these forms and symbols with a revolutionary semantic content and affective power.  

The discovery of the Katipunan by the authorities on August 19, 1896, precipitated the start of the insurrection. Hostilities quickly spread such that, on August 30, the governor-general declared a state of war in eight Luzon provinces (Manila, Cavite, Laguna, Batangas, Bulacan, Pampanga, Nueva Ecija, and Tarlac). Rizal's execution on December 30, 1896, further inflamed the colony.

For Filipinos, revolution was not just a crash course in warfare, it was a school of learning. The forms of writing and composition corresponded to the exigencies of the time: proclamations, manifestoes, improvisatory theater, verses, and songs. The literature produced was not just war propaganda but texts that aimed to constitute a ration. The revolution (as in France) gave rise to the writing of moral "catechisms" and "decalogues" and the framing of constitutions that showed Filipinos quite skilled in the modern discourse on state and republicanism.

It was the country's most complex and politically turbulent period. The revolution stalled with the treaty of Biak-na-Bato in 1897, gathered new force in 1898 against the background of the Spanish-American War, widened into a war of resistance against the U.S. occupation in 1899–1901, and was suppressed in the years that followed. These events exacted their toll. Marcelo del Pilar and Graciela Lopez Jaena died stranded in Barcelona in 1896. Jose Rizal was executed in Bagumbayan in the same year, Andres Bonifacio and Antonio Luna were killed in 1897 and 1899, respectively, in fratricidal struggles within the revolution. More perished in the war. Others—like Pedro Paterno, T.H. Pardo de Tavera, and Isabela de los Reyes—survived and tried, with varying degrees of sense and success, to ride out and direct the changes. A generational change of leaders took place, a new colonial order was established, and the challenge of creating a nation remained.

WRITING ABOUT OURSELVES

WRITING IN 1889, Jose Rizal saw the spread of the Enlightenment within and without the colony as vital in the emancipation of the Filipino. Alluding to "Filipino writers, free thinkers, historiographers, chemists, physicians, artists, jurists, etc.," Rizal said: "This class whose number is increasing progressively is in constant communication with the rest of the islands, and if today it constitutes the brains of the country (cerebro del pais), within a few years it will constitute its entire nervous system and demonstrate its existence in all its acts."  

This was both a boast in the face of colonial power and a statement of Enlightenment faith. Rizal was a realist in whom hope and despair fiercely contended; he was acutely conscious of the dangerous powers of unreason. Yet, Rizal and his generation lived in a time when the colony, though fettered, seemed poised to break free.

WHEN RIZAL spoke of "the brains of the nation," men like Pedro Paterno, T.H. Pardo de Tavera, and Isabela de los Reyes had begun their careers as intellectuals. Established in Madrid, Paterno was entertaining the Spanish literati in his home and writing on the "ancient Tagalog civilization." Pardo
had returned to Paris after a two-year home visit that was intellectually productive even as it was politically distressing because of the civil turmoil in Manila. The young Isabela had just founded El Ilocano and was furiously writing and publishing. They represented many others in and outside the colony.

Who were the ilustrados (“enlightened”)? As educational and professional opportunities expanded in the nineteenth century, the word came into use to broadly refer to the educated and, loosely, the upper class due to the close association of education and wealth. “However,” Cesar Adib Majul writes, “in its more restricted and correct sense, the term ilustrado referred to a person who had a profession, spoke and wrote Castilian well, and had been educated in any of the colleges.” Michael Cullinan adds that ilustrados are a subset of the larger elite and not a separate or monolithic class: “Not all educated Filipinos were recognized as ilustrados and not all ilustrados were from wealthy families.” Differences within this formation are occasioned by such variables as location, scale and type of wealth, and ethnic, social, and familial networks, as illustrated in the examples of Paterno, Pardo, and de los Reyes. The association with wealth, however, is strong, particularly if one limits the category to those with higher education from the university or colegios and were fluent in Western intellectual culture.

There was one other important distinction. The idea of the ilustrado arose in the context of the rise in Spain of progressistas, the “progressives” who emerged during the revolutionary period of 1808–1814 and rose in influence during the “Glorious Revolution” of 1868. Hence, the association of ilustrado with progressive, reform-minded individuals. It is interesting to note that, Majul points out, “colloquially, the term as a collective did not denote any Spaniard, however cultured or educated he might have been.”

Even if broadly defined, ilustrados constituted a minuscule part of the population. William Howard Taft opined in 1902 on the matter of political competence: “Political conception must be generally confined to less than 10 per cent who speak Spanish, and the discussion of political parties must be limited to that 10 per cent.” The rest of the population, he said, was credulous, susceptible to any show of authority and force, and expressed “very little political sentiment of any kind.” Another American, David Barrows, broke down Filipino society into two “classes,”

the gente ilustrada (the “controlling dominant class”) and gente baja (“the subordinate class”), and concluded that the former, “though very small,” was “the only class we have to consider.” Such views are part of the familiar discourse of the colonialist defining and isolating a political “problem.” This was, however, a view of social formation shared by the Filipino elite. The directive role of the educated (Felipe Calderon’s “oligarchy of intelligence”) is a given in the discourse of Rizal and other propagandists. Such belief was part of the intellectual climate in Europe, expressed by thinkers like Edmund Burke, Alexis de Tocqueville, and Juan Donoso Cortes. It was part of a whole philosophy of organic social growth with its distrust of popular democracy, confidence in the elite’s stabilizing authority, and assumption that “liberty” and “equality” are not synonymous.

There is a racial complexion to the ilustrado formation because of the socioeconomic advantages of the Spanish creoles and Chinese mestizos who dominated the commercial and landowning class in the colony. They constituted a very small minority in the population. In a reported Philippine population of 5,151,423 in 1876, there were only 3,823 peninsular Spaniards (nearly half of whom were Philippine residents for five years or less), 9,910 creoles (españoles filipinos), 177,570 Spanish and Chinese mestizos, and 23,252 Chinese and other Asians. Close to five million were indios (Christian and non-Christian indigenos). Ninety-seven percent of the entire population could not speak Spanish.

Racial distinctions, however, can be overdrawn. Spanish creoles were such a minuscule part of the population that they could emerge as a significant political force only to the extent that they identified with Chinese mestizos and indios. Chinese mestizos blurred into the native population by depth of residence, kinship ties, and inculcation. Common causes were forged across social and racial lines. The secularization campaign, agrarian conflicts, and struggle over the civil bureaucracy were not separate but interconnected issues. The secular clergy, in which creoles and mestizos were prominent, typically came from the principales that had as well begun to assert their civil prerogatives and rights to land and property.

What of the indios? A derivative term Spaniards applied to indigenes in their American colonies, indios was the Spanish term for natives of the Philippines though it was later confined to Christianized natives since
Muslims were called *moros* and the pagan tribes *infielos*. *Indio* was not a term the inhabitants themselves used (though Rizal would, in a familiar reversal, turn it into a badge of honor by forming the group *Indio Bravo* in Paris in 1889). They continued to think of themselves in locality or ethnic-specific categories. The nineteenth century, however, brought about an unprecedented degree of integration in the archipelago as the countryside was carved out for cash-crop cultivation, provincial trading centers expanded, communications accelerated, and population grew and became more mobile. While many hinterland areas remained isolated and a large part of Mindanao was unincorporated into the Spanish colonial system, a significant population inhabited the proto-national space where they began to imagine themselves not only as *Tagalog*, *Bisaya*, or *Ilokano*, but *Filipinos*.

The opening up of a “national space” is indicated by the phenomenal increase in the number of towns in the nineteenth century, growth in interisland shipping, and the appearance of provincial newspapers and colleges. By 1895, for instance, there were at least 110 secondary schools outside Manila. Seven of these (in Cebu, Iloilo, Vigan, Dagupan, Bacolor, Naga, and Guinobatan) were “first-class secondary schools” that offered courses leading to a bachelor’s degree, mostly *colegio-seminarios* that developed out of the diocesan seminaries in the provinces. By 1896 provincial newspapers had appeared in Iloilo, Cebu, Vigan, and Nueva Caceres. All these indicated the presence of a communications network that encompassed large sections of the country. If it was not quite the virally functioning “nervous system” Rizal envisioned, it explains why the insurrection that began in the environs of Manila in 1896 would expand, in just a few years, into a national revolution.

*THE PRODUCTION* of modern knowledge in the Philippines was driven by shifting and overlapping motives. Early exploration and missionary narratives reported to Europe knowledge about a new land and glorified projects of discovery, conquest, and conversion. Mercantilist and administrative histories served aims of colonial consolidation through inventories of local wealth, descriptions of administrative structures, and recommendations on matters like trade and taxation. The Spanish vision of an “enlightened imperialism” inspired a “colonial Enlightenment” driven by ideas of political reformism, science promotion, and the paternalistic advocacy of native rights. These themes would persist but a pivotal shift occurred when Filipinos themselves began to write their own history and carve out their own specific version of “Enlightenment” and “modernity.”

The production of modern knowledge by Filipinos was determinative in the rise of Philippine nationalism. In the late nineteenth century, Filipinos, increasingly self-aware in their nationality, started to lay the local foundations of such disciplines as history, anthropology, linguistics, political science, and sociology. Filipinos were engaged in cultural self-definition in the context of anti-colonial nation-formation. There was excitement in the challenge of creating a “national” body of knowledge encompassing such fields as literature, history, language, and politics. Disciplines were cultivated not as specialised, abstract systems but as instruments and ways toward understanding and “organizing” society. Varied in their creative and critical practices, Filipino intellectuals engaged Western knowledge from their own specific site of work, worried about their relation to the country from, of, and for which they spoke, and traced the possibilities of an autonomous, critical voice in dialogue with the West.

