootedness in the pre-North American world. English language and North American pseudoculture and values⁶ permeate Filipino society and nowhere is there any real information on or awareness of Spanish or Latin American history, culture and political evolution. Mexico is the only presence in our cultural awareness of Latin America, but it is limited to the galleon trade and anecdotes of native Filipino seamen who settled there in the 17th century, religious art, plant species, and Aztec words brought to the Philippines in the course of its administrative dependence on *Nueva España*. Nothing is presented on Mexican colonial and revolutionary history, which would be of much greater interest and relevance and would counteract the cultural stereotypes we have been taught about Latin America and her peoples, and which have nothing to do with the richness and beauty of that plurality of marvelous worlds.

In the more sophisticated eighties and nineties, literature on the Spanish period in the Philippines is written in two modes: highbrow or lowbrow. Highbrow is a dead serious, academic style delivered with a barrage of research findings which create an impression of solid scientific knowledge robed in *de rigueur* emotionlessness. The silent message is: “This is all frightfully boring and only for those who attain extraordinary heights of objective intelligence.” Lowbrow, on the other hand, is a subjective, whimsical perspective that is intentionally superficial because it is assumed that Filipinos don’t like to read “serious” things. Both are underpinned by the absence of deep understanding of the Hispanic mentality and emotional empathy with Hispanic experience. Empathy and understanding are replaced by curiosity and nostalgic fascination, which it is presumed can be satisfied by carefully researched information, photographs, remembrances and, when possible, the reconstruction of significant architectural spaces.

The vacuum of deep understanding – and of the empathy that only arises from comprehension – has led to a curious representation of the “Spanish era” as a temporo-

⁶ It is a fact that a recently implanted culture necessarily will lack the profound bases and the richest traditions that are already long rooted in the country of origin, aside from the inevitable reciprocal adulteration that results when a foreign culture comes into contact with an indigenous one. Furthermore, the reasons for North American colonization did not include the dissemination of their high culture but concentrated on the consolidation of economic and politico-military power. In Spain’s case, the cultural aspect received greater attention in the form of the transmission of religion and the aesthetic and moral codes attached to it.

spatial field that was solely inhabited and developed by Spaniards, who lived, thought and acted in total separation from the indigenous population and then left, practically taking everything with them and leaving no trace of their culture behind. In the latter half of the 19th century, the native Filipino image acquires visibility as a historical protagonist; however, such image is not correctly designated as *Hispanic-Filipino* and is *implicitly equated with the image of the modern Filipino*. We believe this is the result of the understandable feelings of identification of North Americanized Filipino historians and writers with the heroes of the Propaganda Movement and the Revolutionary and Republican period, whose most important figures they assumed were non-mestizos from the middle class and the commonfolk.⁷ It has however been overlooked that *those Filipinos* – absolutely all of them – were *Hispanic-Filipinos*. Even Andrés Bonifacio, though he initiated the schismatic crusade against everything Spanish, was a creature of that very milieu. All Filipinos born in our country during the 19th century were Hispanic-Filipinos. The Filipinos born during and after the American period, on the other hand, became North Americanized Filipinos, which is what we are today.

Thus, we are perforce historically and culturally separated from the original Filipinos – the first Filipinos to acquire national consciousness – and this fact has not been properly registered and acknowledged in our history texts. Instead there is a curious, unquestioned belief that nothing really changed for us between 1898 and 1946, except our government and our language. The American period was – as historian-writer Isagani Cruz describes it – a short though traumatic occupation (368). However, we propose that, though short, it nonetheless dealt the Philippines a much more traumatic blow than the previous 377 years of Spanish rule.

What did such traumatic blow consist of? 1) The destruction of the Hispanic-Filipino project of national liberation in 1896 and of republican creation in 1898; 2) the erasing of the Hispanic-Filipino memory; and 3) through the betrayal of self and nation by the generation that became the Americans' supporters and apprentices, and the inescapable conditioning of our literature and history by the power of the U.S., (4) the future generations became the inheritors of cultural alienation and a deformed historiography. All of which have had attendant grievous social, political and moral repercussions on the country's future development – in other words, on the Filipinos' present reality.

As Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn said in his Nobel Prize acceptance speech in 1970, “Woe to that nation whose literature is disturbed by the intervention of power. Because that is not just a violation against “freedom of the press”: it is the closing down of the heart of the nation, a slashing to pieces of its memory.”

⁷ We say “assumed” because in fact there were many mestizos among the Propagandists and the revolutionary leaders. Graciano López Jaena and the Lunas were mestizos, the group of Filipino students in Madrid were many of them mestizos and creoles. We have been too racially conscious and at the same time unable to distinguish between the secondary and the primary: *all* Filipinos in that era were Hispanics, just as the Latin Americans were, because they had been born and formed in a Hispanized cultural environment.

Mutual Forgetting and the Beginnings of Awareness

It is not only the Philippines where the past has been forgotten – Catalanian sociologist and historian Jordi Masachs i Castell writes about the forgetting of the Philippines by the Spanish. In both countries today there begins to arise either the intuition or the clear perception of a historical and cultural gap that asks to be bridged. Spanish Ambassador to the Philippines Delfín Colomé pointed out in a speech given in the Department of Foreign Affairs in Manila on March 10, 1998 that the commonplace of religion constituting the entirety of Spain's legacy to the Philippines is a misrepresentation that glosses over the other significant contributions of Ethics, Aesthetics and the Law (*Centennial Commemorative Lectures*, 131). And despite the innumerable books that have been written and published on the revolutionary period, former president of the University of the Philippines Onofre D. Corpuz, in a speech he gave before the U.P. Alumni Council in 1996, lamented the fact that up until the present, there is still no “standard account [or] full-length narrative of the Revolution... Without a full-length and adequate history of the Revolution...how can we know the spirit of 1896, so that we can honestly resolve to keep that spirit alive?” Mr. Corpuz then states his fundamental doubt: “Rather more troublesome, can we say that the Spirit of 1896 abides in us, so that we can pose as the guardians who will keep it alive?” He ended by calling on his audience “to begin by filling the gaps and erasing the cobwebs in our people's collective memory of that historic, dramatic, colorful, noble, complex but unerringly human, and therefore enduring, epic of the Filipino people” (Philippine Centennial Series, 1).

We believe Mr. Corpuz's question is of primary importance, but that the key to an affirmative answer lies, not in the writing of a standard, full-length narrative on the Revolution, but in the Filipinos' achievement of a deep grasp and emotional/bodily recovery of the fundamental psychosocial meanings that informed the Hispanic-Filipino world. The answer lies in cultural and historical anamnesis.

II. Misconceptions and Misrepresentations of the Hispanic-Filipino World

Mauricio Beuchot defines hermeneutics as the discipline of interpretation of texts through their contextualization, which makes it possible to identify and correct the errors of misconception and misrepresentation that are committed by an empirical reader “who in fact reads or interprets with errors of comprehension and mixing a good deal of his intentions with those of the author, and at times giving preference to his own.” Through the development of the habit or *virtus hermeneutica*, the one who interprets can avoid errors of comprehension and mixing or imposing their intentions over the *intentio auctoris*, the author's intention (4-5).

However, Beuchot further points out that “it is only possible to interpret the world in the light of being, just as being can only be known through the world” (11). If we are to correctly interpret the documentation of the Hispanic-Filipino period and access not only its superficial, explicit meanings but also (and more importantly) its implicit, hidden meanings, we must necessarily acquire profound knowledge of that world – to use Kant's terms – both noumenal and phenomenal (Flew, 251, 266). In other words, essential as well as experiential knowledge, over and above theoretical knowledge and information. Despite

the fact that the Hispanic-Filipino world has disappeared as objective reality, it is nevertheless possible to experience a reality that we believe holds many similarities to it: the Hispanic-American world.

We present two texts by postmodern Filipino authors, Isagani Cruz and Agustin Martin G. Rodriguez, as an exercise in the interpretation of the authors' communicational intentions and to identify what we consider are errors of cultural misconception in the first, and errors of temporal confusion and pragmatic interpretation (referred to Bonifacio's Revolutionary Manifesto) in the second.

Text No. 1: "The Philippines" by Isagani Cruz

Though the anthology that this essay is taken from is a "Traveller's Literary Companion" and not a history text, we consider Mr. Cruz's essay to be illustrative, from the hermeneutic point of view, of characteristic features of Filipino writing on the Spanish era, as follows:

1. Dissociation from the Hispanic-Filipino spirit and world outlook.
2. Absence of interiority in a seamlessly external narrative. In this particular case, the primary emotional tone is an ironic aloofness.
3. An attitude of explicit censure toward the Hispanic era and preferential emphasis on all things Asian, Tagalog and pre-Hispanic.
4. Non-recognition of significant cultural developments during the Spanish period.

In Mr. Cruz's essay, the author's pro-Asian stance and anti-Spanish bias are clearly communicated, especially in the contiguity of negative words to the terms 'Spanish', 'Spain', 'Western':

- "...the Philippine archipelago was the first Asian landfall on the Pacific for *seaborne imperialists from Spain* and from the USA in the 20th century" (359). The reference to the U.S. is anachronical in an introductory sentence on Magellan's discovery of the Archipelago in the 16th century. The author's intention may be to exercise fairness in distributing opprobrium.
- "At the same time, being far from Europe and North America, *the Philippines has not let 400 years of Western colonization alienate it completely from Asia. In blood and mind, Filipinos do not differ significantly from Malays and Chinese*" (Ibid.). The author implies that, rather than alienate herself from Asia, the Philippines has chosen to be alienated from those 400 years of Western colonization. The second sentence is a surely unintentional echo of the common Anglo-Saxon ethnic slur that Asians are "all alike" despite our individual histories and richly differentiated cultures. The author's intention is to emphasize that Filipinos are authentic, unadulterated Asians.
- "Before Portuguese explorer Ferdinand Magellan, sailing under the Spanish flag, *invaded the islands in 1521...*" (362). Mexican and Peruvian historians do not refer to the arrival of the conquistadors as an "invasion," although the conquests of Tenochtitlán and of the Inca Empire were more qualifiable as such. They refer to them, however, as the paradigmatic 'encounter' or clash between the medieval Spanish and the Indian civilizations, which we believe is more applicable to the Philippine discovery .

- “Practically all...pre-colonial writings disappeared for three reasons: ...the second was the *deliberate neglect of these materials by the Spanish authorities*, and the third was the *active campaign of the friars to destroy* these ‘works of the devil’ (375). The Spanish attitude was to be expected (it would have been strange had they sought to preserve them).
- “Literature did not suddenly change with the coming of *Spanish imperialists* to the islands” (376). This is likely true, but the author does not properly state the cultural origins and historical context of the *sarsuwela, korido, sinaculo, pasyon* and *komedyas*. He groups all works by native Filipinos during Spanish rule as “Spanish Colonial Literature” – which would have been literature written by Spaniards in the Philippines. This literature was however *Hispanic-Filipino* – a new, syncretic and valid cultural form. The author qualifies them as ‘borrowings’ from ‘European originals’ (377).
- “Interesting hybrid epics...have pre-colonial characters getting married in church after fighting pre-historic monsters; *sometimes, the monsters would be Spaniards* (376).
- “...indios who quickly identified the Jerusalem *villains with familiar Spanish friars* (377).
- “...the Muslims (*derogatorily called Moros in those days...*)” (365). Moros continued to be called such until the 1970s, and the term was not so much derogatory as the Christian Filipinos’ perception of Moslem Filipinos as the Other, which in cultural terms was certainly true. The Spaniards called them thus because they considered them their religious enemies. The Moros were not given a more flattering name any time afterwards. To be culturally, racially and religiously differentiating and intolerant was the mentality of that age; and in truth, we are still burdened with it.
- “...pure-blooded Spaniards who were born in the islands were *derogatorily called Filipinos*” (365). It was not derogatory, but rather a term that differentiated the Spanish born in the Peninsula from those born in the Philippines. The native Filipinos did not begin to be perceived by the Spanish or by themselves as subjects and valid interlocutors until they had acquired high Spanish culture in the 19th century. Latin American creoles were called *indianos*; however, the term was not derogatory. This is an example of a North Americanized Filipino’s perception of the Hispanic-Filipino world and an incorrect superimposition over that world of beliefs that have nothing to do with it, for lack of knowledge of its historical and cultural context.
- “By all accounts, sometimes even by the Spanish authorities themselves...*Spanish colonization was a disaster*” (366). This statement reflects the shallow historical consciousness that is traceable to the cultural conditioning received under U.S. rule. It would be enough to compare the generation of 1896 with the generations born during the 100 years that followed to realize that a contrary assessment would in fact be more feasible.

Text No. 2: “Revolution and the Restoration of a Moral Cosmos: The Thoughts of Bonifacio, Mabini, and Hermano Pule” by Agustin Martin G. Rodriguez

This is an essay on the restoration of the indigenous moral cosmos as the guiding image of the religious uprising of 1841 led by Hermano Pulé and of the 1896 Revolution, a thesis which Rodriguez recognizes as having been first developed by R. Ileto in *Pasyon and Revolution*. Rodriguez, trained in philosophy and an assistant professor of Ateneo

University, wishes to focus on revolutionary figures who were strong moral referents of their times, as well as to access a deeper level of meaning in their words that will inspire Filipinos and bring them spiritually closer to the most extraordinary moments of their history. He presents three figures: Hermano Pulé, Andrés Bonifacio and Apolinario Mabini. We will focus on Rodriguez's interpretation of "Ang Dapat Mabatid ng mga Tagalog," which is Bonifacio's eloquent manifesto of the moral basis for the act of separation by the children of Filipinas from *Madre España*.

The author's intention is stated as follows:

The task of this reflection is to understand the thought articulated concerning the Philippine revolution from the minds who tried to direct and rally it toward its end. Such a study will seek to understand how different men [Bonifacio and Mabini] understood the meaning of their movement (83).

The objective of the analysis of "Ang Dapat Mabatid..." is therefore to understand the deepest comprehensions that moved Bonifacio's decision to organize and lead the anti-Spanish insurrection.

Rodriguez interprets a Tagalog and not a Spanish text, and so we may presume that there will be no major difficulties as far as language is concerned. However, two important deficiencies soon become apparent, which can be synthesized in just one: a naive level of interpretation which takes the language of the subject text at face value and does not penetrate into subtler, more implicit levels of meaning, proper to its cultural and historical context. The interpretation offered thus consists mainly of the author's (Rodriguez's) subjective perceptions, which he seamlessly fuses with Bonifacio's discourse. In other words, Rodriguez does not interpret Bonifacio as much as he paraphrases him.

Rodriguez's over-identification with Bonifacio is manifested in a disconcerting mixture of verb tenses and personal pronouns. In a style of exposition marked by the continual mixing of present and past tense, the author speaks to the reader simultaneously in past and present without establishing any distinction between the two time categories, as though 1896 and 1996 were the same psychological moment for Bonifacio and the Filipino reader of today. He also refers to the Tagalogs of Bonifacio's day in one sentence, and in the very next one to modern Filipinos ("we"), which also suggests strongly that, to Rodriguez, the two are the same (italizations are ours):

"Ang Dapat Mabatid ng mga Tagalog" is a standard reading for students of Philippine history because here Bonifacio states, through fine prose writing his reading of the Spanish colonial rule and the necessary response to it...In this articulation, *we may be surprised to see not a political reading* of Philippine history which calls for political action. What we see here is a coherent vision of events which come from an ethico-religious world view. The Tagalog is called to revolt *not because history demands that national sovereignty is the most pressing need for economic and political growth*. Rather, *we are called to Revolt against Spanish rule* because Spanish governance has offended the moral order of the universe (88).

In the second sentence the author takes it as probable that the reader will be “surprised” that Bonifacio’s call to revolt was not enunciated in political terms. This seems indicative of a somewhat deficient general level of knowledge of revolutionary history, since the author writes during the Centennial (100 years later), the material analyzed is part of the education curriculum for history, yet he assumes that the motivations of the man who led the revolutionary movement will be a novelty for his readers.

The equating of the present-day Filipinos with the Hispanic-Filipinos of the Katipunan is clear in the phrase “...we are called to Revolt against Spanish rule...”, as though the Filipinos of today were still in the psychological situation of answering a call to enter into battle with the Spanish enemy. We see a probable correlation between the continuing negative attitude of most Filipinos to *an anachronistic image of Spain and the Spanish*, and the transmission of race and culture bias through history texts that have promoted an emotional identification in today’s Filipinos with the mythic protagonists of the moral emergencies of a totally different time and culture. Though positive, this emotional identification is romantic because it is not shored up by the sound analysis and comprehension of certain subtle features of that era’s cultural landscape. This lack of comprehension then leads to the misuse of that emotional identification with our Hispanic Filipino heroes to justify the posture of ethnic purism, on one hand, and on the other, of cultural prejudice against the Hispanic half of our hybrid duality, which is our complex human heritage.

The author had stated at the beginning of his essay that its aim was “to understand how different men understood the meaning of their movement.” However, in our opinion, Mr. Rodriguez has a more important, unspoken aim – to defend Bonifacio’s vision and continue his discourse of revolution as deliverance from the moral degradation of Spanish conquest – as if modern readers were still faced by the very same moral dilemma. In this sense, it seems to us that the author identifies with the text so completely that the fuzziness of the temporal categories does mean, in effect, that for him, the past continues to flow unchanged into the present. Further, he validates Bonifacio’s assessment that eliminating the Spanish presence in the Philippines was a moral imperative, without explicitly stating and explaining his validation – rather he simply echoes Bonifacio’s voice and fuses it with his own. Rodriguez thus declares that Bonifacio’s vision was true, was a correct and global perception of the state of things, and that “Ang Dapat Mabatid...” is a document that completely and perfectly enunciates the profound causes of the revolutionary movement.

In other words, the author fuses with the text he interprets and does not seem to see anything amiss in the symbiosis. Bonifacio becomes the vehicle of expression for the author’s subjectivity, and the author’s attitude transmits to us that Bonifacio’s reasoning is so self-evident it needs no further exegesis – the next step is simply to exhort the reader to assimilate the discourse and somehow translate it into action. We believe otherwise. Such an approach, instead of clarifying the past, creates confusion regarding it. In effect, an overly-identified, personalized and modernized approach actually renders the revolution incomprehensible for Filipinos today, and cannot mobilize the revolutionary spirit in the present era. This interpretation is a good example of how the past, when examined with an unskilled, naive eye, is bled of its power because, stripped of its true context, it is rendered

meaningless, like a slogan. Something more is required of the interpreter. We will elaborate further on this point in a moment.

For now, for the sake of hermeneutic exercise, let us follow the line of exhortation. Rodriguez's tone of impassioned incitement then raises the following question in us: if he does have the intention of moving the reader toward a certain way of feeling and course of action, who is the enemy that the reader must struggle against? It cannot be the Spaniards – this is an absurdity, since they are no longer in the Philippines. However, he does not state outright *who* is now altering the moral order in the nation – and yet the very strong implication is there:

In this document, Bonifacio praises the honor the Filipino has made manifest in battle. He speaks of the necessity of remaining virtuous in war. *Once we fight with honor we fight with virtue, holiness and reason on our side.* That assures victory. To remain virtuous in war and to remain in the realm of honor is imperative to Bonifacio. *He insists always that we never abandon the path of righteousness for that is our only assurance that we will arrive at our end.*

It is certainly possible that the impression that the author merges past and present is a false one, created by a constant shifting between the past and present verb tenses that may in fact be nothing more than stylistic idiosyncrasy. Yet it seems clear that Rodriguez does not speak as one who examines a text to aid in better understanding Bonifacio's world and communicational intentions. Rather he seems to speak as a moral voice echoing his ancestor's call to the nation to redeem the Motherland, so that it will resound from the past into the present.

Hidden Levels of Meaning in “Ang Dapat Mabatid ng mga Tagalog”

Rodriguez goes on to develop the central point in Bonifacio's manifesto: that the betrayal by the Spanish of a sacred covenant of brotherhood justified the Philippines' separation from Spain.

Rodriguez explains the nature of the betrayal:

We will understand this if we understand how Bonifacio shows that *Spain has violated the Tagalog's “kasaganaan at kaguinhawaan” and has become in effect “taksil.”* The document begins with an idyllic representation of the pre-colonial world....Tagalogs before the coming of Spain existed in a state of well being where they were at peace in their material and inner realities...But then the Spanish came to the mother land and were accepted because they promised a better life for the people. Here he expounds on the theme of the mythical “Pacto de Sangre” between Legaspi and Sikatuna, the Tagalog chieftain.

Bonifacio takes for a historical fact the entering of Legaspi and Sikatuna into a blood compact which seals an agreement of mutual benefit. The Tagalogs would help the Spanish with their needs while the Spanish were said to promise that the Tagalog would be led to a state of betterment and wisdom...(88-89).

The foregoing indicates that the interpreter likewise opts for a mythical rather than a historical focus on revolutionary history. This is neither wrong nor right – it is simply one approach, and we believe it is not the best one for a reader who needs to understand the past from other perspectives besides the literal one – from multiple levels of cognition that would engage the reader's intuitive as well as rational faculties. In other words, from a perspective that would not be simple fusion and identification with the object of study (a hundred-year-old text) but that would attempt to comprehend it from a time and a mentality that are radically different from those of its original creator, Bonifacio.

Rodriguez attempts to access a deeper symbolic level but does not have the hermeneutical tools to do so. We believe an indispensable element for understanding and adequately interpreting this text is knowledge of the archaic mind, for the mythic world of Bonifacio was, without any doubt, proper to that of traditional, religious man. His call to rebellion was the articulation of a logic of existential reality grounded in man's relationship to a sacralized universe (Eliade, *The Myth of the Eternal Return*, 28).

First of all, Bonifacio's manifesto is a mythical synthesis of the moral reasons for revolution. He appeals, not to the historical memory of the people, but to the inner myth that is burned into the very fiber of their being, imbedded in their collective ancient memory, perhaps already encoded in their DNA.

It may be observed that Bonifacio speaks as if the blood compact between Legazpi and Sikatuna happened recently. In effect, he compresses the events of over 300 years into a symbolic narrative that takes place in the eternal present – according to Eliade the temporal mode of sacred time – and tells of a mythic pledge that was followed by the betrayal by one party and the oppression of the other. He then declares the original bonds dissolved and that moral order must now be restored by definitively breaking away from the Spaniards. In other words, Bonifacio speaks as the mythic successor of Sikatuna, as *Gat Andrés*, and not as his ordinary historical self – the warehouse employee of a British shipping firm in 1896. His is the voice of the native ancestors and he now acts on behalf of the Filipino nation in order to formally break the bonds once forged in the mythic act that had established brotherhood with the foreigner.

Unless it is made explicit that in his manifesto Bonifacio adopted a symbolic inner emplacement as the voice of archaic man, and unless we present the hidden meaning of the blood compact between the Spaniard Legazpi and the native king Sikatuna as a ritual hierogamy, a symbolic sacred marriage between Heaven and Earth that gave birth to a new Cosmos, now destroyed (Ibid., 23), we do not enable the readers of this text to understand the true power of Bonifacio's call to insurrection, and why the native response to it could not but spread like wildfire. Bonifacio's archetypal connection to his people's psychic world allowed him to articulate and communicate to them in a few synthetic images the psychic reality which they lived in but could not verbalize and thus externalize in action. He verbalized it for them, enabled them to see their 'true' reality mirrored in his speech, and thus they were mobilized to act in order to recreate the Cosmos. From this perspective, the symbolism of the blood compact in the initiation ceremonies of the Katipunan can likewise be understood as the ritual founding of the new Cosmological

order, this time between *true brothers* – the sons of the true Mother – in symbolic return to *illud tempus*, the sacred time of their ancestors, before they renounced their freedom. In the light of the above explanation, based on Mircea Eliade's study of the function of myth in the archaic, religious world of traditional man, Rodriguez's words acquire new depth and become comprehensible:

...To fight for freedom itself was an act of restoration: a restoration of a moral order within the revolutionary fighter because the regaining of order and well-being in the mother land would be an effective reclaiming of the honor that was lost when the Tagalogs subjected themselves to a dishonorable slavery...(Rodriguez, 91).

However, the restoration lay, not in taking up arms and fighting, but in an inner experience of awakened consciousness that came previous to entering into battle. This experience is described by Iletto as the experience of "liwanag" in the katipunero's "loob", or inner illumination (*Pasyon*, 136), an awakening that returned the *katipuneros* to the world of their ancestors and that now gave them the power and invincibility of archetypal heroes. Thus, even before they fought, they had already won. This was because they were no longer trapped in a chaotic, diffuse and darkened world, but had broken through to Reality and effective Being – in other words, into the realm of Power.

The Broken Marriage

We would now like to touch briefly on the theme of betrayal, and how Spain became "*taksil*."

Our leaders were misled into thinking this by the Spaniards' deceptive speech...They were not only deceived with honeyed words but with the Spaniard's ultimate treachery, which was the entering into the blood compact which was an agreement of absolute faithfulness to the agreement....(Rodriguez, 88-89).

Rodriguez, still speaking in mythical mode (though only at the level of discourse and without access to deeper levels of cognition and exegesis), refers to "our leaders" being misled by Spanish treachery. The problem created here is once again that the interpreter's identification with Bonifacio's voice and a naive level of interpretation that inevitably leads to the *demonization of the Spanish*.