The establishment of the Malolos Republic in 1898 provided nationalists with the stage to create an educational system that conformed to their aspirations for an education that was secular, scientific, patriotic, and democratic. The Malolos Constitution and various decrees provided for free and compulsory elementary education and a reformed higher education system. A state university, *Universidad Literaria de Filipinas*, was established on October 19, 1898, with programs in law, medicine, pharmacy, and notary public, and leading ilustrados (like Paterno and Pardo) in the faculty. Short-lived and ambulatory because of the war, the university awarded its first degrees on September 29, 1899, in Tarlac (given to students who began their studies at Santo Tomas). At the graduation ceremony, botanist Leon Ma. Guerrero, the university’s dean, delivered a stirring address in which he called on the graduates to “help create a free country.”

The soldier faces a shower of bullets and shot and repulse the enemy; the doctor and the pharmacist strengthen the body that it may better fight for life, and they cure the wounds of the wounded he-
The country's first autonomous educational system was distinctly ilustrado in orientation. This was not surprising since the first national congress was a veritable roster of the Filipino intellectual elite: 43 lawyers, 18 physicians, 5 pharmacists, 7 businessmen, 4 agriculturists, 3 educators, 3 soldiers, 2 engineers, 2 painters, and a priest. Its orientation to Western-style modernity is shown in the educational plan the congress drafted (which, it may be noted, reflected Rizal's own philosophical bias about what constituted modern education). It did not substantially expand education for women. The new system continued to give primacy to Spanish language and literature, retained Latin, and provided for the teaching of French and English (even German and Italian). Significant departures were the elimination of Religion from the curriculum and the emphasis placed on teaching the Philippines in subjects like geography and history (specifying, for instance, that the textbook in Philippine history must be prepared by a Filipino).

It must be noted that other ideas on educational reform were floated in this tumultuous period. Isabelo de los Reyes, writing from Spain in 1900, called for a system that builds on the privately initiated schools and sociopolitical clubs that mushroomed in the country in the wake of the revolution. Out of these academias, centros, circulos, clubs, ateneos, kasinos o katipunan, he proposed forming an "academy of the country," called Aurora Nueva ("New Dawn"), that will be guided by the principles of Honor, Science, Liberty and Progress. With his usual enthusiasm, Isabelo drew up the organizational structure, statutes, and plans of studies of a network of semi-autonomous groups and institutions (up to the university-level) that will be "adopted" or initiated by Aurora Nueva.

The central aim of this system (which, Isabelo claimed, continued Rizal's Liga Filipina) was to perfect the Filipino through an education that was "virtue, scientific, and free." Its program would stress individual and social rights, patriotism and civic spirit, free inquiry, and the spread of useful, modern knowledge. It would be non-sectarian and democratic in character, encompassing all social, ethnic, and racial groups. Isabelo

locked toward the assimilation of the best in Western culture (what he calls europeación) but combined this with the revival of what was positive in "ancient Filipino civilization." Suggesting by this combination the formation of a distinct kind of Filipino modernity, Isabelo, however, did not pursue the idea in a sustained way. Moreover, in 1900, the initiative had already moved away from men like Isabelo.

The building of a Filipino government was made in a time of war and ended with the U.S. annexation of the Philippines. The admirable effort at forming the political and intellectual apparatus of an independent state did not quash the discursive contradictions of "nationhood" at the time. This is shown in the changing complexion of the revolution as the center of gravity shifted from Tondo to Cavite to Malolos and the leadership passed from lower-class urban elements (represented by Benifacio) to provincial gentry (led by Emilio Aguinaldo) to a national bourgeoisie (represented by men like Pedro Paterno). Perhaps, given the historical conditions, it could not have been otherwise but the contradictions and discontinuities in the formation of the nation would remain in the decades that followed.

THE TURN of the century was a time of great intellectual excitement. Private schools, Masonic lodges, and other associations were venues for discussions and intellectual comradeship. In the early 1890s, young intellectuals like Clemente Zulueta, Epifanio de los Santos, Rafael Palma, and Jaime de Veyra gathered in private houses to talk about European and Latin American literature (from Spanish novelist Benito Perez Galdos to the Cuban poet Jose Marti), recite poetry, and discuss philosophy and the sciences. It was a time of great effervescence in Filipino-Spanish poetry as writers like Fernando Guerrero and Cecilio Apostol brought Filipino writing in Spanish—ironically, in Castilian's twilight in the country—to new heights of refinement.

The burst of civic enthusiasm that followed the collapse of Spanish rule is shown in the remarkable case of Lipa, Batangas. In January 1899, local principales launched a political club, Club Democratico Independista; a women's Red Cross auxiliary, Cruz Roja de Dama; a secondary school, Instituto Rizal; and a periodical called Columnas Volantes de la Federacion Malaya. Led by Gregorio Aguileria and Baldomero Roxas (who had studied in Europe and knew Rizal and the propagandists),
they turned Lipa into a cosmopolitan, republican haven. The club held political banquets and had its own library and fencing salon. *Instituto Rizal*, with a modified Ateneo Municipal curriculum, was authorized to grant degrees by the Malolos government. (Teodoro Kalaw was one of its students.) Patriotism ran high. Instead of religious images, *Instituto Rizal* was decorated with political posters that caricatured the Americans. Pledging support for the Malolos government, the school declared it will teach students “positive knowledge, with philosophical basis, of the latest achievements of modern science” and instill *nacionalismo* and desire in students to fight for *Patria Filipinas*. Columnas Volantes (a Spanish-Tagalog weekly that lasted from March 1899 to January 1900 when Lipa fell to the Americans) had its own press and was run on volunteer labor. Publishing national and provincial news, literary pieces, and editorial articles, the paper announced that it aimed “to contribute to the struggle for liberty and independence” and that it has called itself *Federacion Malay* because it is moved by “noble sentiments that cherish the beautiful idea of seeing Filipinas not only independent but progressing at the front and in union with all the peoples of Malaya.”

It was a time pregnant with possibilities. The intercolonial transition saw a flourishing of the press, the birth of the vernacular novel, and “the golden age” of vernacular letters. The anti-American resistance sparked a burst of creative energy, particularly in literature and music. The surge of creative work did not abate with the collapse of the Republic. Its most dramatic instance was the appearance of “seditious” plays between 1902 and 1906 not only in Manila and its environs but as far away as Laaog and Cebu. These vernacular plays stirred crowds and challenged censors with their use of allegory, symbolism, and stage improvisation in criticizing the U.S. occupation. The Americans cracked down by arresting playwrights, actors, stagehands, and, in one case, an entire audience.

After the Americans shifted from military to civil rule, and the more repressive measures of military occupation were repealed, there was greater latitude than in the Spanish era for open cultural work. Writers’ organizations mushroomed and literary publishing was more vigorous than at any other period. Theater companies, musical societies, and art associations were formed. Filipinos set up colleges, such as *Instituto de Mujeres* (1903), *Liceo de Manila* (1900), *Colegio Filipino* (1901), and
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*Centro Escolar de Señoritas* (1907, now *Centro Escolar University*). Labor organizations were founded. *Asociacion Feminista de Filipinas* was organized on July 23, 1905. Led by Concepcion Felix (who studied law at Escuela de Derecho under Felipe Calderon whom she later married; she also taught at *Instituto de Mujeres*), members included the Rizals (Trinidad, Narcisa, Saturnina, Josefa). Paternos (Agueda and Jacoba), and Concepcion Paro de Tavea.

No one illustrates the time’s intellectual excitement better than Felipe G. Calderon (1868–1908). Of a wealthy Manila family, Calderon earned a licentiate in Law at Santo Tomas in 1892 and traveled abroad to observe colonial administrations. He was not involved in the revolution but played a key role in framing the Malolos Constitution, drawing from his knowledge of European and Latin American constitutions. Like Pardo, his relative, he dissociated himself from the Aguinaldo government and participated in U.S. “pacification” efforts to reorganize local governments. His knowledge of Spanish and republican laws made him an invaluable consultant to the Americans.

Stirred by a passion for “building a new educational edifice upon the ruins of a lost cause,” Calderon was a most energetic advocate. In 1899, he organized *Colegio de Abogados de Manila*, a bar association, and in the same year established *Escuela de Derecho*, the first law school outside of Santo Tomas, which had its first classes in the offices or homes of the professors (among them, Rafael Palma and Juan Sumulong). Calderon managed the school and taught civil law, constitutional law, and comparative legislation. He introduced non-law subjects, like sociology, political economy, and statistics, and developed textbooks suited to the local situation, among them his *Lecciones de Derecho Civil Filipino* (1903). *Escuela* accepted women students and sent students to their towns to research local conditions. Asserting that juridical science should be humane and holistic in orientation, Calderon said: “I do not want to train mere defenders of law suits, I want to produce men.” “It is imperative to turn out not only lawyers, but men, citizens, true Filipinos.” Calderon left a deep imprint on his students. One of them, Teodoro Kalaw, wrote: “His lectures in class were like oracles.”