The conquerors came under false pretenses and entered a sacred pact in order to shamelessly exploit the people... (Rodriguez, 89).

We cannot understand the past if we do not study it with a view to comprehending the worlds of meaning proper to that time, and if we content ourselves with assigning blame and condemning those who we believe perfidiously wronged our ancestors. A perspective that offers greater breadth and height of vision is needed that can give us a broader and deeper mental space within which to manage such perceptions as historical betrayal and visceral reactions such as rage and resentment, because the elementary, Zoroastrian level of perception and relationship with the world leads to the closed circle of intellectual sterility and cultural chauvinism.

In *Dreams and the Growth of Personality*, Dr. E. Lawrence Rossi, researcher in the neurobiology of dreams and the role of dream processes in the growth of the personality, provides a fundamental key for the resolution of problems of comprehension which is, in fact, one of the tools of hermeneutics (emphasis is Dr. Rossi's):

The resolution of problems by developing different levels of discourse has become a fundamental principle in western thought also. Whitehead and Russell in their *Principia Mathematica* (1925), for example, found that the only way to resolve mathematical paradoxes was on another, higher plane of mathematics wherein the paradox on the lower level could be resolved...*One must learn to use a vantage point on one plane of awareness to resolve problems on another* (Rossi, 155).

It is our opinion that the primordial criterion for determining the most adequate interpretation of the past and of human reality in general, is to give priority to what creates new possibilities, what is open to the future and tends toward transforming negative burdens in the past. This is because unresolved past events create historical enchainment; a kind of freezing or immobilization of the collective psyche that prevents it from moving lightly toward the future. Instead, society becomes trapped in a conflictive image of the past which bleeds the collective psychic economy of precious energy that would otherwise flow toward new moments and constructive, creative endeavors.

It is here that the idea of a hermeneutic focus on history formulated by M. Eliade becomes relevant: "A historical event will justify its occurrence *when it is understood*. That could mean that things happen, that history exists, solely in order to force men to understand them" (Rocquet, 134).

Because he does not apply that hermeneutic attitude, we believe Rodriguez commits the error of oversimplifying the meaning of the mythic pact and the Spanish betrayal as stated by Bonifacio:

The Spaniards with their coming, destroyed the peace...of our motherland...No well being...could be ours while they ruled the Tagalogs. While the Spanish ruled, the Tagalogs could only expect greater treachery, insult, and slavery...Thus we were duty bound to drive them from our land (Rodriguez, 89).

In his manifesto, it seems clear to us that it was not Bonifacio's intention to carry out an objective, scientific description of the three-centuries-long process of colonization undergone by the Filipinos. His intention was instead to move his countrymen to revolt, and to achieve this he therefore spoke to them as the incarnation of their ancestors, returned to awaken and rally their descendants to the restoration of order where chaos now reigned. This meaning is the "poetic truth" (Rocquet, 130) of this beautiful text, which serves us as a bridge to the historical truth.

However, in addition to exegetic subtlety, knowledge is also necessary of the *global* historical context of the Conquest in order to carry out a culturally insightful interpretation.

It is highly improbable that we might ever ascertain beyond any doubt whether Legazpi acted with cynical disingenuousness in the blood compact with Sikatuna, nor is it, we believe, of any final transcendence, because what is immensely more useful for comprehending history than isolated events and individual motivations is accessing the vision of a major process in dynamic, evolving flux. Further, it seems to us absurd to ascribe deliberate treachery to Legazpi and, by association, to every Spaniard who trod on Philippine soil after he during the next 333 years. The Conquest was an enterprise in which all sorts of men took part, honorable and dishonorable, compassionate and inhuman. The foremost leaders of the Conquest represented the entire gamut of personalities, from the ambitious, astute seeker of fortune and fame, Hernán Cortez, to the self-disciplined and courageous visionary Ferdinand Magellan. Lacking this knowledge, it will be difficult to interpret a text such as this one with an adequate degree of subtlety and intelligence.

In synthesis, “Ang Dapat Mabatid...” is a literary, polysemous document and a mythical enunciation that must be adequately framed in both its historical and mythical contexts in order to make its meanings comprehensible and bring the reader closer to the truths it bears. The moral dimension that is expressed in it as allegory points to the historical reality of how the Spanish friars and colonial administrators, from being the spiritual and administrative guardians of the archipelago’s inhabitants in the initial moments of the colonial enterprise – when they were still what Toynbee termed a ‘creative minority’ – at some point in time became a merely dominant, parasitic one, that according to A. Chicote was “reluctant to accept any change which might affect such a comfortable existence.”

Nevertheless, *what cannot be denied, overlooked or left unstated* is the fact that the Tagalogs – meaning the natives of that island realm – *did willingly accept the entry into their world of the Spanish*, notwithstanding the subsequent periodic rebellions. There did take place a marriage of civilizations, of customs, of spirits – even of bodies and minds. The indigenous Filipinos did accept Catholicism and fused it with their own monotheistic worship of Bathala. There was indeed a new Cosmology born, the fruit of a paradigmatic marriage between two worlds – and that fruit was Hispanic Philippines.

In comparison to that marriage, which was finally and properly ended by the will of the Filipinos, the invasion and conquest by the United States was rape, and the reeducation of the Filipinos a form of massive cultural brainwashing, abetted by the non-nationalist Hispanic Filipinos’ betrayal of self and country.

III. After 1898: Confiscation of Hispanic-Filipino Interiority

The Hispanic-Filipino world as a psychosomatic reality and societal construct was progressively dismantled after 1898. A new culture was abruptly erected over the foundations of genocide⁸ followed by coercive reeducation and the deformation of Hispanic Filipino social life and history, in fulfillment of the new rulers' designs. Onofre D. Corpus describes the prohibitions under U.S. rule:

In 1901 the United States occupation government in Manila enacted the Sedition Act. This was at the height of the guerrilla war. The law made advocacy of Filipino independence by whatever means punishable by law. The display of our flag was a criminal offense. Patriotic associations were forbidden. Under the United States occupation regime no Filipino could vote, no Filipino could serve in public office, and no Filipino could do business with the regime without taking an oath of loyalty and allegiance to the United States. These rules barred all Filipino patriots from full civic participation or public service; they allowed only pro-American collaborators. These rules governed the consciences not only of one generation, but of those to follow – no Filipino could teach in the public schools without proof of having taken the loyalty oath to the occupying power.

There was intense resistance from the Hispanic Filipino nationalists. According to Agoncillo, the newspaper *El Renacimiento*, founded in 1901 “to express Filipino sentiments...became not only the bulwark of liberalism⁹ in Luzon, but also the seat of culture, for among its writers were those of *La Independencia* who never surrendered their ideals to the importunities and wiles of materialism.” They were Rafael Palma, Cecilio Apostol, Fernando María Guerrero, Jaime C. de Veyra and Teodoro Kalaw. Agoncillo quoted one of its editorials:

An era of turbulence has just extended its arid breath over the Philippines. The buildings still in ashes, the soil hot and filled with waste, and the tombs still fresh with human blood, indignantly cry against such mortality. Nothing has escaped! Sorrow and sacrifices have been offered on the altar of the great Ideal, the Ideal who has turned her back on men who would be disdainful and ungrateful (Agoncillo, 157).

El Renacimiento and its Tagalog counterpart, *Mulíng Pagsilang*, “launched a systematic crusade...against the use of the English language as the medium of instruction in the public schools.” Teodoro Kalaw is quoted by Agoncillo as reminiscing in his later years (italics are ours):

⁸ According to Filipino American historian V. Nebrida, Filipino losses, mostly noncombatants, numbered between 500,000 and 600,000 during the Fil-American War, while the North Americans had 4,200 to 4,300 casualties.

⁹ Again, an example of an anachronism, a concept employed out of temporal context. Liberalism was no longer relevant in the political situation of the Philippines in 1901, as a nation besieged and newly occupied by a foreign invader.

We fought against caciquism in the provinces, abuses by the constabulary, rampant banditry everywhere, exploitation by corrupt officials of the ignorance and illiteracy of the people, *the slow disappearance of the “Filipino soul” under the seductive wiles of Anglo-Saxonism, etc.... We were against the use of English, the language of the American conqueror, in the schools.* The articles on this subject that I dared not use as editorials, I put under a pen name (Ibid.).

Isagani Cruz wrote in 1994:

The American period started with playwrights being imprisoned for staging anti-imperialist (then called ‘seditionary’) plays in many theatres throughout the country. Particularly useful as a vehicle for political propaganda was the genre of *sarsuwela*....(Traveller’s Literary Companion, 378).

It calls our attention that I. Cruz refers to a traditional Hispanic theater form as “political propaganda,” which causes us to ask ourselves whether the North Americans staged *zarzuelas* early in their rule to win popular support for their colonial regime.

The prohibitions against the expression of patriotic sentiments, the repression of theater that manifested anti-U.S. feeling, the implementation of public education in the English language and the bringing to bear of “opportunities and wiles of materialism” in order to persuade the Filipinos to surrender their ideals are all indications of the U.S. efforts to undermine the Hispanic Filipino interiority. These efforts succeeded. The most ardent love for the Hispanic Filipino values, culture, aesthetics and sensibility could not compete with the utilization of the State apparatus for the systematic bombardment of the population with pro-U.S. messages through education, entertainment, technology, consumer goods.

A new generation of non-mestizos called the ‘pensionados’ was educated in the United States, to return as the new sociopolitical vanguard. By the 1920s a new generation of Filipino educators was teaching in English. Our history books said nothing about the Filipino-American War until the 1970s. National life from the early 1900s on – if we believe what the history texts say – consisted exclusively of the political and economic doings of the Filipinos who now ran the government, civil administration and business, under the supervision of the North Americans. In the early 1900s, Miguel de Unamuno commented in a letter to a friend that a Filipino correspondent had written him that the youth in the Philippines had no interest in culture – only in politics and economics.

In 1919, Maximo Kalaw, Secretary of the Philippine Independence Mission to the U.S., wrote to the New York Times:

In your issue of May 9 you printed a letter from Professor Bernard Moses, a member of the Philippine Commission from 1900 to 1902, which gives a rather erroneous impression of the composition of the Philippine Mission¹⁰...Professor Moses states

¹⁰ The referenced Philippine Commission was the Taft Commission, created by U.S. president McKinley in March 1900, headed by William Howard Taft and four other members, including Moses. The Taft Commission was invested with legislative powers and created a civil service, organized the bureaus of

that the Philippine Mission “appears to have been composed largely of ‘intellectuals,’ men who are not dependent for their incomes on the undisturbed movement of industry and commerce, men detached from the commercial and industrial affairs of the islands” (Sentenaryo/Centennial Page, J. Zwick, Syracuse University, 15).

Kalaw reassured the New York Times that the contrary was true and that the independence question had now begun an “economic” stage:

To emphasize the economic phase of the Philippine question and to show that the economic interests of the country are back of the independence movement, men who “are dependent for their incomes on the undisturbed movement of industry and commerce” and “who are attached to the commercial and industrial affairs” of the islands have been appointed on the mission (Ibid.).

He then listed the 26 members and characterized them as follows:

Of the 26 members there are four men officially representing agricultural interests...who own extensive plantations; two representing industrial interests....Two members of the Mission who hold governmental positions...are millionaires....Mr. Yangco, proprietor of a dozen or more inter-island boats, and one of the wealthiest men in the islands. *Thus we see that industry and commerce have the largest representation on the mission, with a delegation of 16 members. No one conversant with Philippine conditions has ever denied the fact that these men justly represent the economic forces, and they are all for the immediate independence of the Philippines.* Of the members of the Philippine Mission connected to the Government, we know of no one who must necessarily depend on the Government payroll for a livelihood (Ibid., 16).

We are moved to comment that Mr. Kalaw spoke too soon – for the men of industry and business to receive a government salary besides (whether as government ministers, senators or congressmen) was still in the future. Kalaw continued, brimming with self-satisfaction:

...It may be of interest to Professor Moses to know *that at no period in the history of American occupation has the school system been given greater impetus than during the last six years in which the Filipinos have controlled the legislative policy of the islands* (Ibid., 16).

Kalaw’s next statement is the unequivocal pledge of allegiance of a faithful vassal, though in the context of that time it may have been dressed up as political astuteness:

education, finance, forestry, and appropriated public funds for improvement of road infrastructure and the port of Manila. Moses refers in his letter to the first Philippine Mission sent by Aguinaldo to Washington in 1900, with Felipe Agoncillo as president and Sixto López as secretary, and composed of patriots and intellectuals. See Appendix II for a letter written by Sixto López in response to a proposal to the Mission to provide college scholarships to outstanding Hispanic-Filipinos in U.S.