Calderon conducted classes in his house, opened his personal library to the public, organized lectures, and taught in several Manila schools. He wrote *El ABC del Ciudadano Filipino* (1903), a question-and-answer
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manual on the citizen's rights and duties that was translated into Philippine languages. He published an important memoir of the revolution, Mis Memorias Sobre la Revolucion (1907). A member of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, he was, according to Ignacio Villamor, "the first who seriously made sociological studies in the Philippines, maintaining scientific connections with the most reputed sociologists in Europe and America." In 1904, he initiated Samahan ng mga Mananagalog, the forerunner of the Institute of National Language, and acted as its first president. In 1905, he launched Asociacion Historica de Filipinas, the country's first historical association.

His intellectual zeal deeply impressed those who knew him. Guided by the belief that the American era was a field of opportunities to be exploited, he said: "We have need of two kinds of work—one of ejection and the other of acquisition. We must eject the old and acquire the new."

With our defective inheritance, and now with an equally unsatisfactory environment, we awake to discover that our greatest enemies are our own selves. Our work of acquisition must consist in the formation of that ideal which should make each one of us not merely a lawyer, or a doctor, or a Federal, or an Independista, or a Catholic, or an Aglipayano, but into a MAN, a true FILIPINO.

Calderon stressed the importance of practical, locally relevant knowledge: "The foundation of all the sciences is in the country. What we need are lessons on things. Our knowledge will then be neither bookish nor useless." In the lecture that opened the school year in Escuela de Derecho in 1903, he called for "the blending of systems of laws and legal institutions in the Philippines against the background of surviving customary laws and traditions." Endorsing the plan of a Manila college in 1905 to establish a "pedagogical academy," he called for "laboratories of ideas" that will carry out philosophical and sociological studies in a "historical, positivist, and experimental" mode. He warned against a dogmatic pedagogy that teaches students such irrelevancies as the number of times Vesuvius erupted instead of the configuration of Mayon and Taal volcanoes. The needed laboratory is one where the "real Filipino" investigates according to "truly scientific criteria" instead of the "garri-
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lity of the pedant." Education must be "realist and local" and not "generalized and theoretical," he said.

LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE were key sites in the creation of a national discourse. This was most visible in the creative field, particularly in poetry, drama, and the novel. The release of creativity in the early twentieth century was remarkable. A survey of printed literature in 1916 cites 3,290 books and pamphlets and 175 periodicals published in Philippine languages, the great bulk of them in Tagalog. More than a thousand novels in Philippine languages were published in book or serial form between 1900 and 1940. As that realm where the nation was most intimately and intensely imagined, literature had an importance greater than academic scholarship in the shaping of popular consciousness.

In Manila and the provinces, language societies appeared and issues of language were avidly debated in the press. In 1903, leading Tagalog writers, scholars, and journalists formed Kapulungan ng Wikang Tagalog, ostensibly to work for the creation of a national language through a fusion of the major local languages. In 1904, Felipe Calderon initiated Samahan ng mga Mananagalog, which aimed to "study, purify and enrich the Tagalog language." Many of those involved in these groups (like Lope Santos, Rosa Sevilla, Hermenegildo Cruz, Jaime de Veyra, and Patricio Mariano) were also active in promoting the study and dissemination of Tagalog literature. The most notable in this group was Epifanio de los Santos (1871–1928), a nephew of Gregorio Sancianco and graduate of Santo Tomas. In 1898, he was Clemente Zulueta's associate in putting out Libertad and was in the staff of Antonio Luna's La Independencia. He was, in the early twentieth century, the country's most eminent biographer and literary scholar.

De los Santos and his cohorts built on unfinished work. In the nineteenth century, the propagandists had initiated the move to construct a "national philology" through palaeographic and linguistic investigations and orthographic reform. Rizal wrote Arte metrica del Tagalog, a paper read before the Ethnographical Society in Berlin in April 1887, the first formal treatise on Tagalog metrics written by a Filipino. He engaged the Spanish author Vicente Barrantes in a discussion of the nature of Tagalog theater and left behind a study of Tagalog grammar, Estudios sobre la
languages (1893), published posthumously in La Patria (December 19, 1899).212

Philological work was carried into the twentieth century by Pedro Serrano Lakraw (1853–1928), a teacher educated in Manila and Spain, who was himself continuing work done by his father Rosalio Serrano (1802–1867), a pioneering Filipino lexicographer who authored Diccionario de terminos comunes tagalo-castellano (1854) and Nuevo diccionario manual español-tagalo (1872). In 1889, Pedro Serrano joined the move for a "new orthography" initiated by Pardo and Rizal by publishing Diccionario hispano-tagalog, which he continued with Diccionario tagalog-hispiano in 1914.213

Another transitional figure was the German Otto Scheerer (1858–1938). A Philippine resident since the early 1880s, he joined the University of the Philippines faculty in 1911 and succeeded Pardo as head of the university's Department of Oriental Languages in 1924. He edited and published The Archive: A Collection of Papers Pertaining to Philippine Linguistics (1924–1932), a series of monographs written by students in a Philippine linguistics seminar Scheerer taught in the state university. The aim, Scheerer said, was to encourage research by students and make available "such valuable information as lies as yet untouched or hidden within the confines of our archipelago, and which can be brought to light by nobody better than by properly guided students hailing from the very speech-groups that are of interest to science."214

Several impulses lie behind language promotion activities at the time. There was the interest, at once scholarly and patriotic, in "recovering" language by producing grammars and dictionaries, addressing a local audience, and correcting Spanish-colonial philological studies on the basis of local understanding and practice. There was the modernizing interest in standardizing, "purifying," and enriching language as medium for modern communication. This was particularly true of languages that developed late as print languages. (For instance, newspapers in Cebuano, Kapampangan, and Leyte-Samar did not appear until after 1900.) Finally, there was the interest in popularizing and officializing the use of local languages in media, schools, and government, as expressed in the call for a "national language," mainly envisioned at the time either as Tagalog, or a fusion of Philippine languages.

These moves carried with them certain hazards. Building a "national" language or literature involves rearticulations of tradition by selecting, discarding, or recombining elements in the culture in a discourse on what "represents" the collective values of the nation. Such acts of promotion are a form of "disciplining" as hierarchies of style, taste, and practice are set up. This is illustrated by a meeting of leading Tagalog writers in Manila on March 8, 1905, at which they chose the poet Francisco Baltazar (Balagtas) as symbol in the campaign to promote Tagalog language and culture. This initiated the literary movement the critic Virgilio Almarion calls balagtasismo that, while laudable in its promotion of Tagalog models, also became a codifying project that privileged certain varieties of form and speech over others. It was not only a project focused on the language of the center, Tagalog, it was—given the formation of its proponents—biased in favor of European and Spanish poetics in its critical vocabulary and the premium placed on formalism and "high," literate poetry.215

Moreover, moves to develop autochthonous traditions of language and literature were compromised by the U.S. imposition of English as medium of education and government and the Filipino intellectuals' ambivalence towards the new colonial language and the national language issue. While the aborted Biyak-na-Bato Constitution (1897) declared Tagalog as the republic's official language, the Malolos Constitution (1899) made no decision on the national language, choosing instead to continue the use of Spanish as official medium and make the use of local languages in government optional. There was no marked aversion toward Spanish at the time. For nineteenth-century intellectuals, Spanish was the link to centers of world-knowledge. For a nationalist movement oriented towards assimilation and modernity, the possession of Spanish rather than its abolition was the goal. In 1889, Solidaridad expressed the prevailing view among intellectuals when, speaking of the benefits of Spanish, the paper said that "the people look forward to the time when they can voice their needs themselves without the intervention of others."216 While the rest of the population may not have shared the ilustrados' zeal for learning Spanish, they were mostly indifferent rather than hostile to it since Spanish was not dominant enough to be viewed as a menace.

The aggressive propagation of English under the Americans presented the elite with what they had so actively sought: linguistic access to modernity and power. Yet, nationalism and the revolution—as shown
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in Rizal's changing views on language and the use of Tagalog by the Katipunan—fostered attachments to the native language as marker and resource of national identity and medium of popular communion. Hence intellectuals were caught between the cultural and moral axioms of a "national language" and the practical and ideological benefits of English. By the 1920s, however, the country had an English-speaking elite that profited from expanding economic, administrative, and educational systems under the Americans. Division and deferral characterized the intelligentsia's attitude towards the national language. The adoption of a national language did not become public policy until the 1935 Constitution, which led to the creation of the Institute of National Language in 1936 and government's declaration of Tagalog as "the basis for the national language" in 1937.

In the intercolonial space of the early twentieth century, local languages and literatures flourished. An English-based educational system derailed this development. There was a dramatic change in the language of print, as shown in the shifts in the medium of newspapers from Spanish to Spanish-Tagalog or Spanish-Tagalog-English, to dominant Tagalog, and then dominant English. Cultural energies released at the century's turn were domesticated or channeled into state-sponsored and academic projects of codification and formalization. Baleograsismo, which began as a nationalist response to the threat of "Anglo-Saxonization," turned nativist and conservative. The national language movement, on the other hand, was safely institutionalized with the creation of the Institute of National Language, intellectualized in such acts as the adoption of Lope Antonio's Balatuy ng Wikang Pamahalaan (1940) as "official grammar," and postposed to some indefinite future.27 In both language and literature, Tagalog and other Philippine languages were subordinated to English and the culture it represented. Writing in the "vernaculars" was deprivilegged as "literature" in the English-based literary education under the Americans. As in the Spanish period, but in ways more complex, a split was preserved between the language of popular discourse and the language of "high" literature and scholarship.

THE NEED to create a Filipino social science was a recurrent theme at the turn of the century. Historiography was an exemplary case. Colonialism, it was argued, erased the Filipino as a historical subject, caricaturing him as a creature of contradictions that defied definition, an "emptiness." The archetypal story told is that of the friar and his blank book. In one version, the friar is the Augustinian botanist Manuel Blanco who, it is said, retired to a monastery outside Manila after his monumental labor on *Flora de Filipinas* to write the history of the Filipino. He sequestered himself in his cell and left orders he should not be disturbed and that his book was to be opened only after his death. When he died years later, his fellow Augustinians searched his cell for the manuscript on which he had labored. When they found his opus, entitled El Indio, they saw a book of blank pages.218

The need to define the nation as a sovereign subject was already the motive behind Rizal's annotated edition of *Sucesos de las Islas Filipinas* (1890). Though sketchy and flawed, the edition contains a veritable grammar of anti-colonial rhetorical moves. Here Rizal traced the basic outline of a Filipino historiography when, speaking to fellow Filipinos in his preface, he positioned his work as one addressed to Filipinos and one that has for its subject "our country" (patria). He sounded the call for the recovery of a lost past ("to awaken your consciousness of our past, already effaced from your memory"), rectification ("to rectify what has been falsified and slandered"), assumption of authority ("Born and brought up... without voice or authority to speak of what we neither saw nor studied"), and orientation to the future ("we shall [then] be able to study the future"). Earlier, in his preface to *Noli me tangere* (1886), he made the problem of authorial location quite clear. Confuting nation and self ("Desiring your well-being, which is our own, "as your son, I also suffer in your defects and failings"), Rizal was acutely conscious of what "writing about ourselves" means. He would infuse into scholarship something of the existential necessity and force of a confessional narrative.219

The call for a history focused on "the Filipino people themselves" was made by Pardo, Calderon, and others. In 1903, the Exposition Board (of which Paterno was a member), preparing for the St. Louis Exposition, planned to have a Filipino history written by Calderon "from the standpoint of Filipinos, in contrast to other historical works which were written from the Spaniards' standpoint, being unjust in giving no credit to Filipinos in the past." As late as 1926, introducing his *Development of Philippine Politics* (1926), a pioneering work in political science, the
U.S.-educated Maximo Kalaw lamented that previous books on the subject were written "from the standpoint of the outsider and have been mostly a record of foreign administrations, Spanish and American, which have been established in the Islands."  

Clemente J. Zulueta (1875–1904) addressed this problem. A law student at Santo Tomas, he belonged to a group of literati that met regularly to discuss poetry and politics, and knew the Luna brothers when he took lessons in the fencing school Antonio Luna opened after he returned from Europe in 1894. (Mabini, before he was paralyzed, was one of the fencing students.) In 1896, he was secretary of the Katipunan's section in Manila's Paco district. To hide his involvement when hostilities began, he presented his services as a military historian to the Spanish authorities. With a safe-conduct pass, he crossed battle lines, did interviews in the field and, it is said, passed intelligence to the rebels. He served as Paterno's private secretary in the Biyak-na-Bato negotiations, and, when war resumed in 1898, joined the Aguinaldo forces and participated in the takeover of the Augustinian-run Asilo de Huerfanos in Tambobong. Put in charge of the orphanage-owned press, Zulueta published La Malasia (1898) and La Libertad (1898). These periodicals were cut short when he was ordered by the revolutionary authorities to move out and close down the press. In September 1898, he joined the cream of the country's literary intelligentsia in publishing Luna's La Independencia.

Opting out of the war in late 1899, he taught history at Liceo de Manila, acted as librarian for Manila clubs, and helped collect materials for the St. Louis Exposition. In 1903, apparently through Pardo's intercession, he was tasked by the Philippine Commission, as "collecting librarian," to undertake research and procure Philippine-related books and manuscripts "with the view to the foundation in Manila of a public historical library upon the subject of the Philippine Islands." For fifteen months, he visited foreign archives and libraries, brought home a trove of source materials, and upon his return called for a "general compilation of historical sources" as an aid to writing the country's history. At this time, American historians Emma Blair and James Robertson had just begun to publish the 55-volume documentary series The Philippine Islands, 1493–1898 (1903–1909), an ambitious private enterprise aimed at enlarging American knowledge about the new U.S. colonial posses-

sion. Zulueta did not believe this fully satisfied the need and urged not only more work in foreign archives but the collection of local materials, including literary works. To promote these aims, Zulueta had started to form Asociación Historia de Filipinas when he died on September 9, 1904, at the age of twenty-nine.

In "El elemento indígena en la Historia de Filipinas," a lecture delivered on June 19, 1902, at Liceo de Manila, Zulueta outlined the need for a new Philippine history. The country, he lamented, has been treated as a mere "appendix" to Spanish history. Spanish-colonial histories glorify "Providence," record only "the acts of the dominant caste," contain "a superabundance of details even on the most insignificant details," and do not amount to "a real critical and philosophical history." Denigrating the natives, Spaniards claimed for themselves and "the dominant class" sole agency in the creation of history.

Historians have neglected, Zulueta argued, "the substantive of the indigenous element (elemento indígena)" in Philippine history. Though "hidden," the indigenous "not only forms an integral portion but the very base and substructure, the main element of Philippine society, not alone during prehistoric times but during the very height of Spanish domination." The victories against Dutch and English incursions, for instance, "are inconceivable without the effective and devoted cooperation of the people." The indigenous barangay shows that "our people had evolved and enjoyed a degree of social interrelationship not demonstrable by races judged more favorably than ours, since this very fact demonstrates most empirically the depth and stability in the race of a spirit of order and justice as its very foundation concept."  

While not beyond nativism, Zulueta stressed that the indigenous had an "assimilating power" as shown in the way native arts and industries were dynamized through precolonial contact with other countries. Spain's "tutelary regime," however, excluded the indigenous from the "political or intellectual spheres" and reduced it to passivity. The native "was obliged to have recourse to an introspective concentration of his faculties until was lost, together with former contact and relations with neighboring countries, much of its own sociability." Because its assimilative power was not allowed full play, its evolution was arrested even as it conserved "its individuality, its personality of race characteristics." Colonial relations were such that between "the indigenous and the domi-
nating element" there could be no social evolution since these two "heterogeneous groups failed to interpenetrate each other reciprocally in their respective spheres of activity." Zulueta concluded by saying "it is fully 
time that the native element take its proper place in Philippine history,
to which factor has belonged not alone the initiative but as well the
accomplishment of many great events." 227

What Zulueta suggests by the *elemento indigena* is the spirit of the
"people," the motivations and acts that generate their distinctive cus-
toms, arts, and industries. This factor "powerfully affected" the course of
events and "gave to history a heroic character." He calls for a holistic
history that includes all human activities and not just the political. His-
thy, he quotes Spanish historian Rafael Altamira, must rest on "the
consideration of social life as an *organism* in which every part and mani-
festation has its own proper and essential value; for this reason it becomes
necessary to study peoples as corporate units, organized in every aspect
of their activities and all the manifestations of energy which they show,
of which one only, politics, cannot claim in all cases and absolutely, the
supremacy." In this regard, Zulueta cites the value of folklore, which has
"only one adepte in the Philippines, D. Isbelo de los Reyes, who, most
certainly has not exhausted the subject." Folkloric investigations, he says,
"can give us a view of the inner life of our people, indispensable for a
fundamental understanding of our society." 228

Zulueta, Gregorio Zaide writes, was "among the first Filipino histo-
rians who advocated the need of interpreting the history of the Philippines
from the Filipino point-of-view and not from the biased viewpoint of the
Spanish chroniclers." 229 Indeed, Zulueta was probably the first to
give a formal, programmatic statement to a theme foreshadowed by Rizal
and Paterno. He does not, however, go too far beyond exhorting histori-
ans to give primacy to native agency. What this required remained
imperfectly articulated both as an intellectual project as well as a mode of
engagement in society and the times.

In 1905, Felipe Calderon gave a more theoretical statement of the
new history in "Por la Historia de Filipinas," a lecture at Manila's Club
Internacional. 230 (Mean: to inaugurate a series of public lectures in his-
tory, this may have been part of the activities launching Asociacion
Historica de Filipinas that year.) Calderon takes off from a review of mod-
ern philosophies of history in which he discusses such versions of "universal

history" as Jacques-Benigne Bossuet's Bible-based providential history
of mankind, Giambattista Vico's theory of historical cycles, Condorcet's
rational-scientific framework of "organic perfectability," the ideas of
Montesquieu and Henry Thomas Buckele on the materialist basis of hu-
nan institutions, and the historicism of Johann Gottfried Herder.