Professor Moses is unjust to the mission when he says that they view the stable Government in the islands as the exclusive result of the work of the Filipinos. In presenting the plea of Philippine Independence to the Government of the United States through Secretary of War Baker, the Chairman of the mission, Senate President Quezon, said:

“Mr. Secretary, will it be necessary to repeat what we have always been pleased to recognize that, with the helping hand of the United States, the Philippines saw prosperity and progress unprecedented? Through the joint labor of Americans and Filipinos the history of your occupation of the islands is replete with achievements great, and results splendid. You have truly treated us as no nation has ever before treated another under its sway” (Ibid., 16-17).

Thus the portrayal of a vigorous political struggle by “nationalist, pro-independence” politicians, landowners, businessmen and industrialists, in earnest negotiations with a United States unwilling to commit to a clear date of independence, continued for two more decades until 1938, when the Tydings-McDuffie Independence Law set independence for July 4, 1946 (Agoncillo, 192).

The demonization of Spain and deification of the Americans gained ground as the Hispanic-Filipino generations aged and died. The Japanese occupation ended with the destruction of Intramuros and the conversion of the image of the Americans as the Filipinos’ saviors from Japanese barbarity.

After independence from the U.S. in 1946, the new generations of Filipinos turned to political doctrines of social redemption and pan-Asian nationalism to ground themselves in authentic ideals and a modern Filipino identity that was now reinvented by an intelligentsia (having no emblematic elders to inspire them) according to an intellectual ideal of Filipino indigenism. There was no other possibility, given the loss of historical continuity and a society already obsessed with the figure of the U.S. and deeply fragmented in consciousness. The historical distortion had already taken firm hold that the *ilustrados* of the Spanish era were the mestizo elite, the enemies of the native ‘masses’ – Rizal and the revolutionary heroes had been reduced to lifeless icons without social or cultural context. The youth with revolutionary spirit turned to Marxism and Maoism, joining the tradition of rural dissidence which also separated their dangerous example from the tractable flocks of the urban citizenry. The Moslems for their part had never stopped defending their culture and sovereignty and simply carried on their struggle.

In synthesis, between the years 1901 (when the Revolutionary Government of General Emilio Aguinaldo surrendered to the U.S.) and 1919 (the date of the cited letter to the New York Times containing a declaration of loyalty to the U.S. in the name of the men of industry, commerce and government of the Philippines), the phenomenon of collective psychosocial betrayal of the Filipino nation was consummated and branded into the most profound stratum of the Filipino consciousness. The betrayal established what was in effect the consolidation of the moral and cosmological chaos that the Revolution had attempted to eradicate, and which, in a perverse pendulum effect, merely changed its outer guise and

reestablished itself, allowing social cancer (neocolonialism and social injustice) to push down its roots even deeper. With the change of cast – North American administrators replacing Spanish friars and officials – a more acute level of moral derangement was established, because this time, neocolonization incorporated three new elements: (1) the apprenticeship in a conditioned pseudodemocracy, (2) the dismantling of Hispanic Filipino culture and identity, and (3) the unwitting complicity of the future generations in historical betrayal and cultural deformation.

Hispanic-Filipino identity and memory, its moral and ethical foundations stripped of all manifest support and validation, first survived in the form of customs and modes of relationship among the more cultured and prosperous layers of society. However, as a psychosocial background (as values, aesthetics, as hard culture) it rapidly succumbed to oblivion. Before the reality of the prohibition against all authentic expression of love for country and the will to liberation, which could only be expressed within the Hispanic Filipino sensibility, this sensibility, prevented from developing and creating a world in its own image, folded into itself and went into deep hibernation for the next one hundred years.

On the other hand, the native Filipino or Tagalog component of that syncretic identity and reality construct could not be repressed and found the way to flourish, eclipsing with time its shadowy Hispanic half, which remained as a phantom limb after an amputation. The reality of the intimate relationship that was forged between Tagalog and Spanish was preserved in the huge number of Spanish words assimilated into the popular idiom. It was one way through which the Hispanic memory was saved from totally vanishing.

IV. On the Nature of the Betrayal

Something more must be said concerning the nature of the historical rupture and subsequent betrayal between 1898 and 1919. In any revolutionary upheaval, one group within the body social in conflict gains ascendancy and imposes ideals, beliefs, or a form of government over the other dynamic contenders for predominance, even if these constitute the majority. However, the process of the 1896 Revolution, followed by the founding of the First Republic, the outbreak of the Filipino-American War and finally the establishment of North American colonial rule was much more complex than a classic struggle for power among the creative minorities within a society that leads to revolution and is resolved internally without the intervention of a new external aggressor.

Since we are most familiar with Chilean history, we will use it as a basis for comparison. The Chilean war of independence against Spain was a 13-year process with a four-year interval of reconquest by the Spanish. The internal composition of the revolution was complex; Chilean historian Encina synthesized it by identifying three main protagonists, all of them creoles with a minority of Spaniards who cast their lot in with the Chileans: the royalists, the pro-independence men called patriots, and a third group which had shifting loyalties and diffuse convictions. The Indians were pro-Spain and fought with the Spaniards. The mestizos – the group which, in the case of the Philippines, was the native

commonfolk and urban workers – followed their employers' orders since they had no political awareness, or fought with the Spanish out of loyalty to the priests.

In the Chilean case, the struggle for power developed among the different groups of creoles, and between the creole patriot army and the Spanish forces. The patriots finally won, by joining forces with the Argentine Liberation Army, and established a republican process.

In the Philippine case, the creoles were such a small group that they did not assume any historical protagonism; the mestizos were more numerous but dispersed; the natives were the overwhelming majority and a small group of them were wealthy. The propagandists were a cultural and not a racial vanguard. They came from all socioeconomic backgrounds; many of them were middle-class natives like Rizal and Spanish mestizos like López Jaena and the Lunas, and there were still others like Paterno, a Chinese-Filipino mestizo from a well-off family of businessmen who had pretensions of entering into Spanish high society, and Trinidad Pardo de Tavera, from a wealthy creole family. However, the least represented in this political and social vanguard were the wealthy; the most represented was the middle class. In the Chilean case, almost all the creoles were from wealthy, landed families and all the revolutionary leaders belonged to the racial, cultural and economic elite. The Philippine revolutionary process was thus a fusion of ideals and visions between the middle and the lower classes and was popular in character, like the Mexican Revolution of 1810.

In Philippine revolutionary history, however, those elements with the clearest intellectual understanding of their historical role did not lead the revolutionary phase, because there were few of them and the majority did their work from exile in Japan, Hong Kong and Europe. Because of differences in understanding – definitely we can qualify them as cultural identity gaps – the ilustrado nationalists and the non-ilustrado popular elements did not unite and were unable to forge an effective alliance. Thus the non-nationalist ilustrados became the fatal catalysts of disunity and artificers of betrayal. Native regionalism took care of the rest.

The men who fought the Revolution and the Filipino–American War were the common people, and the native and mestizo middle class. Their enemies during the revolutionary war were the Spanish and their loyal native troops; and during the war against the U.S., the Americans and the natives who aided them as scouts or spies. But definitively, *many of the ilustrado Hispanic Filipinos who called themselves nationalists before the Filipino–American War*, took part in the Constitutional Assembly of Malolos, even held office in the First Republic — these men, together with the creoles, mestizos and natives who were pro-Spanish before and during the Revolution and who became pro-Americans — *defected to the American camp and became leading figures of the American-era social construct from 1901 onwards*.

The most important factor here, therefore, is not simply the fact that men who believed – or did not believe – in the project of an independent Hispanic Filipino nation ended up achieving predominance in the new historical era. The gravity of the situation lay in that

they gained preeminence because *they gave their allegiance to the country's invaders*, to preserve the economic privileges they enjoyed under Spanish rule, and/or in exchange for political fame and new economic opportunities.

Those who had been wealthy and comfortable under Spanish rule pragmatically switched allegiance to the new power, unconcerned by the implications of such action in the larger spheres of culture and ethics (both of which they perhaps considered equally unimportant under Spanish rule). Those who had pronounced themselves supporters of the First Republic and nationalists continued to call themselves such even as they formed a Federalista Party and lobbied for the Philippines to be declared a State of North America (Agoncillo, 160). Paterno, who consorted with Rizal, del Pilar, López Jaena and others of the emblematic group of propagandists in Madrid, became the mediator, first between the Spanish and Aguinaldo, then between the Americans and Aguinaldo, both times managing to appease the Filipinos while currying favor with the foreign power. Paterno later submitted a formal petition to the Spanish monarch to be awarded a dukedom as compensation for negotiating the Pact of Biak-na-Bato (Ortiz Armengol, 98), though he was not granted one. Manuel L. Quezon portrayed himself as a patriot politician but this was in fact a contradiction in terms under U.S. colonial rule.

Agoncillo recorded the deformation of historiography under the U.S.:

The writing of Philippine history, undertaken by the Americans, was done through American eyes and the Filipino heroes who fought the Americans were transformed into bandits.... "Thus," said the Filipino social critic Renato Constantino, "the Filipino past which had already been quite obliterated by three centuries of Spanish tyranny did not enjoy a revival under American colonialism. On the contrary, the history of our ancestors was taken up as if they were strange and foreign peoples who settled in these shores, with whom we had the most tenuous of ties. We read about them as if we were tourists in a foreign land (220)."

What is most striking for us is that Filipino intellectuals should have expected anything else from American rule.

The *pensionados* who attended university in the United States on U.S. government scholarships, between 1903 and 1914 (Agoncillo, 205) returned to the Philippines to serve as civil servants and become successful businessmen and professionals. Several developed into important cultural figures, such as the writer and educator Bienvenido Santos. These Filipinos, the majority of them sincere lovers of their native culture and land, once they acquired an Anglo-Saxon cultural formation felt themselves turn into strange, unmoored creatures – white Americans in thought, speech and dress; small brown men when they looked in the mirror. Completely belonging neither to the Philippines, nor to America.

The betrayal that materialized was therefore across the board, of multiple kinds and in varying degrees, though we speculate that it was finally traceable to the deeply-rooted Filipino behavioral pattern, entrenched throughout long centuries of subjugation, of adapting and bending to power in the interest of survival. However, the behavioral strategy

of accepting adverse conditions and turning them to partial, private benefit at universal, societal cost, does serious harm to the body social in more complex moments of historical process and higher levels of social development. Thus we posit that the most important consequence of the historical rupture for Filipino society is the phenomenon of “cosmological chaos” that is empirically manifest today in the Philippines.

From 1901 to 1919 the Filipino nation began a new historical process from a condition of collective self-betrayal and loss of memory. Both were inevitable and intertwined. The silenced generations slowly disappeared, taking their memories to the grave (many of the revolutionaries did not pass on their memories because they were too painful), and were replaced in society by new generations who assumed that the Philippines under the United States was what she had always been, that “Filipinas” was only the Spanish version of her Tagalog name. The youth who understood from their history teachers that the First Republic had been destroyed and their forebears stripped of the freedom they fought and died for, rebelled against the monopolization of national life and consciousness by the United States. They then looked to *pre-Hispanic Philippines* for the likeness of their authentic selves. Spain was seen as *the destroyer of that authentic self* when her sons arrived in 1521. Bonifacio fought to remove Spain from the Philippines and restore the land to *in illo tempore*, its pre-Hispanic golden age. Therefore, Bonifacio’s work had to proceed and all traces of Spain rightly rejected and erased, beginning with Spanish. Rizal, always beloved, was also always an enigma and at times cavalierly misinterpreted. Nevertheless, though progressively mythicized, Rizal endured.

This psychosomatic drama and tragedy was suffered in silence by the collective Filipino consciousness. The processes of collective consciousness are of long duration, like the forces that heave and hiss for eons deep within the earth’s core before great volcanoes begin to erupt or powerful earthquakes change the configuration of the earth’s face. As the entire country looked on in soundless stupor and grief, the privileged minority, during long centuries allied to those who became perceived as the “oppressors,” found new shelter under the wings of the American imperial eagle. They would continue to fatten for another hundred years on the toil of those for whose freedom their fathers had fought and died, but who were now once again the dispossessed.

The new rulers of the Philippines prepared their fast-learning apprentices to later rule in their best interests and make actual physical presence unnecessary.

The mirror of Latin America was invisible for the Filipinos, hidden from view by the massif that was North America.

V. Cosmological Chaos: The Legacy of Historic and Cultural Rupture

Czech playwright and philosopher Václav Havel, in a letter to the General Secretary of the Communist Party Gustáv Husák in 1965, defined culture in the following terms, in criticism of the “warrant against culture” that Husák’s government had issued:

The main route by which society is inwardly enlarged, enriched and cultivated is that of coming to know itself in ever greater depth, range and subtlety.

The main instrument of *society's self-knowledge* is its *culture*: culture as a specific field of human activity, influencing the general state of mind – albeit often very indirectly – and at the same time continually subject to its influence.

...It is culture that enables a society to enlarge its liberty and to discover truth – so what appeal can it have for the authorities who are basically concerned with suppressing such values? There is only one kind of truth they recognize: the kind they need at the given moment. And only one kind of liberty: to proclaim that 'truth'.

A world where 'truth' flourishes not in a dialectic climate of genuine knowledge, but in a climate of power motives, is a world of mental sterility, petrified dogmas, rigid and unchangeable creeds leading inevitably to creedless despotism (*Living in Truth*, 16).

Havel ended his letter-reflection with these words, which we consider applicable to the process of cultural deterioration in the Philippines which began upon the confiscation of Hispanic-Filipino interiority:

Who dares measure the consequences of the violent interruption of the long processes of self-knowledge in ontology, ethics and historiography, dependent as they are on access to the normal circulation of information, ideas, discoveries and values, the public crystallization of attitudes?

The overall question, then, is this: what profound intellectual and moral impotence will the nation suffer tomorrow, following the castration of its culture today?

I fear that the baneful effects on society will outlast by many years the particular political interests that gave rise to them. So much more guilty then, in the eyes of history, are those who have sacrificed the country's spiritual future for the sake of their power interests today (Ibid., 20-23).

Because culture is the expression of a human society's spirit, intelligence and future self-projection, to close down a nation's inner life through the prohibition of authentic cultural expression and to coercively impose alien cultural contents over a nation must inevitably harm its inner life and outer development.

Giacomo Corna-Pellegrini, professor of social ecology at the University of Milan, after a six-month tour throughout the islands, summarized the situation of the Philippines in the image of a deep contradiction: modernity for the few who have access to economic progress, "sometimes unrestrained wealth," and the social marginalization of the many. He pointed out in a paper presented in Reggio Calabria in November, 1998 that the concentration of agricultural property created the flight of the landless to the cities where they form – to use Toynbee's term – "parasitic urban proletariats," creating in turn serious social problems. Corna-Pellegrini observed that the middle class, "the principal protagonist

of modernization and development,” did not have favorable conditions for expansion. The constant presence of the army and the influence of the Catholic Church whose “teaching invites the dependent social classes to moderate their claims, while it opposes any family planning policy” were further obstacles to the progress of a population with a high level of literacy and a country possessed of extraordinary natural beauty (1-4).

It is our conclusion that the historical rupture which prevented the foundation of a true Filipino process of national construction, and instead merely perpetrated the ontological condition of economic exploitation, social injustice, and cultural underdevelopment, must be addressed and its collateral negative effects for postmodern Filipino society confronted and resolved, by that very society.

The condition of cosmological chaos that reigns today in the Philippines is principally the outer projection of the inner chaos in its citizens and their vital situation of dissociation from themselves and each other. At the root of both external and internal chaos is the past violent destruction of worlds that have not been able to come back together in a meaningful construct, able to house the social body and mind in a well-integrated, functional unity.

Instead there are fragments hurtling along side by side without touching each other, in a climate of social denial that creates a virtual condition of schizophrenia in national life. In the absence of intentional movement toward integration, the entropic tendency is increasingly reinforced. Left unchecked, it may irreversibly damage the Filipino nation’s psychic and societal cohesion in the near future.

In synthesis, a historico-cultural rupture began in 1901 that had a grave impact on the just-arisen psychic image of the Filipino nation. If the Filipinos of today wish to be truly authentic, we believe it is imperative that the study be undertaken of the profound nature of the confiscation suffered by the revolutionary generation who took up the banner of liberation, carried it to victory, then succumbed to a second vassalage that erased their descendants’ historical and cultural memory.

However, the Filipinos today are not in a situation to issue judgments regarding a reality and a time they did not live through and have not studied in depth. They do have a documentary legacy that holds the keys to the recovery of memory. They also have a larger family who can aid them in assimilating what documents and study alone cannot provide – the living experience of the Hispanic culture and spirit. The forging of cultural and human bonds with the Hispanic peoples will be indispensable for the Filipinos to recover the intimate connection with their Hispanic Filipino selves, and in this way recognize the healing and enduring presence of that past in their land. This, in order for them to finally bring to fruition the dream that that era left as its legacy to the future generations: the building of a nation authentically Filipino and for all Filipinos.

VI. Conclusion

We cite Mario Rodríguez Cobos, Argentine thinker who writes under the pseudonym Silo and who states in the essay entitled “Historiological Discussions”:

Ortega [y Gasset] coined the term ‘Historiology’ around 1928, in his work *Hegel’s Philosophy of History and Historiology*. In a note in our essay we cite Ortega when he says: “The inconsistency that exists today in historiography and philology between the precision employed in obtaining or working with data, and the lack of precision -- even more, the intellectual poverty -- in the use of constructive ideas, is unacceptable. Against this state of affairs in the realm of history, Historiology arises. It is impelled by the conviction that history, as all the empirical sciences, must be above all a construction and not a ‘supplement’. With one hundredth part of the data long since available and perfected, a work of scientific stature could have been produced that would have been more authentic and substantial than what, in effect, is presented by the history books.”

To continue that debate initiated long ago, in our essay we speak of Historiology in the sense of interpretation and construction of a coherent theory in which historical data cannot be juxtaposed or worked with along the lines of simple “chronicling” of events, at the risk of emptying the historical facts of all significance (Silo, 141).

Silo goes on to enumerate four “deformations of historical optics” which arose from the time of Herodotus on, with the introduction of the historian’s inner landscape into historical description. These four instances of deformation are manifest in Filipino historiography in its traditional treatment of the Hispanic-Filipino past. In this paper an attempt has been made to expound on and give examples of the first, the third and the fourth. They are as follows:

In the first place, the intentional introduction of the historical time in which the historian lives in order to emphasize or minimize facts in accordance with his or her perspective. This defect is observed in the presentation of narrative and affects in equal measure the transmission of the myths, legends, religions or literature which serve as sources. The second error is the manipulation of sources which, given their inauthenticity, do not merit further comment. The third corresponds to simplification and stereotyping, which allows the highlighting or denigration of facts in accordance with a more-or-less accepted model. The savings of effort by the producers and readers of these kinds of works is such that works of scant scientific value often end up becoming widely disseminated. In such works, true information is substituted by “stories”, by “gossip” or second-hand information. And as for the fourth deformation we have noted down, it refers to the ‘censorship’ that, at times, not only takes place in the historian’s pen, but inside the reader’s head as well. This censorship impedes new points of view from being correctly disseminated because the historical moment itself, with its repertory of beliefs, forms a barrier of such dimensions that only time, or rather, dramatic events that give the lie to what is commonly accepted, make it possible to overcome it (Silo, 142).

It is our perception that, in the case of Filipino historiography, time has done its work and therefore today we are finally in a position to rethink our approach to the past, with a view to correcting the errors of interpretation and filling up the chasms created by amnesia and the shrinking of our cultural horizons. Said errors have not been the result of deliberate negligence but are the historico-cultural burden created by the unavoidable action of forces beyond our control. Nevertheless, notwithstanding the fact that we are where we are today due to the action of what could be described as fatal destiny, the future is indeed in our hands.

APPENDIX I

Cultural Identity as Product of the Accumulation of Sociohistorical Experience

In an unpublished manuscript entitled “Thru the Lens of Latin America: A Wide-Angle View of the Philippine Colonial Experience,” Elizabeth Medina has elaborated the proposal of incorporating, first, global and process vision, and second, the somatic-emotional dimension to the study and interpretation of Filipino history. The author developed this proposal based on the in-depth study and practical application of the Psychology of the Consciousness developed by Silo, and her experience of discovering personal and historical identity in Chile. In the referenced work, Ms. Medina traced a preliminary concept of the process of identity formation at the personal and social level, which she followed with a paper presented in Reggio Calabria in 1998 which examined the negative effects of two successive colonizations on the process of Filipino identity formation. This Appendix is a synthesis of her thinking on cultural identity as arising from accumulated sociohistorical experience.

Stated briefly, cultural identity is the counterpart, on the collective scale, of the individual “I”, which is the self-image configured through the accumulation of biographical experience and the formation of social roles or coded behavior, which allow the individual to move through life and develop at increasingly more complex and efficient levels of engagement with the world.

In the same way that the individual configures a self-image through the vital experience she accumulates, society also configures a collective “I” through the accumulation of historical and social experience. This process involves a simultaneous dynamic of interaction between the different groups which make up said society and its interaction with other societies (nations). It is through this interweaving and reciprocal influence within and without a society that its culture is born and develops, its particular “system of roles” or manner of being in the world, of seeing itself and representing itself before others.

Within this scheme for understanding human behavior at the individual as well as the social scale, the central role played by memory stands out, not just as the entity that registers and accumulates images and perceptions of the world, but, even more importantly, as a constant actualizer in the present moment of what has already been lived. The memory is a determining factor of enormous importance for the formation and consolidation of self-concept and of an original paradigm of behavior. Without the development of a conscious integration of memory which then makes it possible to direct its actualized projection into the present, and thus imprint force and clarity to human expression in the world, no authentic, self-referenced materialization of identity, culture, originality or self-creation is possible.

It follows then that human and social biography (i.e., history) are none other than the materialization of the memory in a personal and social narrative. A memory that is *dynamic* and *active* -- not passive -- which continually actualizes the past in the present.

This is what differentiates humans from animals: as beings that are determined, more than by nature, by their own history.

Silo describes the importance of human biography for behavior in the following terms (Italics as in the original text):

...[In] any given behavior that is deployed in the world, two factors are present which exercise influence of similar intensity: the stimulus that is received at that moment, as well as everything that constitutes the structure's [i.e., the organism's] previous process.

Normally we tend to think in terms of a simple system of stimulus and response to the stimulus, when in reality, if we are to speak of a stimulus, everything that has happened before that moment is also a present stimulus. The memory is not, in this sense, a simple accumulation of past events. The memory, in this sense, is a system of stimuli that acts over the present from the past. Memory is something that has not simply accumulated in that structure, but it is alive, it is in force, and it acts with equal intensity as the present stimuli....

It seems important to take into consideration these aspects of biography, of history in that structure as being in active mode, in present mode, and not simply in an accumulative mode or one that is merely held in reserve and is solely appealed to when past events are remembered. Whether those events are remembered or not, they are the formative agents of that structure's behavior.

To speak of biography is to speak of personal history. But this personal history, as we understand it, is a history that is alive and acting over the present. *This personal history leads us to consider a second aspect, which presents itself as a code in front of given situations.*¹¹

These codes are the social roles already mentioned. Biography (acting memory) and the social roles configure the "I", or psychosomatic identity ('psyche' + 'soma' or, in simplified terms, 'consciousness + body'). The "I" allows us to carry on with life to satisfy our needs, overcome pain and attain pleasure. This basic identity is configured as a self-image which acts hiddenly, projected over what Silo describes as an *inner space of representation*,¹² which is the counterpart of the external space wherein the body displaces itself and finds itself inserted in a natural landscape on one hand, and a human or social landscape on the other. The contents of the internal space of representation are an inner or personal landscape, which is structured and coordinated by the individual's consciousness. The contents projected on the space are generically called 'images.' The image fulfills the function of transporting impulses, or energetic charges, from the organism's inner structure towards the outer world, as well as from the natural and social landscape towards the individual's inner world. Said images (which are not only visual but correspond to the

¹¹ Silo, "Book of School", Topic: Behavior. Unpublished talks given in Corfu, Greece, 1976, 44-45.

¹² Silo, *Contribuciones al pensamiento, Sicología de la imagen y Discusiones historiológicas*, Buenos Aires: Ed. Planeta, 1990, 39-47.

different senses, i.e., auditive, kinesthetic, tactile, etc.), mobilize the body as the prosthesis of human intention.

The motor driving this vital process of continual engagement with and expansion toward the world is the need to overcome pain and suffering and to reach pleasure and happiness.