Calderon rejects the systematists who write to demonstrate a *priori*
theses on history as well as the determinists who reduce social pheno-
mena as products of nutrition and environment. Natural forces, he says,
determine institutions and events in culturally mediated ways. Human
history is the product of a "double activity," not just the influence of
external phenomena on our "spirit" (espirito) but the action of the spirit
on physical nature. Taking the Herderian view, Calderon stresses human
agency and creativity ("spirit," a word Herder uses for what he also calls
"culture"), the organic interrelation of everything, and the need to un-
derstand human actions genetically in terms of their history. Like Herder,
Calderon believes that history's proper subject is the life of communities
and not the deeds of great individuals. Human achievements encompass
everything from "the modest labor of the most obscure worker to the
lucrations of the scientist, the victories of the *caudillo* and the suc-
cesses of the nation." Using organic metaphors to show how great natural
cataclysms result from a mass of obscure, cumulative changes, Calderon
says that history must encompass "all the manifestations of the activity
of social life." Rhetorically, he asks: How could Bonifacio have set into
motion the Katipunan if the people were not already yearning for greater
liberties they could not obtain by other means? How was it possible that
the seeds sown by Hermano Pule in 1833 should bear fruit in 1898 if
people had remained passive? 231

An "organic conception of society," he asserts, requires that: "the true
content of the history of the Philippines should embrace the study of the
sciences, the arts, industry, customs, religion, laws, etc., of our nation to
appreciate the entire ensemble of organs and functions with their re-
spective dependencies and relationships in the unity of the Subject
(Sujeto), which is no other than the Filippino people." History must not only
be an organic history (what German historians called "cultural history"),
it must be based on the agency of the "people," which Zulueta calls the
"indigenous element" and Calderon (appropriating Herder's populism)
anchors in "the laboring and underprivileged mass of the nation." 232
Brains of the Nation

Organized to stimulate interest in history, Asociación Historica de Filipinas was conceived as a forum that included historians and scholars like Paterno, Pardo, and de los Reyes. The primary movers were Zulueta (who died before the association could be launched) and Calderon (whose death in 1908 effectively ended the association). Three aims animated the association: the cultivation of history as a discipline, archive-building, and popularization. In 1905, the association published the Spanish-English monthly, Revista Historica de Filipinas. The review ceased in 1906 and was succeeded in February 1908 by Enciclopedia Filipina, a monthly that expanded the scope of Revista Historica by covering government, economics, finance, and sociology. Calderon's death cut it short at four issues. It was Calderon who edited Enciclopedia Filipina, headed the editorial committee of Revista Historica, and virtually capitalized both publications.

Influenced by Western positivist historiography, these publications gave primacy to the collection of documents. As Revista Historica's maiden editorial stated, "we are tired of hearing it stated that the time is not ripe to write the history of the Philippines" since the material is not yet sufficient in quantity and quality "to permit the minute analysis ... which must precede all attempts at the historical synthesis of our civilization." Revista Historica and Enciclopedia Filipina published primary sources (such as the sermons of Pedro Pelaes, Chao-ju-kua's account of the islands, and a Tayabas document on the Hernando Pule revolt), bibliographies by Pardo and Ponce, and such foreign contributions as a comparison of Tagalog and Maiayag by the Swiss scholar Renward Brandstetter. It carried an article on feminismo and the lecture "La mujer Filipina" given by Concepcion Felix at a gathering held in honor of Alice Roosevelt on August 11, 1905. Enciclopedia Filipina published book reviews and notices on academic congresses, including a list of papers presented at the 1906 conference of the American Political Science Association in Providence, Rhode Island, as well as an article on the definition of sociology as a discipline.

The ideas of Zulueta and Calderon lie behind both publications. A "true history" has emerged, Revista Historica said, in which "the subject of history is not solely comprised by political events ... nor its only proper subjects certain selected individuals, however great these may seem ... but that it should include all events, the manifold and varied manifestations of human activity as conditioned upon the state of social conceptions and the medium surrounding the same"—that is, "our history as people in this large and complete sense." The "indigenous," the review affirmed, "constitute[s] the true subject of Filipino history and research." To know the indigenous, Revista Historica editors underscored the need to look to the precolonial past as "that broad substructure upon which must rest the substantivity (substantividad) of this essential historical factor of our past."

The Filipino historiographical project would primarily involve Filipinos. However, Revista Historica also invited Americans, "the countrymen of a Prescott, Schoolcraft," to contribute to the project "knowing that a proper and just understanding of the character of any people is essential before it is possible to govern it that both governors and governed are happy." In 1908, Calderon even enlisted the help of Wenceslao Retana in drawing up a "schema of Philippine historiography" for Enciclopedia Filipina. A rabid anti-nationalist, Retana modified his views after the fall of the Spanish regime and devoted himself to Philippine causes. Despite his political past, Filipinos recognized his considerable bibliographic contributions. Responding to Calderon's invitation, Retana presented an outline for an ambitious thirteen-volume history of the Philippines. This history, he writes, should be done by Filipinos but adds that it must not be undertaken for at least ten years since "indispensable" sources are not all available and "bias and prejudice have not entirely disappeared." Commenting on Retana's plan in 1918, Epifanio de los Santos, lauding Retana for his "new state of mind," praises the plan as useful in outlining "a connected historical dissertation of the evolution of the Filipino people." Endorsing the view that the country's history should be written by and for Filipinos, de los Santos agrees that "the time for writing that history has not yet come" as there is still a need for authentication, synthesis, and perspective.

After Revista Historica ceased publication, Manuel Artigas tried to continue its initiative by publishing Biblioteca Nacional Filipina (1908–1909). A Spanish croque, Artigas (1866–1925) studied medicine at Santo Tomas, worked as a civil servant, and, having set up his own press, took up the work that Jose Felipe del Pan pursued before him, producing the twice-monthly review, El Faro Administrativo (1892), the two-volume El Municipio Filipino (1894), and Diccionario Técnico-historico de la...
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*Administracion de Filipinos* (1934). The political situation drove him to Spain in 1897 but he returned in 1902. (At the time of Biblioteca Nacional Filipina, he was a librarian at the National Library; he became its acting director in 1921–1922.) Artigas was basically a compiler. Biblioteca Nacional Filipina, also called Philippine National Library Historical Review, displayed his appetite for documentation. A Spanish-English monthly, it was virtually a one-man publication. It carried biographies, texts of documents, and monographs (such as histories of Filipino parliamentary representation, agriculture, journalism, and the Tagalog language) so formatted that they could be taken out as separates and bound as books. In his maiden editorial, Artigas said that he had taken up the task of building a bibliographic archive "up to now left in the hands of those who did not feel toward the Philippines that love which everyone must feel toward the mother." Hence the need for Filipinos ("we") to collect reliable sources to counter "the prejudices which were allowed in the past to disfigure completely all that related to these islands."486

The need to build a national body of scholarly knowledge animated initiatives in education, cultural organizing, and publishing. Newspapers in Manila and the provinces carried historical sketches, literary and folkloristic works, and bibliographies. Intellectuals who began their careers in the nineteenth century, like Paterno, Pardo, and Mariano Ponce continued to be active. Reviving a series he started in *Solidaridad* in 1892–1893, Ponce produced, with Jaime de Veera, a series of historical and cultural articles called *Efemerides Filipinas* in *El Renacimiento* and *El Ideal* in 1911–1912. He also helped organize *Sociedad Orientalista de Filipinas* in 1918 together with Pardo, Artigas, Jose Alejandrino, Macario Adriatico, and Teodoro Kalaw. The society published a short-lived monthly journal of Asian affairs, *Boletin de la Sociedad Orientalista de Filipinas* (1918).486

After Calderon's death, however, much of the philosophical ambition behind Filipino historiography that he and Zulueta had was dissipated. Even at the outset, despite Calderon’s professed populism, one discerns the drift towards academism and formalism. While the proponents of the new history were lawyers, doctors, and poets, the idea of "discipline" was pronounced. In his 1902 lecture, Zulueta lamented that schools had not kept up with theoretical advances and that the country lacked the kind of scholarly authority scientific societies in other countries had. While the revolution had given impetus to historical works, he said, the passions of the day were such that "this impulse was twisted into channels determined by the passions aroused." A positivist bias put the premium on the collection of written documents. While history was seen as an instrument for "organizing" society there was a mood of deferential premised on the belief that "reliable sources" were not yet sufficient for writing Philippine history.

The "cultural history" project pointed to a new way of conceiving the country's past and reclaiming what colonialism had suppressed. It may be said that in proposing an organic history that placed at its center the structuring principle of the "indigenous," Zulueta and his colleagues strategically displaced U.S. dominance in the "political" realm by asserting the primacy of the "cultural." The project, however, also signified *ilustrado* accommodation to U.S. rule. Like many intellectuals, Zulueta and Calderon believed that the American order was propitious for the pursuit of knowledge and did not quite confront the contradictions between native agency and the new colonial domination. In steering historiography away from an exclusive concern with "politics," men like Calderon and Zulueta expressed the postrevolutionary mood of gradualism, of turning away from a politics of confrontation to one of "nation-building." The avoidance (or acceptance) of U.S. rule rendered the new historiography problematic since it ignored the materially and ideologically constructive effects of the new colonialism.

**The Filipino Enlightenment**

*The intercolonial transition* detailed the development of an "indigenous" intellectual tradition. Private initiatives like *Asociacion Historica de Filipinas* were swamped by the U.S. colonial state's program of reconizing government, establishing an English-based national educational system, and renovating the national culture.

The American colonial state embarked on producing a new fund of knowledge about the archipelago. As anthropologist Daniel Brinton said in 1899, now that the Philippines are "definitely ours," knowledge of the country is essential for its "proper management."487 The Washington-based Bureau of Insular Affairs, America's "colony office," functioned as a research and information bureau for the U.S. government on civil affairs connected to Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines. BIA collected economic intelligence, recruited experts in finance, labor, and
economics (and the first American teachers sent to the Philippines), produced maps and gazetteers, and archived captured records of the Aguinaldo government. In Manila, the Philippine Commission interviewed Filipino experts, initiated the first modern census of the Philippines (1902), established museums and libraries, and laid the groundwork for a countrywide public school system.

Building on earlier Spanish institutions, the Americans established bureaus of Forestry (1900), Agriculture (1901), Mines (1901), and Science (which began as Bureau of Government Laboratories in 1901). The U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey (1900) completed work done by the Spaniards in charting the coast and waters of the archipelago. The American Circulating Library (1900) evolved into the Philippine Public Library in 1908 and Philippine Library & Museum in 1916. (The museum, which incorporated the Insular Museum of Ethnology, Archaeology and Commerce established in 1901, became the National Museum in 1928.) The Bureau of Archives created by the Philippine Commission in 1901 gave rise to the National Archives. A Bureau of Non-Christian Tribes was created in 1901 and charged with undertaking "the Ethnological Survey for the Philippine Islands" which launched expeditions and reconnaissance work, did translation and photographic documentation, organized exhibits, and published monographs. 246

The U.S. occupation opened up a "research field" for American scholars. Bureau of Non-Christian Tribes engaged the services of anthropologists and scientists, like David Barrows, Albert Jenks, Fay Cooper Cole, William Jones, and Laura Watson Benedict. Within months of the invasion of the Philippines, the American Historical Association, American Economics Association, and American Association for Political and Social Science each formed its "Committee on Colonies," while Smithsonian and the Bureau of American Ethnology maneuvered to claim a leading role in colonial investigation. 247 At Johns Hopkins University a course in Philippine linguistics, under Frank R. Blake, was opened in 1900 under the Oriental Seminar directed by Paul Haupt. There were plans for U.S. government support for courses in Tagalog and Visayan, and Blake went on to become a prolific scholar on Philippine languages. 248

More than anything else the sweep of intellectual changes is indicated by the phenomenal expansion of the public school system.

Between 1903 and 1940, the number of schools increased from 3,000 to 13,000; the number of teachers from 2,500 to 42,000; and school enrollment from under 300,000 to 1,860,000. 249 A new higher education system, at the apex of which was a new state university, University of the Philippines (1908), introduced far-reaching intellectual reorientations. English-based, modeled after American universities, and manned by Americans and U.S.-educated Filipinos, the university became the standard for higher education in the country. Women were admitted from the time the university opened in 1908. Student enrolment rose from 67 in 1908 to 7,849 in 1929. The university's expansion can be seen in the succession of colleges established: Medicine (1907), Agriculture (1909), Fine Arts (1909), Liberal Arts (1910), Forestry (1910), Engineering (1910), Pharmacy (1911), Law (1911), Education (1913), Tropical Medicine and Public Health (1914), Dentistry (1915), Nursing (1916), Music (1915), Surveying (1925), and Business Administration (1929).

Disciplines were institutionalized with the establishment in the state university of such departments as History (1910), Anthropology (1914), the first such department in Southeast Asia), Political Science (1915), and Linguistics (1922). Americans did not only run the university but headed academic departments, as in the examples of H. Otley Beyer, Dean Fansler, and George Malcolm. The Department of History, for instance, had an all-American faculty when it was established in 1910. The Department of Political Science did not have a Filipino head until Maximo Kalaw became its chairman in 1920. In 1910-1911, there were six American deans and only one Filipino and the faculty list named 72 Americans and foreign nationals and only 15 Filipinos. 250

Filipinismo was a major theme in discussions of the university's role at its inception. In his inaugural address on December 20, 1911, as the first U.P. president, Murray Bartlett, an Episcopal minister with a Doctor of Divinity degree from University of Rochester, raised the aim of building a university "which shall measure up to world-standards" but stressed at the same time that U.P. will be a "University for the Filipino."

The world-centers of knowledge are essentially national. With students from all parts of the world, Berlin is essentially German
and Oxford essentially English. This university should not be a reproduction of the American university. If it is to blossom into real fruit, it must grow in Philippine soil, it must not be transplanted from foreign shores. It can serve the world best by serving best the Filipino.233

What this mostly meant at the time, however, for American and Filipino intellectual leaders, was the gradual expansion of the role of Filipinos both in the university and the government through the production of educated and efficient professionals in various fields.

What must be stressed is the easy accommodation of the Filipino intellectual elite to the new order. There were skirmishes on issues of political independence, U.S. economic domination, and the cultural perils of Anglo-Saxonization. A celebrated case was the storm over El Renacimiento’s “Birds of Prey” editorial (October 30, 1908) that attacked Dean C. Worcester for using his scientific expeditions to further personal business interests. (A University of Michigan zoologist, Worcester was Secretary of Interior in 1901–1913.) Convicted of libel, publisher Martin Ocampo and editor Teodoro Kalaw were heavily fined and escaped serving jail terms only because of an executive pardon. El Renacimiento was forced out of existence. The case raised not only the issue of press freedom but the use of colonial science to camouflage commercial exploitation and misrepresent a people. Worcester’s advocacy and promotion of Philippine “tribals,” it was said, were meant to disparage Filipinos and undermine their claims of competence for independence. The Renacimiento libel suit became a rallying cry for nationalists.24

Yet, despite such irritants, the intellectual elite saw much in the new order that satisfied their aspirations for secularism and libertarianism. “Filipinization” under the Americans opened up many opportunities for intellectuals. Filipinos had their own legislature by 1907. By 1913, they filled 71% of national civil service positions, 99% of all municipal and 90% of all provincial posts.25 While it was not until the Commonwealth that a Filipino headed the Department of Public Instruction, Filipinos actively participated in the execution of educational policies. In 1920, there were only 385 American teachers compared to 17,244 Filipinos. As early as 1915, the University of the Philippines had Filipinos as president (Ignacio Villamos), acting presidents Jose Escaler and

Alejandro Albert, Rafael Palma, Jorge Bocobo). After an almost exclusive diet of American in the early years, public school textbooks were “Filipinized” in authorship and content. Textbooks narrated the life-stories of national heroes and stimulated a juvenile appetite for “native culture.” In the country’s schoolhouses, pictures of Rizal, Bonifacio, and other heroes graced schoolrooms, the Philippine flag floated side by side with the Stars and Stripes, and the Philippine National Anthem was daily sung.

State cultural agencies were in Filipino hands almost from their inception. Filipino intellectuals directed the National Library and Museum (Manuel Artigas, Teodoro Kalaw, Epifanio de los Santos, Jaime de Veyra) and institute of National Language (de Veyra, Lope Santos). They conducted research, collected “Filipiniana,” wrote on history and culture, and speculated on the Filipino personality. While the intelligentsia had expanded and diversified it is remarkable that the time’s most influential scholars formed a small, homogeneous formation. Epifanio de los Santos, Lope Santos, Jaime de Veyra, Rafael Palma, and Teodoro Kalaw were middle-class, Manila-based postrevolutionary cohorts enthused over the challenge of participating in the U.S.-guided nation-building project. They were mostly allied with the ruling Nacionalista Party (and personally associated with Manuel Quezon and Sergio Osmeña) and served as governors, assemblymen, senators, or held Cabinet-level posts. Scholars, bureaucrats, they exercised considerable influence in shaping public memory and “national identity” in this period.

Unlike the nineteenth-century propagandists, who worked outside the state, the leading early twentieth-century intellectuals were positioned within it. They imagined themselves “organic” (though not quite in Gramsci’s sense) to a state-guided nation-building enterprise that, they believed, represented the people’s aspirations.26 While there were dissident and unincorporated voices, the prevailing mood among intellectuals was one of complacent acceptance of power.

When the twentieth century began, the basic themes of a national historiography had been enunciated. The nation was narrativized as a single and coherent entity with a “long” and “high” past embedded in an ancient “Malay civilization” leavened with centuries-long Hindu, Arab, Chinese, and European influences. While Spanish colonialism stunted its growth, the nation did not lose its capacity for “modernity” and
"progress," a capacity the nation now exercised as it prepared for full nationhood under American auspices. It is a teleological narrative guided by an elite vision of a future blazed by the West but one that Filipinos, by the specific force of their "culture," are making their own.

Writing history and politics from the "Filipino point of view" was the norm though it was not always clear what this meant. On one hand, it meant making visible the actions of the "people" vis-à-vis the colonial masters. Yet, it also involved the strategic move of incorporating these actions into the elite's view of the evolution of the nation. Hence, historians illustrated the "substantivity of the Filipino race" by tracing the lineage of the ilustrado revolution back to such episodes of resistance as the "separatist" revolt of Diego Silang in 1814 and Hermano Pule's "religio-political" uprising in 1841. On the other hand, claims for an autonomous history stressed the rich indigeneity of local culture. Thus the preoccupation of the cultural nationalists with the problem of the "Filipino Soul." The discourse on "soul" —however—like that of a romanticized, abstract "people"—was not one that could not be harmonized with acceptance of U.S. rule.