In *Letters to My Friends*, Silo extrapolates the individual's situation to that of society:

The human condition is such that the immediate encounter with pain and the need to overcome it is unavoidable. Such condition, shared by so many other species, in the human species is accompanied by the additional need to foresee how pain can be overcome and pleasure attained in the future. The human's foresight rests on past experience and the intention of improving her present situation. Her work, which is accumulated in productions in the sphere of social coexistence, is passed on and transformed from generation to generation in the continual struggle to overcome the natural and social conditions that she lives in. Therefore, *Humanism defines the human being as a historical being with a mode of social action that is capable of transforming the world and his own nature. This point is of capital importance because, if we accept it, it will not be possible to later advocate for a natural law, or natural property, or natural institutions, or finally, to argue in favor of a type of human being in the future that is identical to the human of today, as if the human being were a finished being now and for always.* The ancient question of man's relationship to Nature acquires renewed importance. Upon reconsidering it, we discover the great paradox of a human being that appears without fixedness, without a nature, at the same time as we note in him one constant: historicity. It is for this reason that, allowing for a certain elasticity of terms, it may be said that *man's nature is his history*, his social history. Therefore, each human that is born is not the first specimen genetically equipped to respond to their environment, but a historic being whose personal experience evolves within a social landscape, within a human landscape."¹³

In synthesis, cultural identity is synonymous to collective identity and is gradually configured through time and the development of collective historical consciousness. Needless to say, its formative process is a complex one and must go through crises and dialectical encounters within society, even as that society is subject to the influence of external factors, such as changing relationships with larger spheres, and, above all, by the very process of the civilization that a nation is part of and which necessarily conditions it.

¹³ Silo, *Cartas a mis amigos. Sobre la crisis social y personal en el momento actual*. Colección Nuevo Humanismo, Santiago de Chile: Virtual Ediciones, 1994, 15-16.

APPENDIX II

The Hispanic–Filipino World: Selected Texts

Following are excerpts from the writings of two Hispanic Filipinos and two Spaniards. They are presented for two reasons.

First, along the same line of suggesting the value of hermeneutics – the document or text as a door to a cultural world to be studied from the perspective of both linguistic structure and *mentalité* and not only as a source of raw information to be interpreted by a researcher who chiefly relies on their personal cultural landscape. A Spanish researcher working with documents whose cultural world is in fact part of their own historical and cultural narrative, and separated from them only by time, is a quite different equation compared to 20th century Filipinos working with the same texts, who are separated from them by a gulf that is not just one of language and time, but, more importantly, one of mentality and culture.

Second, to exemplify the rich interiority and culture of the Hispanic-Filipino world. In Philippine historical writing and dissemination of Spanish documentation, only a few voices have been presented, the best known such as Rizal and Mabini, creating the impression that there were no others as important or interesting as they. However there was an entire universe of artists, writers, lyricists, playwrights, poets, and philosophers in the Philippines, as well as on the Peninsula in the late 1800s – which were years of cultural ebullience and portentous change, especially marked by the rise of many associations of diverse kinds. The period’s literature and historical documents represent a scarcely-examined treasure trove, through which we may vicariously experience that hybrid cultural landscape which was unusual, and perhaps even unique, for its time, with its complex encounters between heterogeneous human realities, laden with paradox, poignancy, emotional depth – the interiority of the Hispanic-Filipino world.

1. Graciano López Jaena, Bulaqueño

In this article on the initiative of the women of Malolos to ask for a night school so that they could learn Spanish, López Jaena expresses the posture, we believe erroneously termed “assimilationist” by those who study Hispanic Filipino figures, by applying to them the perspective of much later times. We posit that in 1889, López Jaena’s loyalty to Spain, though it may discomfit us today, was in all likelihood the normal and accepted attitude among the Hispanic Filipino ilustrados. The image drawn by López Jaena of the *dalagas malolenses* is a delicate and rare cameo of the Hispanic-Filipino woman.

“Love for Spain, or, To The Young Women of Malolos”
From *La Solidaridad*, 1889.

Our congratulations to the young women of Malolos.

The latest mailboat from Manila, which arrived on the 7th of this month, brought us promising news; one of them deserving of special mention because it is one of the first and most important ones, which *La Opinión* refers to in its January 1st issue:

“According to reports we have received, it seems a school will soon open in Malolos for teaching Spanish, where classes will be given to ladies by a teacher who, at the suggestion of the provincial Governor, will be appointed by the appropriate entity.

This teaching center, long planned in these parts, will finally be approved by the Authorities upon the request of the young unmarried ladies of the town, who presented their petition to General Weyler during his recent visit [to the town of Malolos].

The ladies of Malolos deserve all sorts of praise and there is no doubt that their actions will soon be imitated by the other towns.”

This good news causes us joy. It shows that the Filipino people do not want to fall behind contemporary developments. When even women ask for teaching, light, instruction – *malum signum* [a bad sign]¹⁴ – it makes us see that, over there, everything waits to be done, [and] that neglect of the public good reigns over the Islands.

Regarding this issue of night schools for married and single ladies, favorably resolved today by Sr. Weyler, *La Publicidad*, in its issue of January 30, under a well-written article entitled “The Hispanic-Filipino Association,” had already reflected on and quite frankly raised the veil of mysterious difficulties that this thinking had encountered in official circles, since it said:

“The Manila press offers us some information on a recent case which, in our opinion, deserves some consideration.

“General Weyler, like all generals charged with the command of the Islands, published at Sr. Quiroga’s request, a decree recommending that the diffusion of the official language be promoted with the greatest interest. The ruling was highly praised by the press, [and] *La Opinión* encouraged the country’s patriotic impulse to contribute to the teaching of Spanish, suggesting practical ideas for carrying out such a noble objective.

“Later, the same newspaper reported that Señores Don Teodoro Sandico and Don Graciano Reyes, professors of first and second year high school with academic degrees, but who receive no salaries from the government, approached the Civil

¹⁴ A humorous comment, surely, by a man characterized by his friends as playful and mischievous.

Administration of Bulacán to formally remind the Government of its aims, and to this end they requested permission to open night schools – at no cost to public funds – for adults of both sexes, offering to hew to the following program:

1. Practical and intuitive teaching of Spanish
2. Basic Spanish Grammar
3. Principles of Arithmetic and Exercises
4. Penmanship
5. Basic Geography
6. Basic Spanish History
7. Gymnastics.

“The press and all lovers of progress applauded the patriotism of Sres. Reyes and Sandico. But today we have learned that permission was denied because it was considered that the school would cause harm to nothing less than Spain’s integrity.

“We have no comments.”

To these statements by the writer of *La Publicidad* – which we echo – we can add certain offensive insinuations contained in a report of the office of high government of the Islands: *That morality – it says – would not be the least to suffer if permission were granted.*¹⁵

Good causes find justice sooner or later. The good aims of the members of the fair sex of a town in Bulacán to gain learning and culture have triumphed over those Machiavellian intrigues – though rather more than Machiavellian, such maneuverings to block progress in that Spanish land of the Orient are contemptible.

One presentation – and a presentation by women – was enough to kick out the obstructionist plans to prevent the creation of that school from happening. This, because they are well aware that the ignorance of the fairer half of mankind is the greatest factor that favors the fanaticisms and misery of peoples, just as their culture and love for progress birth advancement and the elevation of nations.

And so, the supporters of the status quo in the Philippines resort to all the means within their reach to submerge the Filipina woman in the bottomless depths of darkened ignorance, exciting her Oriental fantasy with fairy tales and superstitions bordering on deception, that are only accepted by hypnotized or sleeping imaginations, or encouraging and training her heart in the habits of fear and groundless, incomprehensible apprehensions, in a servile consciousness.

But General Weyler, who never wavers from his party’s program, a great patriot and liberal, understanding woman’s influence over all of society and that democracies have not

¹⁵ Italics are López Jaena’s.

spread in these modern times in vain...resolved this noisy issue of night schools to the satisfaction of public opinion and of the lovely petitioners.

We are amazed and do not cease to praise, admire and applaud the noble courage, the beautiful attitude and steadfastness with which the charming Malolense ladies appeared before the highest authority of the Archipelago during his visit to that town, asking for justice to vindicate their honor and loyalty, which had been questioned by certain reports and criticized by more or less veiled commentaries.

Certainly, when the highest authority decreed the establishment of a night school in Malolos, in accordance with the ladies' request in their presentation, it has done nothing but fulfill a patriotic duty and translate into actions the law, the thinking of the central governments and the sacred mandate of our ancient kings of Aragon and Castile, *deliberately forgotten* by those whose duty it was to fulfill them: *to teach Spanish and attract to common life, to make into Spaniards, in a word, the indigenous peoples, the natives of the lands conquered by Spain...*

...[We] shall transcribe the statement that a commission made up of 20 ladies, with a serenity uncommon in young Filipinas, but with much respect and dignity, presented to General Weyler...during his official visit to the entire province....

Your Excellency, The Governor General of the Philippines: We, the undersigned young ladies and a few more, appear and state before you with the proper respect, that in our desire to learn the rich Spanish language, encouraged by and grateful for your generous spirit of spreading the language of Castile in this country, and being unable to learn it in the schools of Manila, some because of scant means, others because of difficult circumstances at home; and being unable to study it by day because we must attend to more urgent domestic tasks, we humbly request that you concede us a Night School in the home of an elderly female relative, where we shall go with our mothers to receive Spanish grammar lessons from a Latin teacher whom we shall remunerate; who in a short time has demonstrated his ability to teach Spanish because of the progress that his pupils have made, compared to the teachers from our town who, without any intention of criticizing their professional capacities, had been unable until now to achieve positive results.

We trust that we shall prove worthy of Your Excellency's well-known kindness. May God keep your valuable life safe for many years. Malolos, December 12, 1888.
 –*Alberta Ui Tangcoy.* –*Teresa Tantoco.* –*María Tantoco.* –*Merced Tiongson.*
 –*Agapita Tiongson.* –*Basilisa Tiongson.* –*Paz Tiongson.* –*Feliciana Tiongson.*
 –(Other signatures follow.)

We are exceedingly gladdened by this decisive action that the *dalagas* of Malolos have openly carried out in favor of modern instruction and enlightenment. We do not hesitate to assure that – given these good desires which motivate the fair sex of Malolos – Spain, our common mother, will see her great concern for improving the social and political conditions of those towns crowned with success....

Furthermore, we would like suggest this thought to the charming young women of Malolos: that tomorrow, when they become mothers, they do not forget that they owe their advancement to their country, and that their duty as Spanish women and mothers imposes on them the sacred obligation of instilling into the tender hearts of their children, undying love for Spain.

2. Sixto López, Batangueño

Sixto López's voice echoes Rizal's; they were friends. The following text was obtained from the Website 'Anti-Imperialism in the United States, 1898-1935' (See Sources).

Background: Sixto López was secretary of the Philippine Mission sent to the United States in 1898 to negotiate U.S. recognition of Philippine independence. When war broke out, this delegation left the country but López returned to the United States in 1900 as the guest of Fiske Warren, an officer of the New England and Anti-Imperialist League, and he made extensive speaking tours and published numerous articles in the U.S. urging independence. His sister Clemencia traveled to Boston in 1902 to petition the government for the release from prison of three brothers in the Philippines who they believed had been arrested solely because of their relation to Sixto and another brother who had joined the Philippine army. ... Sixto López remained in exile for many years because he refused to take the pledge of allegiance to the United States that was required for entrance into the Philippines.

“Educating Filipinos”

December 20, 1900

M.R. Morden, M.D., Michigan:

Dear Sir: I have to thank you for your letter and for the kindly interest which you take in the welfare of the Filipinos. I have also to thank you for the good intention displayed in your activity and generosity in the matter of educating Filipinos in America, and for the [medical] attention which you express your willingness to give should any of them visit your city.

But I greatly fear that your proposal to provide, by public subscription, the means of educating certain Filipinos at Adrian College would not be acceptable to the Filipinos...

You ask: (1) “Do you think that we can easily procure the best representatives of your people for such purposes?” and (2) “Do you think that such a plan will do very much toward the solution of the difficulties which now confront us in supporting your President's policy?”

A negative reply to the first question will serve as an answer to the second. To be perfectly frank, I can assure you that the “best representatives” of our people will not come to America to be educated at the public expense. You must pardon me for saying that you yourself ought to see that such a plan would only attract the worst class of our people. I presume you would not think of making such an offer to the people of England or of

France. A moment's thought will therefore convince you that your proposal implies – I do not mean to suggest that you intended it so to imply – that the Filipinos are an inferior race, who have never known the blessings of education in their own country, and who consequently need, and would be prepared to accept, eleemosynary education from a people whose Administration is seeking to take from them their independence.

We Filipinos have our faults and our failings like the rest of mankind, but I trust we also have a sense of the fitness of things. There is a legitimate pride and a self-respect which are worth more than the education of a few Filipinos....

When the war is over; when our independence has been secured; when amicable relations have been renewed between your country and ours, the Filipinos will be glad to visit America and other countries in order to learn all that is good and to profit by the material civilizations of the West. Mere university education is obtainable in the Philippines, and the Filipinos are able and willing to pay for such education. They are prepared, as has been their practice in the past, to help those of their own people who are without means. But this should and will be done not by public or charitable subscription, but by the application of part of our revenues for that purpose. Education is not a matter of charity or bounty. It is a right and a public necessity, and as such it is a proper function of the government....

As to your second question, I can also assure you that the education of a few Filipinos at the expense of the American people, even if it were not otherwise objectionable, would in no way help to solve the difficulty. The present war has been the means of closing a great number of our elementary schools, as well as the Nautical College and the Medical College of San José in Manila. Until these schools and colleges are not reopened, it is idle to propose the education of a few Filipinos in America. If you really desire to benefit the Filipinos, – and I am convinced that you do, – work and pray that justice may be done and peace restored to the Philippines. Do not allow yourself to be tricked into the belief that a great wrong can be atoned for by the doing of a little good. Do you imagine that the Filipinos would be anxious about the education of a few of their number, while thousands of their best and bravest men are being shot, and while thousands of equally brave women are silently suffering the pangs of sorrow, starvation, and misery? Do you imagine for one solitary moment that any decent, self-respecting Filipino, whatever his political opinions may be, could under such circumstances accept a college education in America at the expense of the American people?

I strongly recommend you to abandon the proposal. Devote, if you will, such money as you have already collected to the purchase of sackcloth and ashes, and I will come and wear it with you in order to atone for the great wrong that is being done to the Filipinos. But do not add indignity to injury by holding out the hand of charity in America while our patriots are being slain in the Philippines.

...I have spoken with great freedom, but not in an unfriendly spirit. Indeed, I regard you as a friend, and we need friends in this our midnight Gethsemane, when drops of blood are upon the brow of our people....

Sincerely and faithfully yours,
Sixto López
Bingham House, Philadelphia, Pa.,
December 13, 1900.

3. W.E. Retana, Spaniard (Madrid)

On the Future of Spanish in the Philippines

From *Archivo del bibliófilo filipino*, Vol. V, pp. 498-506, 1905.

TO SR. LUCIANO DE LA ROSA: In Manila

Dear Sir, Colleague and Friend,

With great satisfaction I've read the interesting letter you kindly sent me through the columns of *El Renacimiento* (issue of April 1st). Between its lines I detect a certain thread of pessimism regarding the final success of the project to form the Association of Filipino Bibliophiles, and frankly, it doesn't surprise me. Pessimism, after all, is a characteristic of our times, and there is hardly a civilized country that doesn't feel or experience it to a greater or lesser degree. Rizal was a pessimist, though he was at the same time a tireless preacher against the causes and effects of that evil factor. I am also a pessimist, and yet I have a burning faith in the future of the Filipino people.

After a few years during which I had not laid eyes on that country's newspapers, I have received from time to time, issues of the ones now being published, and my faith grows. I am extraordinarily impressed (and I said so, just recently, to my old and dear friend Javier Gómez de la Serna) by the unarguable fact that the Filipinos today are writing better than ever – around a hundred times better – than before. And I marvel as well that, even as that [Spanish] press enjoys complete freedom (am I right? I really am uninformed as to the policy that is in force there at present), it comports itself with such laudable good sense, and presents its ideas in a tone of moderation and rationality that deserve every kind of praise.

Those of us Spaniards who know how to give praise where it is due must confess that, until the day of the Disaster, we had not fully come to know the spirit of the Filipino people. More than once (I can prove it), I strongly advocated a reasonable freedom of the Press in those islands, and I cannot easily forget that each time I broached the subject, whether in public or in private, I was stopped by those who, at the time, passed for the only teachers of Filipino Psychology, to tell me: "But Sir, have you meditated on this? What you say is nonsense! If the freedom you favor existed in the Archipelago, each newspaper would turn into a libel mill!"

We Spanish were unable to get to know the Filipinos better, simply because our relations with them were superficial; it wasn't as deep as it should and could have been, without either one or the other being more to blame for it, but fatality -- born from centuries-old practices that were originated by certain misapprehensions... For two races to

understand each other there is nothing as effective as language, and the fact is that after three and a half centuries of constant contact, we Spanish (with the exception of the friars) have remained ignorant of the Filipino languages, and the Filipinos (except for those who are more or less cultured), have remained ignorant of Castilian. We did not have a common language; we lacked that bond, the most powerful one for drawing souls together.

Look at that high-spirited youth who suddenly meets a woman who impresses him, fascinates him, ravishes him.... He wants to tell her, and he finally does. But she doesn't understand him, nor he, her. Looks aren't enough, gestures, action are not enough; mutual attraction at first sight isn't enough. If they can't understand each other, if they can't communicate with ease in the same language, those souls will not fuse in the end, because they lack the fire that can melt them. Physical love will do what it wants to. But spiritual love – what can it do, if the element of communication is missing?

The destinies of some nations are strange indeed! While we the Spaniards and those born in the colonies should have treated each other as brothers, we were almost always bickering. And now that politically we have nothing to do with each other, I don't know what perfume of romanticism springs from our hearts that tends to infuse us with reciprocal love. Today -- today is when the efficacy of language makes itself felt the most!

I've thought a great deal about the future of Spanish in the Philippines. "Will it be lost?" -- I've asked myself innumerable times. And I've always answered myself in the same way: *not completely, no*. At this time it is very significant that there are genuinely Filipino newspapers written in the language that certain Spanish elements resisted propagating for so long (I wonder if they finally regret it!). And not only this, but Spanish is cultivated with such stylistic exquisiteness, that in those newspapers one finds passages that, in literary terms, would do credit to many Spanish newspapers.

But there's more: the liking for History is increasingly becoming a national sentiment, and this alone is enough to guarantee the coexistence of Castilian with the indigenous languages. The principal sources of the History of the Philippine Islands are written in the Castilian language. It's true that they can be translated, that they are translating them deficiently into English. But the studious man, the true scholar, the conscientious analyst of the past – will he be able to content himself with poor translations? No. I believe, therefore, that even if, with time, all trace of the Spanish race disappears from there, the language will not disappear as long as there continue to be investigators of the past. Hundreds of books are written in Spanish which, taken as a whole, constitute the most important part of the synthesis of the Philippines' life for four centuries...

It was foreseeable that a boxing match would begin between Spanish and English. I believe that English should be spread and that for it to spread in the Philippines would be a favorable thing, because beyond its being the lingua franca of North America, it is a language in general use in certain Asian regions -- above all in Japan, a country which in future will exercise a legitimate and healthy influence over the Philippines. And therefore the Filipinos need two foreign languages, which brings to my mind a phrase of Simoun's, the mysterious and tragic protagonist of Rizal's *El Filibusterismo*: "Do you want to add another language to the forty-some others that are spoken in the islands, to understand

yourselves even less?" This is what the necessities of life require, which does not mean that (as some Filipino dreamers propose to do) the cultivation of one's own language should be abandoned. Rather than this, I believe -- together with Rizal -- that that cultivation should be accentuated and perfected, because just as Spanish could not be, nor would ever have become, the *popular* language of the Philippines, neither will English become such, because it cannot be...*nor should it be!*

"Instead of having provincial aspirations, have the aspirations of a nation," said the Great Tagalog. "Each country has its language, just as it has its own way of feeling;" "language is the thought of nations;" "as long as a nation preserves its language, it preserves the guarantee of its freedom." I take these quotes from *El Filibusterismo*, the most nationalistic work of Rizal and one of the most nationalist works ever produced by human genius.

As long as the Filipinos preserve their originality, they will preserve their national spirit. This is a kind of synthesis of what can be deduced from the mentioned book. And this is what he who exercised European thought, who spoke and wrote in several languages, who knew the most important civilizations of the world, said. But who, Filipino in everything and for everything, not for a single moment, under any influence, ceased to sigh for his country, to whom he offered the immolation of his life.

A long stay in Cataluña has made me meditate once again on what language can do to preserve a people's essential character. For several years now, the Catalonians have felt true reverence for their language and among themselves they speak no other, no matter how cultured they may be or how eminent they may be.

They have even gotten the Government to allow them to use Catalan in their telegrams. They've taken things so far that in the past, their great writers wrote in Spanish (Balmes, Bartrina, Balaguer, Pi y Margall, etc.); today, Guimerá, Rusiñol, Narciso Oller, etc., don't write a single letter unless it's in Catalan.

I've asked some of them:

"But can it be possible that you can't write in Spanish?"

"I don't know how to write in Spanish."

"And what about Balmes, and Balaguer, and Bartrina...?"

"You won't convince me. Literature should only be written in the language one was nursed with, for it to be written well..."

And I would insist:

"And Bartrina, and Balaguer...?"

"They weren't Catalonians!"

"What do you mean, they weren't Catalonians?!"

"Of course not -- they lacked national spirit!"

The Valencians, who have a dialect that is so similar to Catalan, don't cultivate it literarily, it can be said; they don't make of their own word what the Catalonians do with theirs. In Valencia there is no nationalism. In Cataluña, there is.

Rizal criticized the Filipinos who were almost proud of not having deep knowledge of their language. How right he was! If the Filipinos look at Cataluña and follow her example, they will boost their own originality more and more. Let the native languages be restored, then, converting the archaic forms into neologisms [new expressions]. Let the native language adapt all the words it needs to from the foreign languages. Perfect its literature. Write no works that are not in the country's language, no poetry, no novels. Don't speak to each other in any language other than that of the land, which you must polish day by day. And when this has become a *custom*, the originality that Rizal fought so much for will become even greater. I was very pleased to see in *El Renacimiento*, in the summary written by Sr. León María Guerrero of the homage to the illustrious patriot, that a distinguished young lady read a speech in Tagalog. Was that not an eminently national celebration? And what is more national than language? Its language is the soul of a Race, the people's spirit.

People may tell me I am throwing spadefuls of earth over Spanish and English. No. Let the people learn these two languages for whom they would be useful, but avoid at all costs that they become *nationalized*. Cultured Catalonians all know Spanish and French, and yet, in matters *that concern them* they prefer Catalan above any other language. We Castilians complain that we don't understand them. "Fine!" they say. "But we understand you. So learn Catalan!"

The triumph of the Philippines in the international concert of Mentality will arrive when we read in the title page of a book that has been printed in Paris or Washington or Madrid:

Translated from the Original Tagalog

Just as we read:

Translated from the Original Catalan.

The Association of Bibliophiles can do much to further these ideas. How? By restoring the jewels of national classical literature, disseminating them, bringing about an authentic philological [literary] revolution (because it isn't enough to do it merely in orthography [letters and spelling]), and encouraging the great prose writers and poets to produce works in their language that elevate the popular spirit. In literature, what is felt is always better than what is thought, and one feels more in one's own language than in any other, no matter how well one knows them.

The seed must be sown that will produce the benefit. It doesn't matter if one seed is lost, or many... Some will take root and those that do will contribute powerfully to the achievement of the good that is wished for. Don't forget the saintly words that Padre Florentino, the pious priest in *El Filibusterismo*, uttered in moments of solemnity: "Where

are the young who will devote their rosy hours, their dreams and energy to the Country's good? We are waiting for you! Come, for we await you!"

Yours most affectionately,

W.E. RETANA

4. Miguel de Unamuno, Basque

This essay is Unamuno's analysis of the national controversy that arose in Spain whose final result was the non-appointment of Archbishop Nozaleda to the Archbishopric of Valencia. The final paragraph is an excellent example of an Unamunan paradox.

"Religion and Country"

January 1904

In recent days – early January – almost all of Madrid's newspapers and many of the provincial ones have been passionately occupied with the designation of the ex-Archbishop of Manila, Fray Bernardino Nozaleda, O.P., to the Archbishopric of Valencia. They do not question Fr. Nozaleda's pastoral work while he was the Archbishop of Manila, but his conduct as an official of the Spanish State, accusing him – I don't know whether justifiably or not – of being a bad patriot and even of betraying the country. This has opened up once more the thorny issue of the influence that the Spanish friars, who established themselves as parish priests and in other positions in the Philippines, could have had over the native insurrection and the resulting loss of those colonies. And this brings along with it the question of the friars' patriotism and everything else connected to them.

I propose to present to the reader in these lines some considerations that are so simple, so commonplace, so self-evident and presented so many times before by other writers and experts in public law, that I really ought to save myself the work of doing it. But experience is teaching me that Spain is where things are forgotten precisely because they are common knowledge, where passions get most confused among those whose understanding by themselves are clearest, and where doctrines accepted anywhere else by people of good sense most frequently get labeled as extravagant ideas or contradictory opinions.

I don't know whether it is due to the eight centuries of battle that our grandfathers did with the Moors, who together with being non-Christians were enemies of the Spanish nationalities of those times. The thing is that here, more than in other nations, a certain fusion has been operating between patriotic and religious sentiment which is harmful to both, but probably more harmful to religious sentiment than to patriotism.