As formulated, the project of Filipino-centric scholarship lent itself to nation-building under U.S. "stewardship." Public school textbooks "officialized" a modular narrative of the country's historical evolution that inserted the period of U.S. rule as the culmination of the people's struggle for democracy and progress. Scholars (most notably, Teodoro Kalaw and Epifanio de los Santos) built a canonical understanding of the revolution and its pantheon of heroes as mental and moral foundation of the new nation. Research and promotional activities created a "national" canon of literature, dance, music, painting, and architecture. Such texts as the "Code of Calantiao," Andres Bonifacio's "Duties of the Sons of the People," and Apolinario Mabini's "True Decalogue" were invented or wrested out of their contexts and deployed for citizenship-building. Departing from the dynamic claims of los Reyes made for folklore studies, works like Kalaw's Cinco Relatos de Nuestro Moral Antigua (1935) harnessed folklore for strengthening state nationalism.

Revolutionary nationalism mutated into "Filipinism" (filipinismo), a benign and conservative view of recovering, preserving, and promoting native traditions in combination with the best in Western (specifically, American) culture. Distinctly culturalist rather than political or eco-

nomic, its spirit is summed up in Teodoro Kalaw's words: "Let me write the songs of a nation and I do not care who makes its laws." Diffuse and non-aggressive, Filipinism was a form of nationalism perfectly congruent with the dominant politics of "constructive partnership" with America. It was congenial to leaders who invoked nationalism to distance themselves from the Americans as well as deflect the radical demands of those who could not abide with U.S. rule. It played into the U.S. policy of "Filipinization" under the country's directing class.

In the cohabitation of "Americanization" and "Filipinization," a canonical, civic nationalism was formed. It is not surprising that a high American official, Joseph Ralston Hayden, would claim Filipino nationalism as product of the American colonial project. In 1941, Hayden boasted that "only within the last generation have they [Filipinos] become generally conscious of a national history, national heroes, and common aspirations for a national destiny."
leged as foundational the contributions of American linguists like Carlos Everett Conant and Leonard Bloomfield. Scholars on Sanskrit elements in Philippine languages have given notice to his works but treat them without benefit of context in nineteenth-century linguistic science and colonial politics. Pardo's polemical essays had the better fortune of surviving but have been culled for contextless ideas on themes like culture and education.261

Isabelo de los Reyes's work has fared better, particularly in his role as "Father of Filipino Folklore" and theologian of the Philippine Independent Church (in no small measure due to the scholarship of William Henry Scott). The totality of his many-sided intellectual contributions, however, has not been carefully examined.

Histories of Philippine anthropology begin with such U.S. state-sponsored projects as the work of Dean Worcester and the Bureau of Non-Christian Tribes, and professionals like Alfred Kroeber and Laura Watson Benedict, or the discipline's institutionalization in the state university after 1914. While reference is made to the "enormous amount" of ethnological data generated by Spanish and other European authors, American anthropologists and the Filipinos who trained under them mainly approached the Philippines as virgin territory. In a summation of knowledge about Philippine "ethnography, ethnology, idiomography," authorized by the Philippine Commission in 1901, Paterno is ignored while only passing mention is made of Pardo and de los Reyes.262

In a survey of the state of knowledge about the Philippines as of 1898, James LeRoy, one of the most influential of U.S.-colonial scholars, mentions the contributions of Filipinos but is dismissive of their value. Calling Paterno a person with "a lively imagination, too lively for politics and history," he dismisses as "ridiculous" Paterno's writings on "an imaginary primitive religion and civilization of the Filipinos." He judges de los Reyes's writings as "commonly unreliable" and, elsewhere, writes that, on the subject of mythology and folklore, "the writings of Pedro A. Paterno are virtually worthless, being in fact discredited to his race, and the pamphlets of Isabelo de los Reyes, while better, do not deserve the name of 'researches.'" LeRoy believed that the "modern era" in the Philippines "in certain respects, did not really begin until after the establishment of American rule." On ethnology, he writes that "the real foundations of that science are only now being laid in the Philippines." He dismisses pre-American scholarship as biased and confused. Spanish ethnological writings were, "speaking strictly from the scientific point of view, unreliable or, in some cases, worthless." LeRoy concludes that "the science of Philippine ethnology proper is still in its infancy."263

The claim of American beginnings has persisted. Karl Hutterer illustrates the break by pointing out that Kroeber's Peuples of the Philippines (1919) does not mention a single primary Spanish (or, for that matter, Filipino) source outside of what was made available in the Blair and Robertson Philippine Islands series. Honoring the work of H. Orde Beyer (1883-1966), hailed as the "father of Philippine anthropology," E. Arsenio Manuel writes: "Before Beyer came there was no Philippine prehistory to speak of. When he started his career in research he practically had to do from scratch." Similarly, Filipino students came to believe it was Beyer who first theorized that the Philippines was once part of the Asian mainland, ignoring the fact that this was an idea already found in Paterno and early Spanish authors.264

The American divide stranded the works of Paterno, Pardo, and de los Reyes in the past. The promotion of the English language, which Pardo ironically pushed, severed a new generation of readers from the Spanish works Pardo and his contemporaries wrote. Language and access, however, were not the only reasons for the genealogical break. Increased professionalization, changing orientations in the disciplines and the hegemonic claims of American education propagated new approaches and methods. The premium on "objectivity" and empirical, fieldwork-based research devalued the philosophical and speculative style of Victorian anthropology. Anthropology demarcated its field apart from the expansive and philosophical ambitions of early ethnology; modern linguistics weaned itself from its roots in nineteenth-century philology; and sociology shifted from a European preoccupation with social philosophy to American positivism.

The postrevolutionary order inculcated values of civic cutelage and academic apprenticeship. The political moment was ripe for a new scientific outlook that stressed disciplinary specialization, empirical research, and detachment from political concerns. Anthropology moved towards cultural relativism, setting the premium on understanding a culture "in its own terms." In effect discrediting the "universal history of mankind"
Paterno was engaged in. While all these advanced knowledge about Philippine society, the new cult of "objective" scholarship masked its own historical groundedness and bias in the treatment of "other peoples." It disguised the continuing complicity of Filipino intellectuals in Western forms of knowledge.

ON THE ADVENT of the Western disciplines in colonial India, Partha Chatterjee (drawing from Michel Foucault) says that differences could appear at four levels in the dispersal of the disciplines in the colony: the formation of objects of knowledge, modalities of enunciation, conceptual formation, and thematic choices. Here the question of "modalities of enunciation" (who is authorized to speak and how, from which institutional site and subject position, and for what ends) is crucial, informing as it does what and how objects and concepts are selected, shaped, and deployed. It brings into play other discursive factors: the location one occupies in existing communication networks, the real and imagined audiences one addresses, and the discursive mode or medium one uses. This makes intellectual biography—with its focus on the specifics of human enunciation—a productive axis for understanding larger discursive formations.

Though the intellectual constitutes discourse, he comes into a field already constituted by others. It is a system of reference with determinative effects, orienting those engaged in cultural production by defining the universe of problems, models, and references. It is both a "space of possibilities" as well as one that subjects the intellectual to "the structured constraints of the field" (in Pierre Bourdieu's words, a field of "positions-taken"). The constraints are not just intellectual (though it is at this level that they are most insidious, lying so deep we are scarcely aware of them) but material (lack of educational opportunities and leisure, censorship, repression).

This is most evident in a colonial situation. By definition, a colonial intellectual is one already compromised. Once one is drawn into the orbit of a colonizing power, the groundwork of one's existence has changed. The "outside" is already part of the "inside" and one is no longer innocent. There is no pure, originary, Archimedean point from which one can interrogate the Other. To be an "intellectual" is to assume a role already contaminated. To begin to speak of the "modern" is to deny a pure indigeneity. The idea of the "local" already presupposes a relation to a wider, engulfing outside.

Yet these very same experiences, of "naturalization" and subordination, are markers of difference that can be mined as source of an autonomous, empowered identity. Mediating knowledge, the local intellectual does not leave it unchanged. His principal advantage is location and difference: of being so situated he knows things the other cannot know, deploying the power of the "hidden" to interrogate the claims of what the other has "revealed," or, conversely, posing the "evident" against what the other has "concealed."

Edward Said writes: "An interlocutor in the colonial situation is by definition either someone who is compliant and belongs to the category of what the French in Algeria called an evolue, notable, or said... or someone who, like Fanon's native intellectual, simply refuses to talk, deciding that only a radically antagonistic, perhaps violent riposte is the only interlocution that is possible with colonial power." Said dramatizes for effect the contrast between the "scrubbed, disinfected interlocutor" who discourses in the master's handsomely appointed salon and the one who is outside, clamoring on the doorstep, making such an unseemly disturbance as to be let in "guns or stones checked in with the porter." Between one and the other—mimicry and silence, genteel repartee and violent riposte—the acts of interlocution are in fact quite complex.

What of the Filipino interlocutor? How does the Filipino intellectual engage Western knowledge? Where relations of dominance and subordination are perceived as existing between cultures, in what specific ways are ideas and categories conceived in the context of the dominant culture received and transformed in the subordinate? What local or indigenous resources are deployed in this engagement with the Other?

Examining the works of Paterno, Pardo, and de los Reyes reveals the varied, dynamic ways in which Filipino intellectuals positioned themselves in relation to Western knowledge. Such variety and dynamism derive from the specificities of their location and formation, the stance they took in relation to the object and audience of their discourse, the refractions of the languages and forms they used, and the shifts in the moments of enunciation. Such an investigation shows that the binaries of collaboration and resistance, acceptance and rejection, are reductive polarities that flatten out historical reality. This is not to deny the util-
The particularities of the Philippine case are important. Nineteenth-century Filipino intellectuals developed in the belly of colonialism. Typically, they were of the urban bourgeoisie and landed gentry, social formations produced by colonialism and capitalism. They were almost exclusively male, mostly creole and mestizo, the racial types that, owing to their spatial and social location, were the earliest to access economic and cultural advantages under colonial rule. Like their counterparts in Latin America, they associated with Europeans, attended European-style schools, entered the modern professions, became proficient in metropolitan languages, traveled widely, and avidly consumed Western culture. 

Empowered by wealth and education, they nevertheless remained subordinate in a colonial order that privileged Europeans over indigenes, peninsulars over creoles, and the “pure-blooded” over the mixed. They were conscious, however, that they were the leading elements of the colonized. They parlayed this “in-between” position into a space of knowledge and power, authorizing them to speak for the dominated and excluded. As cultural translators, they had the privilege of access to both sides. They exercised a double authority (one more chameleon-like than Janus-faced), claiming on one hand the “authenticity” of the native and moral high ground of the victim, and, on the other (or at the same time), access to the European world and its levers of power. They drew authority from their being well-read, well-traveled lawyers, physicians, or writers, yet claimed power from being “native” (as did—even if dissimilar in intent—Paterno when he assumed the title of magnifico or Rizal when he invented indio bravos).

Their positionings were biased in favor of the West. There was little of an autochthonous tradition out of which they could speak or engage the West. Unlike other parts of Asia, there were no large, powerful precolonial “kingdoms,” no well-articulated corps of royal scribes and religio-literary specialists, no archive of written histories or legal treaties. Islam was incipient at Spanish contact and while it maintained its influence in the archipelago’s unincorporated southern end, it did not seriously challenge Spanish hegemony in the rest of the country. There were, despite Paterno’s fantasies, no ancient kingdoms to restore, no “past” to summon into the present. The “nation” did not even have a name. Tagalog nationalists diluted Tagalog to refer to the nation and even then it did not quite include the unassimilated Muslims and “tribes,” who were not encompassed by the term indio but were classed as moros and infeites. Tagalog did not catch on for those who thought of themselves as Bisaya or Ilokano. Thus the recourse to the name the Spaniards invented for the country, after the King of Spain, Filipinas.

When Rizal’s generation was born, Spanish colonialism was already three centuries deep. Men like Paterno may have descended from “old Tagalog nobility” but this did not invest them with real symbolic or material power beyond the nostalgic and decorative. Despite the nationalists’ wishful theme of the lost codex of papyrus manuscripts and Rizal’s lament over “our vanished nationality,” the challenge for Filipino intellectuals was, in a sense more apt and urgent than elsewhere, the “invention” of the nation. They used Western frames and sources in this endeavor. It could not have been otherwise given their intellectual formation and available resources. It could not have been otherwise given the primary audiences they addressed (Spaniards, Europeans, fellow ilustrados), the language and verbal genres they used, and the assimilationist aims that guided the Propaganda Movement.

It simplifies to say that theirs was a “derivative discourse.” It is less derivative (with what the word suggests of the handed-down and imitated) as appropriated and reconstituted. If the West’s discourse had to be appropriated it was because colonialism happened. Filipino intellectuals had to work through it and not outside of, or apart from, it. They worked out of their particular location, framing the object (“nation”) in their own way, deploying themes and concepts to their advantage, making their own strategic choices. They claimed the best of what the West had to offer as their own. Trained in the modern professions, exposed to Europe, adept in its language and textual practices, they appropriated
the authority of its best minds, seeing themselves in the same simultaneous order as Voltaire and Darwin. They did not only claim parity with Europeans, they did something more radical. They "provincialized" the Spaniards in the colony by claiming they knew "Europe," what it represented, better than these Spaniards did. They, and not the Spaniards, were the moderns.

To a certain extent, as in Paterno's case, this was mimicry. Yet even mimicry has an unstable, dangerous quality. While it reinforces the mystique of the original, it can slide into parody and subvert it. In more positive ways, it was not just mimicry but an assumption of the theoretical premises of Enlightenment thought, the promise of science and reason. Such men as Rizal were acutely aware of the perils of "foreign" knowledge. In his message to the young women of Malolos in 1889, he endorsed the value of learning from others but warned, "may you not gather in the garden of knowledge the unripe fruit but select what you pick, think about it, taste it before swallowing it, for on the face of the earth all are mixed and it is not unusual for the enemy to sow weeds together with the good seeds in the middle of the field."

In staking out their claim to knowledge they constructed the agency of a nation. In arguing that Filipinos had an ancient and noble past, Rizal and his contemporaries mostly relied on Spanish sources but selected, recontextualized, and stressed statements and themes to advance their thesis. They developed European "migration wave" theories of the peopling of the islands into a theme of historic dynamism and progressive advance at the crest of which they stood. They used to their advantage the Spanish chroniclers' Eurocentric observations about petty states, a local priesthood, and beliefs analogous to Christianity, using them to show that the elements of "civilization" and "high religion" existed in precolonial times. They turned Spanish observations about similarities in local languages, customs, and racial types into "proof" of the existence of a definable nation.

They expanded this argument in two directions. They excavated Malay and Asian sources outside the Philippines to link the country to broader, better-documented civilizations in the region, the "Malay" or an Ur-civilization that Filipinos shared with other Asians, like the Japanese (in Paterno's extreme case, even the civilizations of the Near East). And, in the case of Isabelo de los Reyes, they attempted the recovery of folklore in a bid to resurrect and replenish a storehouse of indigenous traditions and popular thought.

Both projects were flawed and unfinished. There was a pronounced bias for Western frameworks of modernity and progress (naive and mendicant as well as critical and pragmatic) in which local phenomena were explained according to Western categories and local history realigned to fit a Western teleology. Equally important, much was left unrecognized or unfinished with respect to accessing and building a local knowledge-base and expanding the scope of the people's substantive participation in intellectual life.

Leading theoreticians of the nation died young or were lost and co-opted in the shift to the U.S. colonial order. De los Reyes was consumed by many enthusiasms and did not push forward the project of a folklore Filipino. Pardo grew impatient with the past and devoted himself to the pursuit of an American vision of the present. Despite the populism of de los Reyes and the commitment to public education of Rizal and Pardo, the work of the intellectuals (in a time when the "directing" role of an educated elite went largely unquestioned) remained elitist in range and assumptions.

The elite's historical formation carried with it ethnic, territorial, economic, and political biases. It would be a mistake to overstress racial and class divisions. Racial categories like "mestizo" and "creole" are blurred by such facts as depth of residence, density of local blood and social ties, or (in the case of creoles) the lack of numbers to sustain an autonomous, corporate identity. Polarities of "elite" and "masses," on the other hand, do not account for the dynamic specificities of social formation in nineteenth-century Philippines, particularly in the places where revolutionary activities were intense. The ilustrado version of the "nation," however, remained inchoate and provisional, one shaped out of their own locations. It is limited in the ways they imagined the nation's body in terms territorial (in its bias for a Tagalog center), social (in its marginalization of Muslims and "tribes"), and political (in its misrecognition of the agency of the "people" they presumed to lead).

Nationalist thought is a process. Today—with the interest in the historical "situatedness" of knowledge and "the native viewpoint"—the examples of writers like Paterno, Pardo, and de los Reyes are immensely instructive. They were, after all, among the first "natives" in Southeast
Asia to engage Orientalist scholarship in its home grounds. Inserting themselves into a European discursive formation, they selected and used topics, methods, and theories dominant in European scholarship at the time. In the process, it may be said that they created a derivative discourse that affirmed the ideas of racial, social, and political hierarchies that underwrote Orientalism. However, to dismiss their works as a simple case of complicity is reductive. The figures of Paterno in Salamanca, Rizal at the British Museum, and Pardo at the Sorbonne are signs not only of complicity, but the critical engagement of Filipinos in Western structures of knowing the world.

There are important lessons to be learned from looking at the enunciative modalities that informed how they dealt with local realities and positioned themselves in relation both to European knowledge and the national community with which they identified themselves. Rizal, Paterno, Pardo, and de los Reyes are instructive not just for how they engaged European Orientalism but—and this is part of the same process—how they located themselves in relation to the country from, of, and for which they tried or pretended to speak. There is much to be learned from the unfinished, strange and wondrous itineraries they took.

A PHYSICIAN in the Age of Reason, Jose Rizal was fond of speaking of society in medico-physiological terms. His image of the nation as a nervous system expressed his hope in the formation of an integral, coordinated, virally functioning body. It is not a bad metaphor. As in the human nervous system, a nation cannot be self-sufficient. It is nourished by a constant flow of impressions from the outside world, otherwise deprived of contact and starved of stimulation, the body falls disoriented and prey to hallucinations. It is not only turned outwards but inwards, alive to what goes on inside the body, parts sensitive and interconnected, the system’s sensory receptors receiving and processing information, alerting the body to what dangers lie within or may sneak in from the outside. It is a centered system, with the brain and spinal cord as main base of operations from which neural impulses travel through a wondrously intricate network, stirring emotion, thought, such that the body acts as one.

There are limits to the analogy as well as dangers, as in the specter it raises of the center as a malign controlling intelligence. Rizal, how-