And now, of course, getting into the subject, upon a little reflection it is not very logical to ask the friars for patriotism, and even less of the kind asked of them. The religious orders were not founded to serve the political or national interests of this or that

nation, nor should it be the duty of the bishops to preserve or reject the sovereignty of one or another State over the souls under their charge.

For a religious order to have fulfilled its mission in the Philippines, it should have conducted itself in such a way that, even if the natives had grievances against Spain, the Government and the Spanish officials, they should never have had anything to complain about with regard to the religious. The latter should never have gone there to make Spaniards [out of the natives], but Catholic Christians, because such is their mission.

The friars who accepted – whether expressly or tacitly – the role of supporters of Spanish sovereignty in those islands, and of disseminators of Spanish loyalty, whether they did it well or badly, acted clumsily. But the greatest blunder of all was that of the Spanish State, who made use of the friars to strengthen its sovereignty and never gave any thought to sending missionaries of culture.

I say “missionaries of culture,” because Spain’s duty in the Philippines was to promote and propagate her culture, because it was only in exchange for this duty that there was any right to sovereignty. And the religious orders – whatever those who flatter and praise them may say without tact or sense -- are not, nor have any reason to be, organs of culture....

The Catholic Church was not founded to promote culture, nor do the religious orders born from her have the mission to make or undo countries, nor does the Church herself have anything to do with the disputes of monarchs and States. The alliance between the Altar and the Throne is, in the long run, fatal to both....

...Years ago, in my Basque country, on the occasion of a circular from Sr. Romero Robledo [Deputy of the Cortes], and more recently in Cataluña, in regard to a pastoral letter from Bishop Morgades, the issue was raised of whether Catechism had to be done in the official language of the nation, or of the region, and preaching in one or in the other. And later, for the same reasons as are now happening with the issue of the patriotism or anti-patriotism of the friars from the Philippines, things got out of hand and there was a big mess. Monsignor Morgades was in large part correct, and those in my country who were indignant that any attempt should be made to oblige the clergy to preach in Spanish.

The Church, they said —and they said it well— has nothing to do with arguments about the predominance of one or another language, nor with the State’s trying to impose its own and the regions’ resistance to it in order to preserve their languages or dialects. The Church should make itself understood and for this she should preach to each people in the way they will understand her best, and teach them Christian doctrine in the people’s own language. If the people change languages, then the Church will make provision for them to be taught in the new one, and will remain neutral before the linguistic battle. And what is certain is that in most parts of the Basque country —those I am familiar with— even the villagers who speak Spanish and can follow a conversation in this language (some better, others worse), when they go to listen to a sermon in it, they’re left in the dark. “Let them learn Spanish!” say the supporters of language unification, and the Church can

answer, "Teach them yourselves; in the meantime, I will have them preached to in the language they understand..."

...Certainly there is no reason why the Church should make efforts for Spanish to be spoken in all of Spain, although she has adopted an official language for her liturgy in the entire world. But it behooves the State to take measures for that one language to be adopted, and this in the interest of culture, whose imposition on nations is the first and primordial duty that the State has. But there are cases in which the clergy often sides with regionalism and with all kinds of movements that provoke disunity, which appears in contradiction with the strict meaning of the word "catholic," that is, universal. It is understandable, nevertheless, because with the separation of peoples from each other, upon dividing them and weakening or destroying great nationalities, hardly any international force stronger than the Church is left. The Church as an earthly power began to decline as soon as the formation process began of the great modern nations, a process which has produced, among other results, the union of the kingdom of Italy upon the fall of the Popes' temporal power. For those who dream of a new Gregory VII, or at least of the clergy's political supremacy, there is nothing better than to divide the people and oppose all intimate communication between them....

...And returning to the beginning, one can only wonder yet again that, on the occasion of matters such as this one of Fr. Nozaleda's designation, that the friars are labeled anti-patriots and blamed because they didn't work in the Philippines to consolidate Spanish pride. The more serious charge would be to throw it in their faces that, in order to maintain and consolidate Spanish influence and sovereignty, they compromised the interests entrusted to them by the Church and the welfare of souls. Of all the charges against them that I have read these past few days, that they ran away before danger or welcomed the conquerors are not the important ones, the religious being concerned. [What is serious is that] they whipped up public condemnation of the native revolutionaries and brought their influence to bear in the executions of some of them by firing squad. And [the charge is serious], not because the executions may have contributed to the outbreak of the insurrection, but because of the principle of the thing.

Let's suppose that in a colony like that one, the natives were conspiring and meeting in secret to shake off the Mother Country's dominion, and a religious, who was there to look after the healing of souls, discovered it and he was certain that if he denounced the leaders of the conspiracy, they would be executed. For all those people who are bent on merging religion and country, and who talk about the alliance between the altar and the throne and other such things, the priest's duty is clear: to denounce the conspirators. But for someone with a reasonably healthy Christian religious sentiment, it is even clearer that the priest shouldn't become an accuser but should let events follow their own course.

It will be said that all of this is based on an absurd and senseless presumption, which is that the religious are nothing more than religious, that a friar should only be a friar and not a Spaniard. But such are the consequences of establishing a group of persons whose profession is religious worship. Such are the consequences of making the priesthood a function reserved for certain men. Such are the consequences, above all, that derive from the meaning of the so-called religious orders. The man who, renouncing family, makes

vows of obedience, poverty and chastity, should also renounce his country. And perhaps it wouldn't be a bad idea for the men of State to study how friars and members of religious orders might be denationalized, stripping them, together with the privileges, of the rights of citizens of one or another nation, and subjecting them to the general laws of nations, considering them foreigners everywhere.

Although Christ's reign is not of this world, we Christians can believe that we must live in the here and now while we're alive.¹⁶ Despite religion's being one thing and country another and very different matter, we may also think that the imperatives of religion can be combined with the demands of country and, above all, the existence of culture (in the widest sense of the word). This implies, however, not making religion a thing apart and even less something whose ministry can be delegated to another person. Religion is the intimate life of the spirit which permeates all of life's activities and gives them meaning. It is something deeply personal that peers out through all our actions. It is a way of thinking and feeling imposed on us by an external authority. I say "external" because that supreme authority can be called God (I simplify in order to avoid lengthy and complicated explanations), even though those who deny the Its existence may give it another name. Paradoxically, however, that authority is not external. Not being so, such an authority chooses a determined number of men from all the rest to anoint them as ministers of religion and imposes an indelible character on them. These men must sacrifice patriotism for religion, especially so when the religion they profess is Catholic -- which implies not believing in the differences between peoples or nations.

¹⁶ What follows is a characteristic element in Unamuno's writings, the paradox. As we understand it, Unamuno proposes the contradiction created when religion – an intimate question of the individual's relationship with the Divinity – becomes a public issue because it begins to change the relations within society, upon some men being made different from the others because they are religious.

SOURCES

- Agoncillo, Teodoro A. *History of the Filipino People*. Agoncillo & Alfonso. Quezon City: Malaya Books, 1971, front cover overleaf.
- A *Short History of the Philippines*. Caloocan City: Philippine Graphic Arts, by arrangement with The New American Library Inc., New York, 1975, 160, 192, 105, 220.
- Berman, Morris. *Coming to Our Senses: Body and Spirit in the Hidden History of the West*. New York: Bantam Books, 1990, 44, 108-109, 121, 133.
- Beuchot Puente, Mauricio. “Perfiles esenciales de la hermenéutica: Hermenéutica analógica”, 2, 4-5, 11. In J.L. Gómez Martínez, ed., *Ensayo Hispánico*. At <http://www.jlgomez@ensayo.rom.uga.edu> (Julio 1999).
- Buldain Jaca, Blanca E. “*Causas del pronunciamiento de 1820 y de su éxito*”. (U.N.E.D.) Proyecto Clío, 8. At <http://clio.rediris.es/numero005.html>.
- Centennial Commemorative Lectures 1998*. Manila: Philippine Centennial Commission, Department of Foreign Affairs, DFA Ladies Foundation, 1998, 87-92, 129-130.
- Colomé, Delfín. “Embrace the Past, Envision the Future. 1898-1998-2098: The Challenge of a Centennial.” *Centennial Commemorative Lectures 1998* (127-140).
- Corna-Pellegrini, Giacomo. “Modern and Marginal Philippines in the 21st Century.” Milan University, 1998, 1-4.
- Corpuz, Onofre D. “Keeping the Spirit of 1896 Alive” in Hector Santos, ed., *Philippine Centennial Series*, 1-3, 9-10. At <http://www.bibingka.com/phg/misc/spirit96.htm.US, 10 October 1996>.
- de Veyra, Jaime C., ed. *Discursos y Artículos Varios por Graciano López Jaena*. Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1951, 241-245.
- Dingwall, Alastair, ed. *Traveller’s Literary Companion. South-east Asia*. UK: Utopia Press, 1994, 359-383.
- Diokno, Jose W. *A Nation for our Children*. Selected Writings of Jose W. Diokno. Priscila S. Manalang, ed. Quezon City: Claretian Publications, 1987, 89, 135.
- Eliade, Mircea. *The Myth of the Eternal Return Or, Cosmos and History*. Bollingen Series XLVI. Translated from the French by Willard R. Trask. Princeton: Princeton U P, 1991, 23-24, 29.
- *The Sacred and the Profane. The Nature of Religion*. Orlando, Harcourt Brace & Co., 1987, 24, 28, 96-98.
- Flew, Anthony. *A Dictionary of Philosophy*. 2nd ed. New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1984, 146, 251, 266.
- Havel, Václav. *Living in Truth*. Jan Vladislav, Ed. Faber and Faber Ltd: London, 1988, 16 y 23.
- Ileto, Reynaldo C. *Pasyon and Revolution. Popular Movements in the Philippines, 1840-1910*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila U P, 1997, 136.
- Kalaw, Maximo M. “What the Filipinos Ask.” *Sentenaryo/Centennial*. Page maintained by Jim Zwick, Syracuse University, fjzwick@ican.net. created 9/14/75; Updated 5/11/97.
- López, Sixto. “Educating Filipinos.” *City and State* 9 (Dec. 20, 1990), 1-3. At <http://www.rochester.ican.net/fjzwick/aitexts/s1001213.html> In Jim Zwick, ed., *Anti-Imperialism in the United States, 1898-1935* <http://www.rochester.ican.net/fjzwick/ai198-35.html> (August 1996)

- Mallery, John C., et al. "Hermeneutics: From Textual Explication to Computer Understanding?" *The Encyclopedia of Artificial Intelligence*, S.C. Shapiro, ed., John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1987. "Origins", 1; "The Methodological Hermeneutics of Schleiermacher and Dilthey", 1-2, "Hermeneutics and the Social Sciences", 1-2. At <http://www.ai.mit.edu>.
- Medina, E., "Sobre el asunto de la Identidad", *Revista Electrónica del Movimiento Humanista*, N° 5, junio de 1996, 76-79. In: *Mundo del Nuevo Humanismo*, <http://www.mdnh.org> (Select: "Revista E. del MH").
- Ortiz Armengol, Pedro. *Rizal: Dos diarios de juventud (1882-1884)*. Notas de A. Molina y O.A. Madrid: Ediciones Cultura Hispánica, 1960, 98.
- Retana, W.E. "Del Porvenir del castellano en Filipinas". *Archivo del Bibliófilo filipino*, Vol. V. Madrid: Librería General de Victoriano Suárez, 1905, 498-506
--- *Aparato bibliográfico de la historia general de Filipinas*, Tomo II, Imprenta de la sucesora de M. Minuesa de los Ríos, Madrid, 1906, pág. 487.
- Rocquet, Claude-Henri. *Mircea Eliade. Ordeal by Labyrinth. Conversations with Claude-Henri Rocquet*. Tr. Derek Coltman. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1984, 130-134.
- Rodriguez, Agustin Martin G. "Revolution and the Restoration of a Moral Ciosmos: The Thoughts of Bonifacio, Mabini, and Hermano Pule". *Centennial Commemorative Lectures 1998*, 87-92.
- Rossi, Ernest Lawrence. *Dreams & the Growth of Personality*. 2nd ed. New York: Brunner/Mazel, Publishers, 1985, 155.
- Silo. *Habla Silo. Recopilación de opiniones, comentarios y conferencias, 1969-1995*. Santiago: Virtual Ediciones, 1996, 141-142.
--- *Contribuciones al pensamiento. Sicología de la imagen y Discusiones historiográficas*. Buenos Aires: Ed. Planeta Argentina SAIC, 1990, 89.
- Toynbee, Arnold J. *A Study of History*. Abridgment of Volumes I-VI by D.C. Somervell. New York: Oxford U P, 1947, 3-5, 50-51.
- Unamuno, Miguel de. "Religión y Patria". *Viejos y jóvenes*. 6^a ed. Madrid: Espasa Calpe S.A., 1980, 95-107.